HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 31, 1986*

The House met at 10 a.m.

Dr. Roger D. Willmore, pastor, First Baptist Church, Mayfield, KY, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, quiet our souls before Your throne of grace as we take up the responsibilities of this day. Make us dependent upon the Holy Spirit and His enabling power.

Grant to the officers and Members of this body Your guidance, wisdom, and strength. Make them conscious of Your good and perfect will. Give them courage to do what is right, and may they find spiritual resources for the strain and pressures of their duties in this place.

Lord Jesus, we thank You for Your bountiful blessings upon our great Nation. We pray that we might continue to conduct ourselves in a manner worthy of all Your benefits. In Jesus' name we pray. 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. BILIRAKIS. 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. BILIRAKIS. 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 263, nays 131, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

YEAS—263

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gradison
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hillis
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lujan
Luken
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schulze
Schumer
Sharp
Shumway
Siljander
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waldon
Walgren
Watkins
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—131

Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Dyson
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gregg
Gunderson
Hansen
Hawkins
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jones (OK)
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McCollum
McGrath
McKernan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Monson
Moorhead
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Saxton
Schroeder
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Sikorski
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Solomon
St Germain
Stangeland
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Swindall
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Waxman
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—37

Barnes
Bedell
Breaux
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Chappell
Clay
Collins
Dingell
Dixon
Eckert (NY)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Grotberg
Jones (NC)
Kleczka
Lundine
MacKay
McCurdy
Mikulski
Mitchell
Moore
Neal
Nichols
Panetta
Pickle
Seiberling
Shelby
Slattery
Stark
Sweeney
Torres
Towns
Wilson

□ 1015

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 2690. An act to prohibit certain companies who have filed for bankruptcy from discontinuing medical and life insurance benefits to retirees.

PASTOR ROGER D. WILLMORE

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

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have as my guest Dr. Roger Willmore, pastor of the First Baptist

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Church of Mayfield, KY, who is guest chaplain today in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Being a longtime member of the First Baptist Church of Mayfield, I consider it a privilege to call Dr. Willmore my hometown pastor and my good friend.

Dr. Willmore, a 34-year-old native of Arab, AL, began his postsecondary education at Samford University in Birmingham, AL, and graduated from Jacksonville State University in Jacksonville, AL, with a bachelor of arts degree. He further pursued his theological studies at Luther Rice Seminary in Jacksonville, FL, where he received master of divinity and doctor of ministry degrees.

Since 1973, Dr. Willmore has served as pastor for 6 years at Cherry Street Baptist Church in Attalla, AL, 6 years at Locust Fork, AL, and he has served as pastor at First Baptist Church in Mayfield since March 1985.

Dr. Willmore has to his credit a record of distinguished service to the church and leadership in many organizations such as the Alabama Baptist State Convention, the Keswick Christian Life Convention, and Stop Child Abuse Now [SCAN]. He has also performed missionary service in Bogotá, South America, and in Nigeria, and in 1983 he was honored as one of the Outstanding Young Men of America.

Dr. Willmore is married to the former Sandra Carroll of Arab, AL, and they will be celebrating their 13th anniversary this Sunday, August 3. They are the parents of one child, Stephen Andrew Willmore, age 9.

Again, I am very pleased and proud that Dr. Roger Willmore is with us, and I know my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in expressing our gratitude for his serving as our guest chaplain today.

TAX REFORM: A QUESTION OF FAIRNESS

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the pending tax reform legislation is being sold to the American people on two basic premises. First, it is supposed to be simple. As the conferees do their work, that concept appears to be less and less likely.

Second, it is advertised as fair. In some respects this may have merit. But there is one arrangement built into the bill which is little less than outrageous. By the usual fiscal sleight of hand, our tax writers are prepared to give to a Japanese auto firm tax benefits which, it is alleged, may reach as much as $100 million.

The excuse is that that company will build a factory to assemble its product in the State of Kentucky, thereby protecting American jobs. Have we reached the point where we are telling Americans that we are sending their taxes to Japan for their benefit?

This is taking place against a background of increasing the tax load on American businesses trying to compete with these very firms. Investment tax credit, depreciation, and capital formation for American firms are being made harder or being eliminated—all this to benefit a foreign producer?

I, for one, started with high hopes for a better deal for the American taxpayer and the American family. This kind of swindle will sour me and the rest of us taxpayers on this tax reform. Let's stick to the basics and not use tax reform to transfer more of our assets to our foreign competitors.

□ 1025

TRADE DEFICIT TAKES ANOTHER UPWARD BOUND

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the trade deficit, which is closing American factories and throwing Americans out of work, took another upward bound last month. It is time for the Senate to act on the House-passed trade bill which has been languishing there for 10 weeks. This trade deficit now soars at a record high of nearly $170 billion this year.

Because of administrative inaction, the United States, which was the world's largest creditor nation just 4 short years ago, is the world's largest debtor nation today. Our Nation's economy is staggering, our family farms are in desperate straits. Only recently the world's biggest food exporters, we now are importing more farm products than we sell abroad. Even Paul Volcker finally sees the problem. Government statisticians admit that 2 million American jobs have been lost to this trade deficit.

Reminiscent of President Herbert Hoover, Mr. Reagan has insisted on doing nothing, but his promises of "prosperity just around the corner" have not materialized.

It is time for action. The House passed a positive, constructive trade bill more than 2 months ago. Fifty-nine Republicans joined in a huge bipartisan affirmation. The public's patience is wearing thin.

If the Senate fails to take up H.R. 4800, it will do the Nation a grave injustice and the American people will expect more than a mere apology for its inaction.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it not against the rules of the House for someone to refer to legislative action in the Senate and that "the House bill languishing in the Senate" is beyond the scope of the House rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets that he was in conversation and did not hear the remarks of the gentleman from Texas.

The Chair would respond to the inquiry by reminding Members that a Member may refer to where legislation is in the Senate; that is within the rules. Members cannot be critical of the Senate or name any Senator by name.

The gentleman may either take that as a warning or the gentleman can take it as he so feels.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend my statement to say that, "This important legislation has been languishing without action in the honorable Senate for the past 10 weeks."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, even in the gentleman's amended version, the gentleman is beyond the scope of the House rules, and it seems to me that the Chair, which is so often anxious to remind the members of the minority of their obligations under the House rules—it is interesting to hear the majority over there "ooing and aahing" until——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is making a speech and not making an inquiry.

REAL ESTATE INVESTMENTS AND TAX SHELTERS ARE NOT THE SAME

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

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1981, Congress passed a tax reform bill that abolished all abusive tax shelters. Real estate, however, was not considered an abusive tax shelter. In fact, real estate was given an additional tax incentive by shortening the declining balance depreciation life to 15 years. This resulted in a stampede by developers and syndicators to overbuild apartment houses and office buildings. This resulted in glutting the real estate market in nearly every major city in the country. As a result, vacancies increased at an unbelievable rate to where revenues couldn't cover operating expenses, let along debt service.

In certain areas, such as the oil-oriented economy in Texas, the dis-

tressed situation has resulted in unprecedented real estate foreclosures.

The Senate Finance Committee apparently cannot differentiate between real estate investments and tax shelters. They consider them one and the same. This is absolutely not the case. Most real estate investments are made primarily for economic reasons. Investments in real estate tax shelters were structured strictly for tax shelter purposes with very little regard to the economics involved. They looked only for a large tax deduction in the current year and, hopefully, a capital gain advantage somewhere down the line. The current distressed real estate industry is incurring huge cash losses as distinguished from paper tax shelter losses. These cash losses are the same as would be incurred in any nonreal estate business venture. The proposed regulations do not distinguish between the two investments. None of the actual and substantial cash losses would be deductible. If enacted, if will bury the real estate industry. Again, I ask my colleagues in this body to examine the measure more closely before we regret its consequences.

A PLEA TO THE PRESIDENT TO STAND TALL FOR AMERICAN WORKERS, AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN, AND AMERICAN FARMERS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's foreign trade figures were another blow to America's working families. The excess of foreign imports into America over U.S. goods going abroad climbed another $14.2 billion in June. America is well on its way to a staggering $170 billion trade deficit for 1986—the largest in our history. For the second month in a row, as preposterous as it may seem in the richest agricultural nation on Earth, America imported more agricultural goods than it exported.

As our Nation continues to pile up international debt and our economy slows down, more American workers lose their jobs and more American farmers go under. The administration's response has been, up until now, to do nothing. To make matters worse, we find out the administration has been cutting deals with countries like South Africa to allow more of that country's textile exports to flood our markets.

This House has passed comprehensive, solid trade legislation. Mr. President, join the House and stand tall for American workers, American businesses, and American farmers. It's time.

LET US CONTINUE TO WORK TO SECURE THE RELEASE OF THE REMAINING MIDDLE EAST HOSTAGES

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, we all rejoice at the release of Rev. Lawrence Jenco from the hands of his kidnapers in Lebanon. That joy, however, is tempered with the knowledge that at least four other Americans remain captive or unaccounted for in the Middle East.

I have sent a letter to President Reagan and to the Secretary of State expressing my dismay about the plight of the remaining hostages, and I told them that the greatest country in the world can and should effect the release of our fellow citizens.

It is my belief, I also told them, that there is a national determination to bring these captive Americans home. In the past, I have given a series of speeches from this floor of the House to draw attention to the plight of the hostages. Today, I am resuming those speeches in the hopes of keeping the concern of this problem alive.

Our colleague, the late George O'Brien of Illinois, was keenly interested in making sure that all the hostages were returned safely to American soil. George would want us to continue to work toward securing the release of the remaining hostages, and I hope all of the Members will join me in this effort.

□ 1035

TRADE DEFICIT CONTINUES, SETS NEW RECORD

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's trade policy encouraging foreign imports continues to close down U.S. factories, cost American jobs, and depress American farm prices. Yesterday, the Commerce Department announced that the trade deficit for June was $170 billion, heading for another record, by this administration.

Dependence on foreign goods is causing the economy to stall out, costing thousands of jobs in Arkansas, and contributing to our continued rising unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto week after next on the textile bill which, if enacted, would save jobs in Arkansas.

ORGAN DONOR SOUGHT FOR COLORADO CHILD

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

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, in the past Members of this distinguished body have appealed for help from their colleagues when a constituent needs help, especially in cases involving medical donors.

Today I make that same urgent plea to my colleagues in the hope that someone may be able to help 14-month-old Jessica Davignon of Eckert, CO.

I met little Jessica and her mother recently in Colorado. Jessica desperately needs a new liver. Her survival without it will be measured in weeks. While Jessica has been on the priority list at the University of Pittsburgh for some time, her small size has made it particularly difficult to find a suitable donor. Jessica weighs 17 pounds, 7 ounces.

I appeal to my colleagues to remember that spreading the word can help Jessica if they know or hear of a possible donor.

For a number of reasons, parents cannot direct that their child's liver be donated to a particular child. Nevertheless, the knowledge of a specific case like Jessica's may spur someone to make their child's organs available—a decision that would otherwise be too painful to make.

A chartered plane stands by to fly Jessica to Pittsburgh. If anyone hears of a possible donor, they should contact my office.

TRADE DEFICIT HIGHER, MORE RED INK

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I rise today to express alarm at the continued flow of red ink in our trade deficit. The disturbing thing is not only the $170 billion deficit but the fact that agriculture, once the mainstay of our exports, now have seen for the second month in a row more imports than exports. In the meantime, the Reagan administration continues to pursue its do-little policy, failing to use the tools already available to it to insist on fair trade. Also in the meantime a good trade bill which we have passed in the House languishes in the other body.

There is an old saying, "You ain't seen nothin' yet." Mr. President, if the responsible trade bill the House has passed fails to become law this year, watch out for next year. Protectionist sentiment will continue to grow and grow, and, Mr. President, you will see

next year new meaning to that phrase, "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

TAX REFORM AND THE BLACK HOLE THEORY

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, as the conferees enter the twilight zone of this so-called tax reform, it is perhaps wise if the rest of us examine the black hole theory.

You know the theory—the one which supposes the black hole is the center of the universe and is everything to everybody and exists by consuming everything that is attracted to its magnetic zone. The tragic ending is that the more it consumes the greater its attraction. The black hole consumes everything until nothing is left to consume and nothing is left of anything, period.

Someone looked in on the conference committee on tax reform and the magnetic force was almost more than he could resist. It was a shaking experience to view the black hole tax theory. Here everything is taxed, including IRA's, credit unions, capital gains, investment credit, income averaging, until nothing is left to be taxed and nothing is left of the economy. And nothing is left to taxpayers.

The taxpayers need to ask their Congressman if he has been drawn into the magnetic field of the black hole and warn him to turn back before jobs are lost, before businesses fail, before all of us and our economy collapse inward.

A TRIBUTE TO MIDWEST FARMERS FOR THEIR RESPONSE TO DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREAS

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to constituents of mine who have joined hundreds of farmers throughout the Midwest in assisting fellow farmers in the Southeast who have been devastated by drought.

In particular, Robert Burnworth, Jr., of Fulton, MI, is leading the effort in southwestern Michigan to collect and deliver thousands of bales of hay to South Carolina farmers. It is this spirit of cooperation upon which our country was founded, but that is all too often forgotten in today's world.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that the effort or the part of midwestern farmers to reach out is not organized by any Federal agency or local organization. Instead it is the response of those who see others suffering and who cannot sit idly by while others are helpless to change conditions that may destroy them. Their action will save the lives of hundreds of head of livestock, and the livelihood of many farmers.

We are all in debt to those who have responded so selflessly. It is eloquent testimony to the notion that together, we can, in fact, make a difference.

GRESHAM'S LAW, B.C.

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the following quotation is from the comedy "The Frogs" written by Aristophanes in 405 B.C., at a critical moment in the history of the Athenian democracy.

I'll tell you what I think about the way
This city treats her soundest men today:
By a coincidence more sad than funny,
It's very like the way we treat our money.
The noble silver drachma, that of old
We were so proud of, and the recent gold,
Coins that rang true, clean-stamped and worth their weight
Throughout the world, have ceased to circulate.
Instead, the purses of Athenian shoppers
Are full of shoddy silver-plated coppers.
Just so, when men are needed by the nation,
The best have been withdrawn from circulation . . .
My foolish friends, change now, it's not too late!
Try the good ones again: if they succeed,
You will have proved that you have sense indeed.
And if things don't go well, if these good men
All fail, and Athens comes to grief, why, then,
Discerning folks will murmur (let us hope):
"She's hanged herself—but what a splendid rope!"

(—Translated by David Barrett)

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY—A WOMAN'S ISSUE

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, next week we will vote on the veto override on the Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act.

There is one aspect of this issue that I feel has not received adequate attention. The textile issue is a woman's issue. Of the thousands upon thousands of unemployed textile and apparel workers, the majority are women. These women work because they need to work. Many of them are single mothers who work to feed and clothe their children. There are others who work to supplement the family income. As we all know, it is increasingly difficult for even middle-class families to get by on only one paycheck.

As more textile and apparel manufacturing plants close, more and more women are left without work. For some, the only skills they have are those learned in the textile or apparel industry. We must guard against further erosion of one of our Nation's most vital industries. We must override the veto.

PROCEDURAL REFORMS NECESSARY TO CURE THE LIABILITY CRISIS

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

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, it was reported this week that the American Bar Association's commission on professionalism has issued a report intended to rekindle professionalism in the legal profession. Among the recommendations of this commission was a recommendation that judges at the State and Federal level impose sanctions on lawyers who file frivolous suits or are party to delaying tactics.

This report and recommendation is further evidence that procedural reforms within the tort system must be part and parcel of any liability insurance crisis solution. It was for this reason that I included the following reforms within H.R. 4460, the Tort Liability Reform Act of 1986:

First, a preliminary evaluation session is required within 30 to 60 days of filing of a tort action. The session would be administered by a special master appointed by the court and would be intended to sort out frivolous suits and motions.

Second, if the parties to a tort action have not completed discovery within 1 year, a similar evaluation session would occur to formulate a plan for moving the case to trial. In jurisdictions with binding arbitration programs, this alternative dispute resolution method would be used. In other jurisdictions a plan for discovery would be formulated and administered.

Third, at both the above evaluation sessions, judges in both State and Federal court could assess monetary sanctions against attorneys bringing frivolous suits, making bad faith motions, or intentionally delaying the process.

Given the importance of these reforms and the similar concerns expressed by the ABA commission on professionalism, I would strongly urge my colleagues to take a close look at H.R. 4460 and a different approach to the liability insurance question.

MORE BAD NEWS FOR THE ECONOMY

(Mr. BONKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's announcement by the Commerce Department that the trade deficit could reach $170 billion is more bad news for our economy.

Last month, the U.S. imported $14.2 billion more than it sold overseas.

Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker is worried that the trade deficit could precipitate a recession within a year.

It could mean more lost jobs and declining competitiveness. Mr. Speaker, this trend, like our budget deficits and external debt, is simply not sustainable.

What is surprising is that even in agriculture where the United States has been a strong exporter in the past, we are now importing more than we are exporting.

Whether it is the sagging economies of other nations, exchange rates, Third World debt problems, or unfair trade practices, something is seriously wrong with our trading position.

That is why the House took action on a comprehensive trade bill several months ago.

But the President apparently opposed everything in the bill and asks us instead to support his policies:

Obviously those policies are not working, as evidenced by the statistics from his own Department.

We need speedy action on trade legislation to bring down our trade deficit, restore our competitiveness and improve this Nation's economy.

LEGISLATION TO TIGHTEN AND IMPROVE FEDERAL LAWS AGAINST MONEY LAUNDERING

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

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleagues and I on the Banking Committee approved legislation to tighten and improve Federal laws against money laundering. This legislation is the combination of several bills which I and my colleagues had previously introduced, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the new legislation, H.R. 5176.

When I speak of money laundering, I am also speaking of its close companion drug abuse. The lifeblood of organized drug crime is the profits it reaps. This legislation strengthens our attack on the jugular of organized drug crime.

Our committee has heard hours of testimony revealing the great lengths to which drug traffickers will go to conceal the source of their profits. Law enforcement officials, on the other hand, make every attempt to uncover a money trail that connects the criminals with the drug crime. It is readily apparent that new Federal legislation is needed to combat money laundering because of its intimate relation to the illegal narcotics economy.

Our current drug laws are primarily effective against persons who actually handle illegal drugs. But the drug czars and the kingpins of drug distribution avoid these laws by hiring others to do the dirty work. However, there is one surefire way to identify the drug czars: They have large amounts of money available to them and they spend it. After all, the point of crime is to live a life of ease at the misery and expense of others. These drug czars launder their money by making it appear that it comes from a legitimate business or investment. That is why tough money laundering laws are essential to prevent powerful criminal leaders from concealing the source of their ill-gotten gains.

There is no need to describe the far-reaching and painful costs of drugs, and money laundering to individuals and society. There is a need for solutions, and I have no doubt that the legislation our committee has passed will prove to be a vital component in the overall antidrug campaign.

THE TEXTILE BILL

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

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, the American economy continues to set records.

The latest news is that we spent $14.2 billion more for foreign goods in June than our overseas customers paid for American products. This matched our dismal performance in May. And worse yet, we appear to be heading for an annual trade deficit that dwarfs the disastrous record we set just last year.

These records are not mere numbers or statistics. They mean the loss of American jobs—jobs in our traditional manufacturing sector, jobs in our new high technology industries, jobs in the textile industry, and jobs in agriculture, which has already been devastated by drought and low prices. According to the Commerce Department, the trade deficit has cost 2 million American jobs since 1981. Do millions more have to follow before we take action?

Textile workers are not alone in facing challenges from unfair foreign competition, and we need to address the plight of other industries as well. But the problems in textiles are among the most widespread and acute in the American economy. We needed the Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act when we passed it last year, and we need it even more now. I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto and pass this bill again. Millions of Americans are counting on us.

KEEP THE PRO-LIFE LANGUAGE OF THE HOUSE

(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, later in this year there will be the two Senate conferences where they will try to water down the pro-life language that this House has put into several appropriations bills.

Now, I want all my good friends and colleagues in this House, Mr. Speaker, to take note of the birth yesterday of a female child in Santa Clara, CA, Michelle Odette Poole. She was born to a mother who had been declared brain-dead for 7½ weeks. Her body, this earthly sanctuary that God lends us, was kept alive by machines, a heart machine and a lung machine, so that the mother functioned as nothing but one large womb, one placenta, to nuture her separate little child inside the womb.

Now, one of my daughters is 8 months pregnant. My office manager, Robbi Hartt, is 8½ months pregnant.

Mr. Speaker, this is a child in my daughter, Teresa. That is a child in my office manager Robbi over there in the Cannon Building. These are children that we are killing in their mothers' wombs, 4,000 a day.

God will not be mocked. This is a terrible thing that is happening in the free world and it is even worse in the Communist world. There are mothers in the Communist nations who have had 10 abortions!

Now, the reason that the infant and neonatal mortality rate is so bad in Washington, DC, as we are finding out by science and the evidence, is that mothers who have had abortions in their next pregnancy, miscarry, have babies with lower birth weight, and experience more prematurity than mothers who do not have abortion. This has been verified by a number of studies including ones funded by the National Institutes of Health. Please, remember this when the D.C. appropriations bill is considered in conference.

JUSTICE REHNQUIST

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

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, the principle that the Constitution of the United States requires a "wall of separation between church and state should be frankly and explicitly abandoned," those are the words of the man nominated by President Reagan

to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Nine years ago, the Harvard Law Review published an appraisal of Justice Rehnquist. That critique concluded, after an analysis of hundreds of cases, that Mr. Rehnquist was guided by certain basic principles, the most prominent of which was that conflicts between the individual and the Government should be resolved against the individual.

In the 9 years since that study, Justice Rehnquist has opposed efforts by the lower courts to halt the mistreatment of institutionalized retarded persons, to stop the abuse of civilians by the police and to limit overcrowding in Federal prisons. His decisions opposing remedies for racial discrimination all lead back to the memo he wrote for the late Justice Robert Jackson in which he defended the proposition of separate, but equal schools—a proposition overturned in 1954.

Justice Rehnquist was the only dissenting vote in 1983, when he wrote that the U.S. Government had no right to deny a Federal tax deduction to Bob Jones University in South Carolina even if it admitted or denied students based on race.

For those who are retarded or handicapped, for those in prison, or for those who have been unjustly accused, for women, and for those who are members of racial or religious minorities, and finally for those who believe in the individual against the power of the central government, Justice Rehnquist is an unhappy choice.

Most Americans see the Constitution as a bulwark against discrimination, racism, state-supported religion, and cruel and unusual punishment. Justice Rehnquist sees it as an ally.

THE TRADE BILL

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while I was back in the office, I heard on the monitor the distinguished majority leader criticizing the other body today for not acting on the House trade bill.

I have only to suggest that had this House acted in a bipartisan fashion and produced a responsible bill, we would have been able to get something enacted into law in short order.

The fact is that the trade bill was passed for partisan politican gain, not American trade relief, and when you sacrifice good legislation for political greed, you do not do this institution that much good, nor do you get good legislation enacted into law.

THE TRADE DEFICIT IMBALANCE

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join many of my colleagues who have spoken this morning on the matter of the Commerce Department release of our trade deficit imbalance, which has now increased in June by $14 billion and is projected for this year to be $170 billion.

This means again the loss of many jobs, not only the Midwest and the East, but also in the West and the South.

This means also that we are losing the battle on our agriculture exports.

That release also pointed out that in the month of June, as well as the month of May, that our agricultural imports had exceeded our exports.

It means that this administration has refused to use the agricultural export enhancement programs that we have presently in law so that we can get rid of the excess agricultural reserves that we presently have on hand and we can remedy the trade imbalance.

It means that this administration, in deference to the gentleman from Peoria who just spoke, that this administration and the other body have refused to act on the question of fair trade.

Our House has passed legislation, H.R. 4800, that would correct the trade imbalance, but the other body has refused to take it up.

We need action, Mr. President. We do not need words. We need to save our jobs and to save our farmers. We do not have to worry about jobs in other countries, as you have been doing. We need to worry about jobs here at home.

THE EXPORT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

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

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, those of us from rural America have traditionally been among the best free traders, because we know the perils of protectionism; but we also know the perils of a complacent, do-nothing trade policy. Farm exports have fallen 37 percent in the last 5 years, and a do-nothing trade policy will not reverse that intolerable trend.

I rise today in support of a bill introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. PAT ROBERTS, regarding the Export Enhancement Program. Where it has been used, the Export Enhancement Program has been very successful. Argentina went from our 22d to our 4th best wheat customer because they were included in the program. Of our top five wheat customers this year, three have received significant sales under the program.

But the backlash from limiting this program has overshadowed these isolated successes. The Soviet Union, our best wheat customer 1 year ago, has dropped now to 29th, because they were not included. China has also cut its wheat purchases by 75 percent. Opening up the program to these customers, as the Roberts bill calls for, will bring the same success we have had in Argentina and Egypt into big markets like Russia, China, and Nigeria.

The administration has the authority to broaden this program immediately. By opening up the Export Enhancement Program, it would take a bold step toward a more aggressive and successful trade policy. The White House should know that we cannot accept the status quo in the farm country. With the textile bill facing a veto override vote soon, the problems of trade are foremost in our minds.

The White House should not assume that the veto of the textile bill will be sustained with the help of farm State free traders, unless it is willing to address the serious trade concerns of rural America.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

(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, colleague after colleague, Member after Member, rose today to speak about the extended trade deficit. It comes as no great surprise because that is exactly what it is. It is a trend. It is the continuation of a trend.

What boggles my mind is this problem has been with us for more than a decade with little being done to counter this movement. I recall a former Member, John Dent, whose lone voice would be heard hour after hour speaking about the exportation of our industries, to no avail.

Special emphasis has been placed today on agriculture. Well, it is agriculture now. It was the electronic industry before. It is the automobile industry currently under threat. What will it be tomorrow? Consider the consequences—millions of jobs lost; America becoming a creditor nation as contrasted to a history of debtor states.

Yesterday we had an opportunity. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], in a valiant and heroic effort to make one little constructive step forward, offered an amendment to compel the U.S. Government to buy American when it purchases for its own utilization.

□ 1100

That was a valiant effort, though futile. His was a passionate anguished address, because in his community, they have lost all their jobs, and it is happening everywhere. Mr. TRAFICANT has been an energetic champion of his constituents since he came to Congress. It is unfortunate the House didn't see fit to follow his lead.

What happens hereafter—who is to say? All I can say is that America should wake up. We have been dormant and apathetic, and we are reaping the bitter fruit of that apathy and neglect over the years.

PHILOSOPHICAL TEST FOR SUPREME COURT IS UNCONSCIONABLE

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, in the last national campaign, liberals ran an ad on television that suggested that there was something terribly wrong in a country that might move toward a philosophical test for the Supreme Court. One wondered why they ran such an ad at the time, because there was no chance of that in the Reagan administration.

Now we know. Liberals had in mind a philosophical test for the Supreme Court, and they are now in full flower in attempting to achieve it. We had a speech on the House floor just a few moments ago from a liberal who suggested that Judge Rehnquist is not qualified to serve as Chief Justice because he does not meet philosophical qualifications.

This is not a question of whether someone has legal qualifications; it is not a question of intellectual ability. The liberals are now saying that you have to meet their political and their philosophical test before you can serve on the Supreme Court.

It is my opinion that a political and philosophical test for the Supreme Court is not just disturbing—it is unconscionable.

CONGRESS CAN ANSWER ADMINISTRATION'S DO-NOTHING TRADE POLICY

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion here about the trade deficit—a historic trade deficit. It is even worse than the figures, because the trade deficit for last month included a $2 billion one-time sale of gold to the Japanese.

The manufacturing portion of the deficit was $12.7 billion last month—$12.7 billion. And what did we hear from the President last weekend? Just rosy comments. What is rosy are his economic glasses, and while Mr. Baldrige is talking tough in Japan, the President is giving us soft talk here in the United States.

The minority leader comes down here to object to our House bill. The best answer to him was given by someone from his own party, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER]. As he said, we have had a do-nothing trade policy coming from this administration, and here is how Congress can answer it. Two ways.

First, the Senate should pass an omnibus trade bill. If they do not like what we have enacted, let them get off the dime and enact their own bill.

Second, let us override the textile veto next week. That will be a vote that will be heard around the world.

ICC SHOULD EXPLAIN DENIAL OF RAIL MERGER

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 the ICC voted 4 to 1 to deny the merger application of the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific Railroads. After nearly 2 years of review, the ICC announced the denial in a meeting which lasted only 18 minutes. The ICC staff had recommended approval of the merger, but called for special conditions to ease concerns about competition.

We may not see a written explanation of the Commission's rationale until October 20. As a result of this decision, Santa Fe now faces two major competitors in the Western United States that are each approximately twice its size. The Southern Pacific is on the brink of bankruptcy. I fail to see how this result will encourage competition in the rail industry.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Kansas House delegation wrote to the ICC to let them know that we believe that they should issue a written opinion immediately. We are entitled to an explanation of why the Commissioners overruled their professional staff, and we should not have to wait 90 days to get it.

ATTACKING THE DRUG PROBLEM

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to laud the leadership which you have displayed in putting together a task force to deal with the national problem of international drug trafficking and the serious impact that it is having on our society.

Our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, JIM WRIGHT, is working very closely with our distinguished minority leader, and already they have alerted the ranking minority members and the chairmen of all of the committees to come together with a package that can most effectively be presented to the President of the United States.

Not too long ago the President joined in this struggle and indicated that he is going to make this a crusade around the United States—indeed, throughout the free world.

I think that this gives us an excellent opportunity to cast aside those labels of "Republican" and "Democrat," "liberal" and "conservative," and to take advantage of this great atmosphere that has been created by our leadership in order to do something about this most serious problem.

It seems to me that when former Chief Justice Warren Burger has indicated that in his belief the threat of narcotics is more serious to our national security than the threat of communism, it is time for this Congress to join with the President of the United States to make certain that for this generation and the generation that follows that we are able to say that as a part of our legacy we cleaned up this problem, not only for ourselves, but for the world.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT EMPLOYEE AND RETIREE BENEFITS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we heard from the gentleman from Pennsylvania extolling the virtues of the nominee for Chief of the Supreme Court. I take a passage from Thomas Jefferson, who was very leery and very concerned about the powers concentrated in Federal judges. He said "one Federal judge can take the Constitution and mold it as clay to his own particular position. Thank God for juries." One of the most important assignments made in this country is confirming a Federal judge, and more importantly, a Supreme Court Justice, specifically the Chief Judge. Extreme caution and extensive scrutiny is needed to evaluate Judge Rehnquist.

But I am not here for that today. I am here today because 11,500 retired people in my district, are injured by this LTV decision. I say these retirees should be treated differently and special for one reason: they have contributed to these plans. Their hard-earned money was paid in to help pay for these benefits. They were used as an inducement for early buyouts, and the promises made by LTV must be kept by law—section 1113(f) of chapter 11.

That is why today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation which would amend title II of the code to prevent companies from rejecting hospitalization and health benefits for current or former employees specifically, and expand upon existing law to insure no judge can misinterpret Congress' intent.

Let me just say this to the Members: 10 of the 12 top steel companies in America have underfunded pension plans, and they are in their boardrooms right now with $500-an-hour attorneys searching for legal technicalities to get out from under their liability. Congress must put its foot down and protect the rights of our retired people, or we will have divorced ourselves from the rights of Americans so impacted upon by this decision. I am asking Members for their help.

A HOUSING TRAGEDY

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

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a tragedy that is currently unfolding in my district, and which is spreading across the Nation.

About 70 elderly, handicapped, and low-income residents are in the process of being evicted from a Farmers Home project in my district. These people are being evicted for one reason—the lack of a coherent Federal housing policy. The Government contract has expired on this project and therefore the restrictions that obligated their owners to serve low- and moderate-income families will no longer apply. Under new ownership, rents were tripled and some even quadrupled forcing disabled, elderly, and low-income tenants to be displaced or evicted because they could not afford the new rents. Repeated attempts to get these people assistance through Farmers Home and HUD have thus far proven futile.

What is happening in my district is not an isolated incident. In California alone, similar loan payoffs have occurred or are pending in 31 Farmers Home projects. According to housing officials, as many as 90 percent of the tenants in these projects have been displaced. From all accounts, what is happening now is just the tip of the iceberg.

We cannot continue to let these people fall through the cracks in our housing policy. This national crisis is a result of short-sighted Federal policies. Yet the Federal Government is unable to act quickly enough to fulfill the Federal obligation to these new homeless.

For this reason, I am inserting in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of letters I have sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development requesting their personal involvement in the tragedy. I direct my colleagues' attention to these letters.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, along with tables and charts, on the bill, H.R. 5233.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1987

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5233) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1110

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. 5233, with Mr. FUQUA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to serve on the subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and all the other members of the subcommittee.

We are especially grateful for the support of the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, Mr. WHITTEN, who serves on our subcommittee. He has helped us all down through the development of the 1987 bill. He has, in particular, helped us when making the allocations under section 302(b) which are critical to us. We want him to know we appreciate it.

We have an excellent staff on our subcommittee as do all the other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee.

We miss our old friend, George O'Brien. George O'Brien was one of the able Members of the Congress. He served on our subcommittee for many years and on the full Committee on Appropriations.

I want you to know now, Mr. Chairman, that he was especially concerned about two programs in this bill and, Mr. Chairman, they are both in this bill in the manner in which our friend, George O'Brien, wanted them to appear.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5233, which we present to the House today, makes appropriations for the fiscal year 1987 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and for 12 related agencies, including the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the National Council on the Handicapped, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, the Physician Payment Review Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.

The bill includes 1987 appropriations totaling $103,710,016,000 for these Departments and Agencies, which is $5,965,251,000 over the amounts requested by the President, and $6,657,331,000 over the comparable amounts available for 1986.

A large portion, 75.5 percent, of the appropriations in the bill is for entitlement programs for which funding levels are determined by the basic authorizing legislation. The bill includes $78,793,369,000 for these entitlements in fiscal year 1987, an increase of $1,847,020,000 over the amount requested by the President and an increase of $4,380,838,000 above the amounts available for these programs in fiscal year 1986. For discretionary programs, in which spending is con-

trolled through the annual appropriations bill, the bill includes $24,916,647,000 in fiscal year 1987, an increase of $4,118,231,000 over the President's budget and an increase of $2,276,493,000 over the amount available for fiscal year 1986. In addition to these amounts, consideration of $8,414,107,000 of budget estimates for 1987 has been deferred because authorizations have not yet been enacted for these programs.

In addition to the amounts included in the bill, very large sums are automatically appropriated each year for labor, health and human services, and education programs without consideration by the Congress during the annual appropriations process. The principal items in this category are the unemployment compensation, Social Security, Medicare, and railroad retirement trust funds. If the trust funds were counted, total budget authority for labor, health and human services, and education programs considered in this bill would increase from $420,569,642,000 in 1986 to $449,232,514,000 in 1987, an increase of $28,662,872,000.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is well within the ceilings set by the 1987 budget resolution. After adjusting for advance appropriations included in the bill, the total for fiscal year 1987 which counts against our 302(b) ceiling is $102,571,705,000 of which $77,655,058,000 is for entitlements and $24,916,647,000 is for discretionary items. These amounts are below our 302(b) allowance in total by $11,274 million. The bill is $10,634 million below for discretionary programs and $640 million below for entitlements. This results because the subcommittee has deferred consideration of programs which are not currently authorized for fiscal year 1987. The President's budget requests $8,414,107,000 for unauthorized programs which received $9,809,326,000 for fiscal year 1986. The amount of 302(b) ceiling remaining is sufficient to fund these deferred programs as well as to fund new or expanded authorizations assumed in the budget resolution.

With respect to outlays, the bill includes $112,971 million in outlays for fiscal year 1987 including $97,852 million for entitlements and $15,119 million for discretionary programs. This is $4,812 million below the 302(b) allowance in total including $4,180 million for discretionary programs and $632 million for entitlements. This occurs because of the deferred items not included in the bill. While the outlay ceiling is extremely tight, we believe that there are sufficient outlays remaining to cover the items which have been deferred.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The bill provides a total of $5,524,294,000 for the Department of Labor, including $4,907,400,000 for discretionary programs and $616,894,000 or for entitlements. For discretionary programs, the bill exceeds the President's budget request by $650,016,000, and it is $297,649,000 over the 1986 level. For entitlement programs, we are below the President's request by $1,023,151,000 and below last year by $1,077,007,000. We have provided all necessary funding for the entitlement programs, and we are informed by the Department that the President's request will shortly be amended in line with what the committee has recommended.

In addition, the bill includes a total of $2,751,696,000 in trust fund transfers, an increase of $4,351,000 over the President's request and $163,285,000 over the 1986 level. Virtually all of the trust funds are for financing the administrative costs of the State employment security agencies.

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For programs under the Job Training Partnership Act, we recommend $3,517,121,000, an increase of $607,513,000 over the President's budget and $205,640,000 over the 1986 amount. This includes $662,700,000 for the Job Corps to maintain the current services level of 106 centers and 40,544 training slots. We also prohibit the closing of any center before July 1, 1988. The administration proposed to cut the program approximately in half. We maintain the summer youth program for the summer of 1988 at the same operating level as the summer of 1987, 635,000 jobs. The committee approved a large requested increase of nearly $21 million for pilots and demonstrations. Bill language that was requested to modify the allocation formulas for the summer youth and dislocated workers programs was not approved by the committee.

We recommend $26 million for training, job search, and relocation assistance authorized by the Trade Act, the same as the original 1986 appropriation. This program was recently extended for 5 more years. The administration did not propose to fund it. State administrative costs for the program are included in the State Operations account in the amount of $3,900,000.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

The bill includes $326 million for the older workers employment program under title V of the Older Americans Act. This is an increase of about $14 million over 1986. About 64,000 part-time jobs would be funded, with 78 percent coming through national contractors and 22 percent through the States.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

We provide $755,20,000 for Employment Service State grants, about the same as 1986. For State administration of the unemployment insurance system, the recommendation is $1,731,600,000, an increase of $144,032,000 over 1986. The increase is to restore reductions made in 1986 pursuant to Gramm-Rudman and to provide for workload and cost increases.

In the Employment and Training Administration, we restored 70 full-time equivalent staff to maintain current staffing levels with respect to the Job Corps (40) and the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance (30). We reduced a $10 million request for unemployment research and demonstration pilot projects to $5 million.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

We added $1 million to the budget request for the Employment Standards Administration to finance an additional 20 full-time equivalent staff for the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. These are to be used for additional nonsupervisory enforcement caseworkers. This restores part of the staff reduction sustained here in recent years.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

In the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the committee added $8,565,000 to the President's request along with 61 full-time equivalent staff. The specific increases over the budget request are as follows: 18 FTE's and $5 million to restore the Permanent Mass Layoff and Plant Closing Program; 41 FTE's and $1,299,000 to restore an arbitrary 2-percent reduction as a result of assumed productivity increases; 2 FTE's and $900,000 to restore the Occupational Employment Statistics Program; and $1,366,000 to restore proposed reductions in area detail on employment now provided in Labor Market Information programs. The committee redirected an increase of $2,062,000 requested to expand the Professional, Administrative, Technical and Clerical [PATC] survey. The report says that these funds are to be used instead to begin the planning, testing, and implementation of a national white-collar salary and benefit survey.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

We added about $8 million over the budget request for veterans' employment and training. This is to restore the number of local veterans' employment representatives to the 1986 level.

For the other departmental salaries and expenses accounts, the committee has approved the President's budget request. In most cases, this restores the 1986 Gramm-Rudman reductions and allows for built-in cost increases.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

H.R. 5233 includes $84,001,567,000 for programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, including $12,598,065,000 in advance appropriations for fiscal year

1988. The amount included in the bill is $4,664,651,000 above the President's request and $6,446,724,000 above the amount currently available for these activities in fiscal year 1986 after the reductions required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. The committee did not consider at this time budget estimates of $3,908,210,000 for programs which are not currently authorized for fiscal year 1987. These include low-income energy assistance, refugee and entrant assistance, Head Start, family planning, alcohol and drug abuse research, and several smaller programs. Appropriations for these activities as well as several new programs or program expansions being reviewed by the Congress will be considered as soon as possible after the passage of authorizations.

The substantial increases included in the bill reflect a number of priorities of the committee in reviewing funding levels for the programs of this Department.

First, this bill reflects a strong commitment to research on the cause, treatment, and prevention of acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS]. This disease has already claimed more than 12,600 lives and is expected to kill more than 175,000 Americans during the next 5 years. AIDS is described by the Department as its No. 1 public health priority. The bill includes $336,753,000 for these activities, an increase of $133,271,000 over the President's budget and $112,478,000 over the amount available this year.

Second, the bill demonstrates continued support for a strong program of biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health including funds for 6,200 new research project grants. The bill includes $6,152,775,000 for the NIH, an increase of $1,073,628,000 over the President's request and an increase of $893,120,000 over 1986. This large increase is necessary to complete the buildup in the number of grants which was begun in fiscal year 1985 when the number of new grants was increased from 5,000 in order to accelerate the biomedical research program throughout NIH.

Third, the bill rejects the President's proposal to terminate a number of programs including health professions education, mental health service demonstrations, and the work incentives program [WIN]. The committee believes these programs should continue to be supported by the Congress.

Fourth, the bill reflects a decision to provide selected increases for high-priority programs, especially those serving low-income or disadvantaged populations and those targeted at high-risk children.

Fifth, the bill reflects a commitment to fund entitlement programs, which provide cash assistance, medical care, and social services to our most needy citizens, at levels mandated by current law. The committee bill includes $73,415,819,000 for these entitlements. This is $2,803,965,000 over the President's request and $5,320,427,000 over the amount available in 1986. The President's request for these activities was based on a series of legislative and regulatory proposals not accepted by the Congress.

Lastly, these recommendations reflect the committee's commitment to adequately fund administrative costs under the Social Security and Medicare programs. While benefit dollars for these activities are not appropriated, the committee is charged with approving all trust funds allocated to administer these programs. The bill permits the expenditure of $5,300,417,000 for this purpose, an increase of $271,114,000 over 1986. These programs serve more than 40 million Americans and are expected to spend more than $298 billion in benefit payments in fiscal year 1987.

The committee believes these recommendations reflect the priorities of the Congress and the best interest of the country. These are critical programs which serve our most vulnerable and needy citizens. Let me describe these in some additional detail.

ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS)

The Public Health Service considers AIDS to be the most serious and devastating public health problem to appear in recent memory. It is the No. 1 health priority of the Department. Over 23,000 cases have been diagnosed so far and the number is expected to escalate geometrically in the next several years.

In response to the steady growth in the number of cases, the committee has recommended a substantial increase in appropriations for AIDS activities. The bill includes $336,753,000, an increase of $112,478,000, or 50 percent, over the 1986 level. In addition, there is $9,765,000 for the Food and Drug Administration in the agriculture appropriations bill, making a total appropriation for AIDS of $346,518,000. We believe that this substantial increase should enable the Public Health Service to continue to make progress against this dread disease. By agency, the amounts in the bill are as follows:

Centers for Disease Control, $87,007,000; National Institutes of Health, $198,943,000; Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, $47,553,000; Health Resources and Services Administration, $1,900,000; and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Health, $1,350,000.

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

The bill includes $1,267,068,000 for programs administered by the Health Resources and Services Administration. This is $293,894,000 above the President's request and $11,502,000 above the amount available in 1986. The committee did not consider the budget requests for the family planning and National Health Service Corps programs which are not currently authorized for fiscal year 1987.

The mission of the Health Resources and Services Administration is exceptionally broad. Its activities include the provision of inpatient and outpatient health care to the poor, pregnant women, children, and other high risk populations; the training of health professionals and the rational development of health resources, including health personnel and health facilities, throughout the United States. Approximately 3,300 persons are currently employed by this agency to carry out these responsibilities.

Of the funding added by the committee over the President's request, almost 75 percent relates to the committee's rejection of the proposal to terminate Federal support for the training of health professionals including nurses. The bill includes $212,015,000 for these training programs which is $14,096,000 more than available for these programs in 1986. The committee has rejected the administration's position that the national surplus of physicians widely predicted for the 1990's justifies a Federal abandonment of the effort to improve the geographic and specialty mix of health professionals and to increase the number of minority health providers. These are real problems which the overall surplus has not resolved. The committee has, therefore, recommended that these programs be funded for the most part at the same level provided in last year's appropriation act. The committee has also rejected the administration's proposal to reduce HEAL loans for these students from the $290 million currently authorized to $100 million. The committee believes these loans are the financing of last resort for many of these students who would otherwise have to drop out of school.

The bill includes $68,900,000 for nursing programs including $16,700,000 for the newly authorized National Center for Nursing Research. This Center has recently been set up at the National Institutes of Health and the committee expects the funds to be transferred to NIH as soon as the appropriation is enacted into law.

The bill also includes $478 million for the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, the maximum amount currently authorized for this program. The NCH Block Grant is targeted to high risk mothers and children and to crippled children. The Congress is currently reviewing the need for additional funds in this area. If the authorization is increased, the committee will reconsider its recommendation in this area.

The bill also includes $400 million for community health centers which is also the maximum amount currently authorized and an increase of $4 million over fiscal year 1986 funding. These funds subsidize approximately 50 percent of the operating budgets for 550 centers providing primary health service to more than 5 million Americans. In addition to these general purpose centers, the bill includes $45,400,000 for migrant health centers which will support 125 projects serving approximately 2,700,000 migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

The committee recommends $6,800,000 to fully fund activities authorized by the National Organ Transplant Act (Public Law 98-507). This will support a nationwide system to increase the availability of organs and to facilitate the matching of donors and recipients. This is a major new initiative initially funded in fiscal year 1986. Included are funds for the full year costs of the national network which received part year funding of $400,000 in 1986.

The committee has not recommended funds for the health planning programs in fiscal year 1987 as requested by the President. This program expired on September 30, 1982. While the committee has recommended that the program be funded since that time under a series of continuing resolutions, the House has recently voted overwhelmingly to terminate this program. Close-out costs not covered by the 1986 appropriation will be included in the fiscal year 1987 continuing resolution if necessary.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The bill includes $6,152,775,000 for the 17 appropriations which together fund the programs of the National Institutes of Health. These include the appropriations for the 12 research Institutes, the Division of Research Resources, the John E. Fogarty International Center, the National Library of Medicine, the Office of the Director, and Buildings and Facilities. Funds for research on AIDS are consolidated in the Office of the Director. The new National Center for Nursing Research, which has recently been transferred to NIH, continues to be funded in the bill under the appropriations for Health Resources and Services.

Mr. Chairman, at the time my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, SILVIO O. CONTE, and I were elected as members of the Committee on Appropriations, we had $77 million in the National Institutes of Health.

The total 1987 NIH appropriations of $6,152,775,000 recommended by the committee represent increases of $1,073,628,000 over the amount requested in the President's budget and $893,120,000 over the amounts currently available for 1986.

The committee continues to give the highest priority to the support of investigator initiated research projects, and intends that the amounts in the bill should be used to fund full direct and indirect costs of no fewer than 6,200 new and competing renewal awards in approximately the amounts recommended by peer review groups. In addition, the committee expects that 13,320 noncompeting research projects will be supported at approximately the amounts recommended by peer review groups for a total of 19,520 competing and noncompeting research project grants. The committee has also provided increased funds for the support of research centers which may be used for existing and/or new centers, as determined by each Institute. In certain instances, the report specifies that additional centers should be funded. For example, funds have been provided in the new National Institute of Arthritis, Muskuloskeletal and Skin Diseases for the establishment of nine specialized centers of research in the high priority areas of rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, and osteoporosis. Funds are also provided for the creation of six kidney and urologic disease research centers to be named for the late Honorable GEORGE M. O'BRIEN of Illinois, who was a member of our subcommittee for many years, in recognition of his distinguished service in the House of Representatives, and in recognition of his consistent support for the work of the National Institutes of Health.

For training grant programs, the bill provides sufficient funds for the support of 10,500 trainees. Additional funds are also provided for other essential elements of the NIH intramural and extramural programs, including—but not confined to—research career awards, clinical trials, biomedical research support grants, intramural research, instrumentation grants, construction and renovation of facilities including animal facilities, research management and support, and the National Library of Medicine.

In last year's report, the committee called attention to the fact that staffing levels at NIH have been drastically reduced in recent years, while appropriations have steadily increased.

The funds in the 1987 bill should support at least 13,500 full-time equivalent positions. The committee is especially concerned about staffing for patient care at the Warren G. Magnuson Clinical Center. Visitors to the Center report that many beds in the Center are not occupied because of lack of staff.

The committee has provided funds distributed among the NIH Institutes for small instrumentation grants in response to the findings of a recent instrumentation survey which was funded jointly by the National Academy of Sciences and NIH. This survey, entitled "NIH Program Evaluation Report: Academic Research Equipment Needs in the Biomedical and Medical Sciences," reported on trends in amount, condition and cost of existing research instrumentation in the Nation's principal research universities and the nature and extent of the need for upgrading research instrumentation. This survey identified many problem areas concerning obsolete or poorly maintained research instrumentation; however, the most significant need cited by the survey is for relatively low-cost prices of equipment in the price range of approximately $5,000 to $60,000. These funds provided for fiscal year 1987 will begin to address this problem by supporting the purchase of small equipment, which cannot be included on a single research project grants application and which also do not qualify for support under NIH's larger specialized grant programs.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

The committee recommends $518,254,000 for disease prevention activities at the Centers for Disease Control. This is $92,999,000 above the President's budget and $77,154,000 above the amount available in 1986. This includes $89,525,000 for the Preventive Health Services Block Grant. In addition to the increase for AIDS related activities discussed earlier, the committee has recommended substantial increases for childhood immunization and sexually transmitted diseases. For immunization, the bill includes a total of $70,012,000, an increase of $13,122,000 over 1986. This will be used to continue to build the vaccine stockpile maintained by the CDC and to offset the higher costs of vaccines. For sexually transmitted diseases, the committee recommends $66,454,000, an increase of $12,589,000 over 1986. This increase will partially replace funds reallocated in the last several years to the AIDS emergency and will also fund enhanced efforts against several of the sexually transmitted diseases including chlamydia. The committee has not approved the President's request to terminate the training activities of the national Institute for Occupational Safety and Health and has recommended $9,900,000 for this program, an increase of $1,517,000 over 1986.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH

The committee recommends $929,787,000 for programs administered by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration including $36,353,000 for the Federal share of costs at St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia. This amount is $111,484,000 over the President's request and $81,550,000 over the amount available in fiscal year 1986. The committee has deferred consideration of budget estimates totaling $124,023,000 for drug abuse and alcoholism research which are not currently authorized for fiscal year 1987.

$47,553,000 of the amount recommended is for AIDS related research with emphasis on the drug abuse population who are a major risk group for the disease and also a major threat for heterosexual transmission to the general population. Funding for AIDS increases by $35 million under the committee bill.

The committee has been impressed with the quality of recent research at the National Institute of Mental Health and believes that the potential for breakthroughs in our understanding of the cause, prevention, and treatment of mental illnesses such as schizophrenia and Alzheimer's disease are possible in the not too distant future. The committee has therefore recommended a funding level of $229 million for this program which will permit more adequate funding of ongoing efforts including the intramural programs and will also support an increase of the number of new investigator initiated research projects.

The committee bill also includes $15 million for the community support program [CSP] which finances State and local demonstrations to better serve the chronically mentally ill many of whom have been released from mental hospitals as a result of deinstitutionalization programs. This program is focused on the chronically ill patients with special emphasis on children, adolescents, and the homeless.

The committee recommends $490 million for the alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health block grant which is an increase of $21,070,000 over the amount available in 1986. These funds are distributed to the States by formula in order to fund treatment activities for persons suffering from the these debilitating conditions.

Last, the committee has included $3 million to initiate new prevention activities to attempt to reduce the incidence of alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health problems. This initiative is intended to complement prevention research efforts undertaken over the last several years and will attempt to apply research findings to the real world. The principal focus of this initiative is on preventing or at least reducing drug abuse among school-age Americans.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION

The committee bill includes appropriations of $40,290,892,000 for programs administered by the Health Care Financing Administration. This amount includes $26,480,359,000 for State Medicaid programs, an increase of $1,519,875,000 above the 1986 level and $1,172,237,000 above the President's request. The committee has restored $1.2 billion in savings assumed in the President's budget but not now expected to be enacted into law. This account supports approximately 55 percent of the cost of the State Medicaid programs of health insurance for the poor.

The bill also includes a $20,826,000,000 for payments to the Medicare trust funds. This is $1,972,000,000 above the 1986 level and $469,000,000 above the President's request. The amount recommended is based on the most recent estimates of costs under current law submitted by the Congressional Budget Office. This mandatory appropriation now supports 75 percent of the Medicare part B program from general funds.

H.R. 5233 includes $1,301,027,000 in general and trust fund appropriations for Federal administration of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs. The committee has recommended total funding of $1,102,000,000 for the cost of processing Medicare claims. This is $95,200,000 above the President's budget and $87,576,000 above fiscal year 1986. This amount is expected to be sufficient to handle a substantial increase in the number of claims and to maintain the payment cycle for claims at historic levels of approximately 22 days.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The bill includes general funds appropriations of $16,447,480,000 for programs administered by the Social Security Administration including those programs in the process of being transferred to the new Family Support Administration. This amount includes $500,555,000 for payments to Social Security trust funds including military service credits, $963,437,000 for black lung benefits, $10,995,068,000 for Federal cash assistance for the aged, blind and disabled under the Supplemental Security Income Program and $9,317,035,000 for cash assistance to the poor through the Assistance Payments Program principally AFDC. The payments are all for mandatory entitlements which provide cash payments to more than 15 million needy Americans.

The amount recommended by the committee for the Assistance Payments Program is $1,013,942,000 above the President's request. The committee has not approved two categories of savings assumed in the budget. First the budget assumes $777,200,000 of penalties for error rates above levels mandated by law. These penalties have been delayed for a minimum of 1 year by Public Law 99-272. In addition the committee has restored $236,000,000 in legislative savings assumed in the President's request but not now expected to be enacted into law.

The committee has deferred consideration of budget estimates totaling $2,474 million for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance and the Refugee Assistance Programs which are not currently authorized for fiscal year 1987.

The committee recommends that $4,011,373,000 be expended from the Social Security trust funds for administrative costs of the Social Security retirement, Survivors and Disability Program. This is the same amount requested by the President and an increase of $163,510,000 above the amount available in 1986. This limitation account supports the staff, computers, telecommunications, facilities and other resources to manage these programs which are expected to pay more than $220 billion to more than 40 million Americans in fiscal year 1987. The committee bill provides for a staffing level of 74,437 full-time equivalents which is an increase of 1,167 over the number of FTE's requested in the budget. This results because of the committee decision to freeze overtime at not to exceed 3 percent of total employment rather than the 4.5-percent proposed in the budget. In addition the committee has continued to follow closely the issue of potential district office closings. No funds have been requested by the President nor have any funds been included by the committee for any large program of office closings or consolidations.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The committee bill includes $2,700,000,000 for the social services block grant entitlement. This is the same amount requested by the President and the maximum amount authorized for 1987. These funds are distributed to the States by formula for a variety of social and supportive services for children, aged and other vulnerable populations.

The committee recommends $925,017,000 for other social services activities under the human development services account. Included in this amount is $732,700,000 for aging programs including $425,000,000 for elderly nutrition programs. Aging programs have been increased by $61,300,000 over the level available in 1986. Also funded in this account is $31,000,000 for child abuse programs, $23,250,000 for runaway youth and $75,500,000 for services to the developmentally disabled. The committee has deferred consideration of the budget request for the Head Start Program which is not currently authorized for fiscal year 1987.

The committee recommends $1,005,233,000 for family social services including $758,000,000 for the Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Programs. The amount for these entitlements is $153,786,000 over the President's budget and $215,029,000 over 1986. The $100,228,000 of this increase relates to 1986 costs which were requested by the President in a 1986 supplemental but which have been provided by the committee in the 1987 bill. Also included in this account is

$225,000,000 for child welfare assistance grants. The committee has recommended an increase of $26,901,000 over 1986 for this program which serves high risk, vulnerable youth.

Finally, the bill includes $200,000,000 for the Work Incentives Program which the President's budget proposed to eliminate. This program supports efforts to train and place welfare recipients in full-time employment. The committee has deferred consideration of funding for the community services block grant which the President's budget also proposed to eliminate. This program has not yet been reauthorized for fiscal year 1987.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES REORGANIZATION

The Department of Health and Human Services is currently carrying out several major reorganizations of its programs. The most significant of these creates a new Family Support Administration which consolidates Federal cash assistance and support services for the poor into a new operating component of the Department. This consolidation involves the assistance payments, low-income energy assistance, child support enforcement, refugee and entrant assistance, community services block grant, and work incentives accounts. In addition, the Department is in the process of transferring the Health Maintenance Organization Program from the Health Resources and Services Administration to the Health Care Financing Administration and the National Center for Nursing Research from the Health Resources and Services Administration to the National Institutes of Health. While the decisions to carry out these reorganizations have been made and do not require congressional approval, the details of staff and resources to be transferred have in some cases not been finalized. The committee has, therefore, considered these activities under the old appropriation structure. Once final decisions have been made and determination orders issued, these resources can be transferred to their appropriate accounts.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

For the Department of Education, the bill includes $13,369,231,000, an increase of $1,458,132,000 over the President's budget request for fiscal year 1987. The total amount in the bill is $991,797,000 over the amount available for 1986. The committee was required to defer consideration of over $4 billion requested in the budget for programs which are not authorized at this time for fiscal year 1987. These programs will be considered for funding as soon as possible following the enactment of authorizing legislation.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The bill includes $3,999,163,000 for chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, the largest amount appropriated for this program in its 20-year history. This amount is $469,591,000 over the amount currently available for 1986, and $311 million over the amount requested in the budget for 1987. About 14,000 school districts participate in the program serving approximately 5 million disadvantaged students.

IMPACT AID

The committee bill provides $700 million to continue the Impact Aid Program at about the same level as in fiscal year 1986. This is $152 million over the budget request. The committee restored $130 million for category B payments which the budget proposes to terminate. In addition, increases over the budget have been provided for construction and special payments to local school districts.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS

For a variety of elementary and secondary education programs, the bill includes $699,943,000, an increase of $96,034,000 over the budget request and $32,331,000 over the amount available for 1986. The chapter 2 block grant program will be continued at $533,909,000, about the same amount as fiscal year 1986. Civil rights training, women's educational equity, leadership in education, territorial assistance, and Ellender fellowships will be maintained at 1986 levels. The budget proposed to terminate these programs.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

For bilingual education, the committee has provided $179,637,000, an increase of $14,426,000 over the 1986 amount, and an increase of $36,686,000 over the budget request. The amount recommended includes $3,686,000 for bilingual vocational training, $159,000 above the 1986 level; and $30 million for emergency immigrant education, an increase of $1,290,000 over the 1986 amount. In general, the Federal bilingual education programs are designed to assist limited English proficient children to improve their academic skills.

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

In the bill we include $1,494,420,000 for the education of handicapped children at elementary and secondary school levels. This amount is $191,320,000 over the budget request and $144,886,000 over the amount available for 1986. The amount provided in the bill will assist State and local educational agencies in providing special education to 4.2 million handicapped children.

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND HANDICAPPED RESEARCH

With the exception of the basic State grant program and the Helen Keller Center, which are authorized for 1987, the committee has deferred consideration of budget requests for rehabilitation programs because authorizing legislation for 1987 has not been enacted. For basic State grants, the bill includes $1,148,356,000, which is $3,208,000 more than the amount available for 1986, and $48,356,000 above the budget request. For the Helen Keller Center, the bill includes $4,300,000, the same amount as in 1986.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

For programs authorized by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, the bill includes $906,433,000, an increase of $505,459,000 over the budget request and an increase of $103,688,000 over the amount. Funds available for vocational education are designed to support and improve programs that provide education and training needed by persons to compete and advance in the labor market.

The bill includes $110,000,000 for adult education programs, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request, and an increase of $12,421,000 over the 1986 current amount. These funds are used to assist State programs that serve an estimated 2.6 million persons annually.

STUDENT AID

The President's budget request of $3,812,568,000 for student aid is based on a legislative restructuring of the Pell grant, supplemental educational opportunity grant, College Work Study and National Direct Student Loan Programs. No funds are requested in the President's budget for capital contributions for national direct loans and State student incentive grants. The bill does not include funding levels for the student aid programs because authorizing legislation has not been enacted. The committee regrets that the lack of authorization requires the deferral of the consideration of appropriations for the student aid programs. The committee will recommend adequate funding levels for all these programs as soon as possible following enactment of authorizations.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

The bill includes $3,394,000,000 for the guaranteed student loan appropriation account, the latest estimate of the funding that will be required for the program under current law. This amount is $66,250,000 less than the administration's current law estimate for 1987 provided in its budget request and $134,025,000 more than the 1986 appropriation. In its budget request for 1987, however, the administration proposed certain legislative changes that would have reduced its 1987 estimate for the program by $1,115,241,000. The committee makes no assumptions about changes in existing law, which may result from the regular legislative process.

HIGHER EDUCATION

For various higher education institutional aid programs which are authorized for 1987 the bill includes $29,500,000 an increase of $24,500,000

over the budget request and $13,710,000 over the amount available for 1986. The bill provides $21,000,000 for Carl Perkins scholarships, $5,000,000 for minority institutions science improvement, $1,500,000 for law school clinical experience, $2,000,000 for talented teacher fellowships.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

For college housing loans, the committee authorizes $60,000,000 in new loans compared to $57,420,000 in 1986 and zero requested in the budget.

LIBRARIES

Again, as in previous years, the budget proposes to terminate all Federal assistance to libraries. The bill provides $130,000,000, an increase of $14,682,000 over the amount available for fiscal year 1986. The recommendation includes $25,000,000 for public library construction.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

For payments to special institutions the bill includes $5,510,000 for the American Printing House for the Blind; $32,000,000 for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf; $60,737,000 for Gallaudet College; and $170,230,000 for Howard University.

RELATED AGENCIES

The bill includes $814,924,000 for 12 related agencies. This is entirely discretionary spending. We are over the President's request for these agencies by $215,603,000 and over the 1986 level by about $10,000,000. This includes $214,000,000 for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting, which is an advance appropriation for fiscal year 1989. In addition, there are trust fund transfers here in the amount of $76,916,000, an increase of $2,795,000 over the budget request.

The ACTION Agency and the U.S. Institute of Peace are not included in the bill because their authorization for appropriations has expired. The House Rules, as the Members know, prevent us from including unauthorized appropriations. The Physician Payment Reveiw Commission is funded for the first time in the amount of $1,000,000. Railroad retirement dual benefits are fully funded at $380,000,000.

I would like to mention to the committee at this time, Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman who presides over this bill today and who has presided over this bill on a number of occasions.

The gentleman is one of the able Members of this Congress. He is one of the best presiding officers in this House. The gentleman is the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology and he has announced his retirement. This will be the last time that my friend, the gentleman from Florida, DON FUQUA, will preside over this bill in the House of Representatives and I want all the Members to know that all down through the years, we have appreciated the fact that the Speaker of the House would name the gentleman from Florida to preside over this bill.

Mr. FUQUA, I want you to know that as a member of this subcommittee, we appreciate it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join with my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, BILL NATCHER, in bringing this bill before the House for the fiscal year 1987 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, as I stand here this morning to talk about this bill, I am compelled to say that GEORGE O'BRIEN will be missed by this committee. GEORGE worked long and hard with us, and he cared deeply about the positive things this bill can do.

Mr. Chairman, even as his own health faltered, GEORGE's concern for the health of others did not. He continued to sit with our subcommittee this past winter and spring, as we went through the long process of putting this bill together, and in that time, he built a strong case for the specific needs of a group of diseases unrelated to his own. At his request, we have included funds in this bill to establish six new kidney and urologic disease research centers through the National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to say that this bill contains language to ensure that these centers be established in honor of him, and will be named "The George M. O'Brien Research Centers for Kidney and Urologic Diseases.

It is an honor to serve as ranking minority member with a chairman as distinguished as the gentleman from Kentucky. He is always fair. He is always thorough, he is always compassionate, and he is always responsible in exercising his duty as chairman of our subcommittee.

That sense of fairness, thoroughness, compassion, and responsibility is what has allowed this subcommittee to develop a bill that the President has signed for the past 3 years. And I think we have a fair shot at getting this bill signed this year, as well.

Why? Because this bill, like its predecessors in fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986, responds both to the budget strictures that have existed over the past several years, and to the real needs of the American people.

This bill is not a budget buster. It is well within the ceilings of the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution approved by this body, 333 to 43, on June 26—just 5 weeks ago. And it is well within the budget authority allocated to the subcommittee under the 302(b) procedures.

In terms of responding to the needs of the American people, Chairman NATCHER has said on many occasions, this bill is the people's bill. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation that this body considers each year.

Mr. Chairman, I have often thought that we should rename our subcommittee so that its name more accurately describes what the bill does. We should call it the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Labor Programs and Services—HELPS. Because that's what this bill does for those Americans, from infancy through old age, who need help from their Government. For that reason, we work very hard to bring a good bill to the floor each year.

And this year is no exception. We started our hearings on February 19, shortly after the President had submitted his budget request to the Congress. In 33 days of hearings, including 25 days with administration witnesses and 8 more with outside groups, we heard testimony from 398 witnesses, representing 274 organizations. And to show you how important this bill is, I am pleased to note that before we concluded our hearings on May 7, 62 Members of Congress had appeared before the subcommittee.

Let me now tell you what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we bring to the House today recommends a total of $103.7 billion, $102.5 billion in current year funding, and the remainder to fund mandatory advances for prior or subsequent years.

We have added $5.8 billion to the President's budget request—$1.8 billion in mandatory accounts, where we received new estimates from the departments, or where legislative proposals had not yet been enacted into law, and about $4 billion in discretionary programs.

In terms of growth over last year's bill, we have added $1.3 billion for discretionary programs, and $3.6 billion in mandatory spending. There's no doubt about it; it's a lot of money. But let me emphasize what I said before—we are well within the budget resolution and our 302(b) allocation for this bill, even after we take into account those programs which are not yet authorized.

Nearly 76 percent of this bill, or $78 billion, is in mandatory spending over which our subcommittee exerts very little discretion. We act as a conduit through which that mandatory spending passes, and we depend entirely on the estimates given us by the administration and the CBO.

For discretionary spending, which comprises 24.5 percent of the amounts contained in the bill, we have provided $24.9 billion.

In most areas, we have restored programs to the fiscal year 1986 level. In doing that, we have simply restated

the wishes of this body 9 months ago when we voted, 322 to 107, to adopt the fiscal year 1986 Labor/HHS/Education bill, which itself was, by and large, a freeze from fiscal year 1985.

Then came Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and its miserable across-the-board cut. Up until 2 weeks ago, not one of us had had the chance to vote for or against those mandated cuts. And even then, we didn't really get a chance to exercise any judgment on the budget. Rather, we were allowed only to confirm the cuts put together by the green eye-shaded accountants in GAO and OMB. I voted "no" for that reason.

I believe the Congress should exercise its judgment on funding for individual programs, and that's what the subcommittee did in recommending increases in three major priority areas.

The first of those priority areas is AIDS research and control. This new disease is reaching epidemic proportions since Chairman NATCHER and I first provided direct funds for it nearly 5 years ago. Cases of AIDS have now been reported in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the 4 territories.

The most recent report by the HHS task force on AIDS says that by 1991, 179,000 deaths will be linked to this horrible disease, as compared to only 18,000 by the end of this year. The number of new cases reported also will jump from 16,000 this year to over 74,000 annually by 1991.

For that reason, we have responded to the latest request from the Public Health Service to provide a 50-percent increase in the subcommittee's share of the assault on this disease. The bill provides $336.7 million for that purpose.

A second priority area that the subcommittee identified is biomedical research performed by the National Institutes of Health. We provide an increase of nearly $1.1 billion over the amount requested by the President, which includes much of the AIDS money I just mentioned.

This increase is made to sustain the vital research performed at NIH in the never-ending battle against disease, disability, and death.

These national institutes perform research into areas that affect Americans of all ages, and must be sustained if we ever expect again to be able to say that we have eradicated a major disease or significantly alleviated human suffering.

Let me read from the names of some of the institutes so Members will get a better idea what I am talking about: Child Health and Human Development; Allergy and Infectious Diseases; Diabetes, Digestive, and Kidney Diseases; Heart, Lung, and Blood; Cancer; Aging; and Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke. We're talking about the whole gamut of human life. This is definitely a priority area that could properly be funded at even higher levels.

A final priority area that I would like to call to the attention of Members is chapter I, education for disadvantaged children. This is the major Federal program for ensuring equal educational opportunity to low-income, disadvantaged children. Once again, the subcommittee exercised its judgment and recommends an increase of $311 million. It did that despite the administration's proposal to level fund the program and to dramatically change the legislative purposes of the program.

In fact, the subcommittee exercised its judgment on each of the administration's other budget requests, whether those programs were proposed for elimination or proposed for major reductions or proposed for level funding.

Let me highlight a few of these.

The subcommittee acted to restore some funds for 21 of the programs proposed for elimination in the President's budget, programs that benefit millions of Americans. Among those, the bill restores $118 million for trade adjustment assistance and benefits, $212 million for most of the health professions programs, $69 million for nurse training programs, $6.8 million for organ transplants, $4 million for the vaccine stockpile, $10 million for mental health clinical training, $10.3 million for mental health protection and advocacy, $200 million for the work incentives or WIN Program that provides job opportunities to welfare recipients, $130 million for impact aid "B" payments, $30 million for emergency immigrant education, $31.6 million for consumer and homemaker education, $60 million in new loan commitments for college housing loans, and others.

The bill includes restorations in seven programs proposed for major reduction: $664.5 million for summer youth employment, $662.7 million for the Job Corps (together with a prohibition on center closings until July 1, 1988), $290 million for HEAL loans, $1.1 billion for Medicare contractors, $1.3 billion for education of the handicapped, $906 million for vocational education, and the NIH level that I already discussed.

I am also delighted to report that the bill continues funding for two programs within the Department of Labor Women's Bureau: the Displaced Homemaker's Network and the Corporate Linkage Program under the Bureau's Demonstration Grant Program. In addition, the bill continues, at a $5 million level, another important initiative that I take pride in having had a role in funding, now for the third straight year—the plant closing and mass layoff survey under the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Finally, I would like to call attention to a provision of the report.

It relates to an untimely regulation issued by the Education Department that has virtually stopped the processing of student financial assistance for this coming school year. I continue to support reasonable efforts to reduce fraud, abuse, and waste in all programs, but I believe this specific process is unreasonable. My language prohibits the Secretary from implementing the March 14 verification regulation for the remainder of this program year. In addition, it directs him to consult with the appropriate congressional committees to redraft a workable and reasonable verification system and to publish it before processing begins for the 1987-88 school year.

In response to my report language, I am pleased to report, the Education Department now plans to issue an emergency regulation within the next few days, changing some of the more onerous requirements of the verification process. In particular, I am informed that the Department plans to lift the requirement that all guaranteed student loan applications be certified before any processing can occur. This is a positive step, that, with other changes may make the verification process more reasonable for the time remaining before school starts this fall. I will continue to monitor closely the Department's actions in this area.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the best Labor/HHS/Education bill I have ever had the privilege to work on. Some may think we recommend too much spending; others will say we didn't do enough. I firmly believe that this is a balanced bill, balanced between fiscal responsibility and concern for the needs of the American people.

One final comment, Mr. Chairman. The Director of OMB has stated that he would not recommend that the President sign this bill as it is currently constituted. We have received the same signal from OMB for the last 3 years, and in each of those years, the President eventually signed the bill into law. And this year, we may have an easier task of negotiating with OMB, now that the young slasher is gone. I am confident that over the next few weeks, as the other body acts, as OMB readjusts its own projections, and as we go to conference with the other body, we can take this bill and reach the compromises necessary so that all parties can be satisfied with our final product.

This is a good bill based on good judgment. It maintains the time-honored traditions of the House to emphasize the labor, health and human services, and education needs of the American people, and providing reasonable funding levels to support them.

I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1130

I only wish that John Fogarty were here today, and also Mel Laird; they would support this bill.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI].

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman and Member, a man with no peer, a man for whom I have deepest and heart-felt affection and respect.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a total of $326 million for title V of the Older Americans Act—community service employment for older Americans. The committee report indicates that this is the same amount requested in the President's budget. I am also aware that this amount is some $13.9 million above the adjusted fiscal year 1986 level and some $2 million above the amount provided for in the budget resolution.

I would also note that all the other major service programs in the Older Americans Act were provided with increases above the President's budget in this bill. These are funding levels which will permit the kind of essential growth needed to meet demand. I contend title V is deserving as well. It is the only program in the Older Americans Act specifically serving the low-income elderly. Even with the levels provided in this bill, the funds will only support a maximum of 63,800 part-time jobs in 1987. This is less than a 3-percent increase from program year 1984-85.

It should be remembered that title V workers are employed in jobs important to communities across our Nation. More importantly, more than 40 percent of all title V workers are employed by programs serving other senior citizens.

It is my understanding that as part of the budget resolution there was a provision allowing for $1.5 billion in additional funding for certain education, training, social service, and low-income programs which I have been advised would include certain Older Americans Act programs. At the time when future decisions are made regarding the distribution of these funds, or as part of any supplemental appropriations which may become necessary during fiscal year 1987, could the chairman indicate his intention to consider additional funds for the title V program?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman, I would like the distinguished gentleman from New York to know that all down through the years since the gentleman has been a Member of Congress he has worked with us on our bill, not just when the bill comes to the floor but during the hearings on the bill and in the preparation of the bill generally, and we appreciate it.

The distinguished gentleman serves not only on his regular committee, but he is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Services of the Select Committee on Aging and has served on the Select Committee on Aging since this committee was formed and placed into operation. He is one of the able members of the committee.

I want the gentleman to know this, that if I have my way between now and the final conference report on this bill, if we can add $10 million or more to the bill for the purpose that the gentleman points out, title V of the Older Americans Act—community service employment for older Americans, we will certainly take that action.

The request of the gentleman is nothing but fair. If we could have placed a little more money in the bill at the time of the markup instead of increasing it $13.8 million above the adjusted level for 1986, we would have gone a little higher. And one of the main reasons, Mr. BIAGGI, is due to the fact of the gentleman's interest and the time that he spends every year on programs pertaining to the elderly, and we appreciate it.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the chairman very much.

Clearly the response of the chairman as well as his longtime and longstanding commitment are a reflection of his advocacy of programs for help for our Nation's senior citizens. No Member of Congress, Mr. Chairman, has worked harder or more effectively on behalf of senior citizens than has Chairman NATCHER.

Mr. Chairman, before I yield back my time, let me express my strong and wholehearted support for this legislation. I wish to take special note of the fact that this legislation does in fact provide desparately needed increases in funding for a variety of critical programs ranging AIDS research, summer youth employment, child support enforcement, and family services.

I wish to especially commend the committee for the funding levels they provided for title III of the Older Americans Act. Under this legislation, $275 million is provided for the many important supportive services under title III B of the Older Americans Act. This represents a $21.4 million increase over the adjusted fiscal year 1986 levels and $10 million over the President's budget. It is also the first increase this program has enjoyed since my amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1984. It must be noted that included among the vital services that are funded by title III B include transportation, in home services, legal services, and information and referral. That latter category has taken on extreme importance in recent years because many of the beneficiaries of these services, are those elderly who are being discharged prematurely from hospitals under the terms of the DRG system under Medicare. Title III B also is mandated to provide services to victims of elder abuse and under the terms of legislation I developed it provides important supportive services to families of Alzheimer disease victims.

The funding levels provided for the two nutrition programs under the Older Americans Act are also excellent. Combined, this legislation would provide a total of $425 million for the congregate and home delivered meals programs. This represents an increase of almost $39 million from the adjusted fiscal year 1986 levels. If we want to look to a model Federal program performing its mandate in a cost-effective manner it is the Nutrition Program. Over 225 million meals are served each day in this Nation in congregate settings and homes across our Nation. In the case of the home delivered meal, it can represent the difference between maintaining a person in their home and being placed in an institution. Upward of 20 percent of persons in nursing homes are there due to an inability to maintain a proper diet.

It must also be noted that the Nutrition Program is serving those elderly more likely to be "at risk." As an example the average age of those in the congregate program is now 73 and the home delivered program is 78.

I am very familiar with the operations of the nutrition programs across the Nation. I can state with confidence that the taxpayer gets their full bang from this buck. Money goes to provide services and is done with great efficiency. These funding levels are entirely appropriate and I support them strongly.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB].

Mr. DAUB. I appreciate the recognition, and I appreciate the subcommittee chairman yielding to me.

I very much want to say in the beginning that the bill that he and the ranking member bring to the floor and to the membership today is one well crafted, in my opinion, and one with the symmetry that fits the opportunities we have to progress in the three areas that the appropriation bill covers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the chairman the concerns of a number of highly impacted school districts with respect to the Impact Aid Program.

It is my understanding that the manner in which this legislation has been drafted coupled with the amount of money in the bill will, in fact,

produce reductions in the Federal payment to a number of highly impacted school districts, and particularly to "Super A" districts—which are my primary concern.

It appears that this reduction in payment to these districts was unknown to the committee upon its inclusion of the new redistribution formula in the bill before us; nevertheless, the shifting of moneys from highly impacted districts to lesser impacted districts is not in the best interest of the Federal Government nor the students, staff, and taxpayers of those communities affected by the change.

Further, I would like to urge the chairman, on behalf of those school districts nationwide that are heavily impacted and which are dependent upon these payments "in lieu of tax" to continue to strive toward strengthening the Impact Aid Program itself and, more importantly, to reconsider the new distribution of funds now included in the appropriations process.

Would the chairman agree that this issue of establishing funding priorities within the Impact Aid Program would more properly be addressed during the impact aid reauthorization process?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the gentleman from Nebraska to know that we will follow the matter of impact aid payments carefully. If there are problems in the payment distribution formula, we will take the necessary action to resolve these problems as the bill moves over to the other body and later on into conference.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his assistance all down through the years since he has been a Member of Congress, not just on the other matters in the bill but on impact aid in particular. Each year the gentleman appears before our subcommittee to testify stating to the committee that category B should go back into the bill and that there should be sufficient funds for impact aid.

I want the gentleman to know that we appreciate his assistance.

Mr. DAUB. I thank the chairman. I appreciate the chairman's remarks, and I particularly agree with him as to category B, a subject that will be debated later today, as it will be affected by an amendment to be offered. I want to thank the chairman for his dedicated efforts on behalf of the education community, and I look forward to working with him to specifically address the concerns of those heavily-impacted school districts that will be detrimentally affected by the new funding formula contained currently in H.R. 5233.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the Committee knows, over the last several days we have been looking for ways to provide resources for the coming bipartisan war on drugs. I am pleased to say that, as we bring this bill to the floor, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, is going to be offering an amendment to put additional resources into the drug education programs that are contained within this bill. His amendment will almost give us a fivefold increase in that particular program. I think it is a very meritorious effort, and I intend to be fully supportive of what he is doing.

It seems to me that goes in the direction of providing sufficient resources there to do the valuable kind of thing. In addition, our colleague from California, Mr. HUNTER, is going to offering an amendment that will, in effect, deny funding to those educational institutions that do not, that do not have in place drug abuse prevention programs, an effort that goes along with what the Secretary of Education, Mr. Bennett, has proposed in the past.

So with those two amendments in this bill, which I fully expect us to consider, we will have in fact a dramatic effort done in this House that helps move ahead our war on drugs, and I certainly think that the committee is to be congratulated for working with us in making certain that we are able to bring these amendments to the floor for consideration.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman in the well. He is being very modest calling this the Coughlin amendment. It is the Coughlin-Walker amendment because the gentleman has been persistently after me to offer this amendment. The gentleman deserves as much credit as anyone else, not only in this bill but in every appropriation bill that has come to the floor in the last 2 weeks, where the gentleman has persistently and jaundicedly watched those bills to make sure there is enough money for drug interdiction for the proper agencies. For that I want to commend him.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman, and I am just pleased that on this bill we are going to be able to move forward and there will be a couple of other efforts later on particularly on the Customs Service that I hope we can work out some way to get some money there as well. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, on April 30, 1986, the Center for Disease Control halted all mandatory Federal inspections aboard cruise ships and determined that cruise ships would conduct their own health inspections. However, within 3 weeks of this decision, over 1,000 passengers were found ill aboard two Florida based cruise ships. After investigating this incident, Federal inspectors found that these ships had failed earlier health inspections. The CDC is the only agency that inspects cruise ships for safety. Without them there are zero inspections by any Federal, State or local agency.

Mr. Chairman, the recent decision by the CDC is appalling, unwarranted and shows a lack of concern for those who vacation on cruise ships. Since only 58 percent of all cruise ships pass Federal inspections, the cruise ship industry should not be solely responsible for inspection. Instead, the CDC must establish, together with the cruise ship industry, a standardized procedure for inspecting and scoring cruise ships. This is, in fact, what the cruise ship industry wants.

On two occasions, I wrote to the CDC asking them to reinstate Federal health inspections. Their unwillingness to do so has led me to request that the Appropriations Committee take action to ensure that CDC continue its cruise ship inspections.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly appreciate it if the chairman would indicate to the House as the chairman of the subcommittee what action has been taken on these cruise ship inspections.

□ 1145

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, on page 39 of my report you find the following:

> The Committee was made aware that CDC has substantially reduced its activities with regard to health inspections of cruise ships. The Committee believes that this was an unwise decision. CDC is therefore directed to immediately resume all of its prior activities with regard to cruise ships.

This matter, Mr. Chairman, was called to our attention by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH]. The gentleman is exactly right about it.

It is the intention of our subcommittee and our Committee on Appropriations that the Center for Disease Control continue the activities that it has carried out up to this time in regard to cruise ships. I want the gentleman from Florida to know that we intend to follow this matter carefully to see that this takes place.

We want to thank the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I certainly thank the members of the committee for their attention. The gentleman has done a great service to the traveling public, both American and foreign visitors here in the United States and to south Florida and the cruise ship industry.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this provision and the bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, it is a difficult chore on this particular bill to be critical. The distinguished subcommittee chairman is well known in this body as being a careful and thoughtful legislator. The gentleman's Republican counterpart is the same. To criticize the work of these two gentlemen calls for an act of courage which few people are willing to accept.

I really have only one criticism of each of them. I wish the distinguished chairman would miss a few votes some day and stop embarrassing the rest of us. I wish the distinguished ranking member would inflict more discipline on his baseball team.

But with respect to the bill, Mr. Chairman, despite the hymns of praise that have echoed through these Halls, it is quite obvious that this is a seriously overfunded bill.

We are looking at an increase of 7 percent across the board in this bill. I have no idea what the nature of the increase will be for the items which are not in the bill because they are unauthorized, but must be added later. I estimate this bill is going to be over last year by 10 percent in budget authority by the time it runs its full course.

The committee has much difficulty with its mandatories. As has been noted earlier, it can only add up what the costs are and fund them, and they represent three-quarters of this bill.

The discretionaries, however, do leave the committee some room for frugality. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I must report mandatories increase less than 6 percent, but discretionary items increase more than 9.1 percent. When we go into debate on the amendment which I intend to offer to reduce discretionary amounts within this bill back to 1986 levels, I will go through some of the items that have been increased by very large amounts.

I do not make light of the job of the subcommittee. I think it is one the more responsible committees in the Congress, and perhaps the hardest working. Nevertheless, I feel obligated to remind the members of this committee that a 9-percent increase is more than this House can tolerate in discretionary items.

There is no question what this bill is. It can be properly described as a budget buster. If amendments are not adopted, it is certainly going to have veto trouble as it winds its way toward what we hope will be ultimate enactment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and Mr. Chairman, a Member who down through the years has worked with us on our bill and who has been of great assistance to us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the chairman is very kind. I appreciate that, and particularly appreciate the excellent work the gentleman from Kentucky has done on this bill. I want to say publicly that, without the gentleman's effort and close work with his colleagues on his own committee, as well as his work with the Committee on Education and Labor and the Budget Committee, without his willingness to do that, we would not have been able to arrive at this point. We are very appreciative of it, both those of us on the Budget Committee and those of us on the House Education and Labor Committee.

This is an important point in the recent history of the United States and of this House of Representatives, because with this legislation of the House of Representatives, I believe the Nation turns a corner. We change directions some by saying to the American people, we hear you now with regard to appropriate Federal assistance to education, and we are going to reestablish the Federal effort to appropriately fund education. We hear you now with regard to appropriate assistance to the elderly both through Social Security and through employment assistance to the elderly. And we know, America, that you want this House of Representatives, this Congress, to provide appropriate assistance, yes, even within the restrictions of the deficit, appropriate assistance to those Americans of moderate- and low-income means and to those Americans who are disabled.

This legislation does that, and it does it in a way that we have not been able to achieve during these 6 years. This marks a departure point now, and a departure point which I personally believe, and I think that soon we will find the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives believe, tracks us more closely with the popular will in this country to get on with the great social urgencies before us.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of the chairman's leadership that we are able now to once again follow the will of the American people in providing appropriately for education and health care and the necessary research to bring us into the next decade.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues of the committee, let me first pay my respects to the members of the committee, the distinguished chairman and ranking member, with whom I served for some 20 years as a member of the same subcommittee which brings this bill before the House. Those were very pleasurable days for me. I really got to know the inner workings of the Departments of Labor and the old Health, Education and Welfare, now HHS, because Members do devote so much of their time to the detailed operations of the departments during the committee hearings.

I think the thing that distresses me today, as contrasted to several years ago, is that we had as many as 3 or 4 days scheduled for the consideration of this bill, and this Chamber was packed with Members, similar to what may be the case next week when we debate the Armed Services Committee authorization bill. It is disappointing today to see so few Members on the floor.

But it certainly does not diminish in any way the amount of time and effort devoted to the crafting of this piece of legislation by Members on both sides of the aisle. As I said, the time I served on the committee was one of the more pleasurable times in my career here in the House.

□ 1155

The gentleman from Massachusetts made mention of the $78 billion, roughly, of mandatory spending in this bill compared to $25 billion of discretionary. So there are some limitations and wraps in which the committee does its business. Then, of course, we do not want to forget that there is roughly $10 billion of spending left out of the bill due to a lack of authorization. That brings me to another point, and that is I think it is tragic that right at this moment we are meeting here, the Appropriations Committee is meeting in another location on two very important bills. Some of us are missing rollcalls on important amendments to those bills because this bill is being considered here on the floor of the House at the same time.

Let us face it, the people who really know the arguments backward and forward are those serving on not only the subcommittee but also the full committee. I think it really does the system and the institution a discredit to have the scheduling take place as it does in this fashion.

Here we are again, trying to jam everything in just before recess time, while earlier in the year we did very little, not meeting on Fridays, not

meeting on Mondays and with light schedules in between.

I just have to decry that kind of scheduling and hope that we can put our act together in the next Congress and review this system. Maybe part of it is the budget process. While I supported its revision initially, I was also one of those members of the Appropriations Committee who frankly looked rather ascance at what was happening.

The general public has trouble following all the budget debates we engage in here in Congress.

Only when they hear the informed members of the Appropriations Committee take these items, line item by line item, and discuss them in detail do they really have a grasp of what is involved in spending a billion here and a billion there. As our old friend, Ev Dirksen, used to say, "You know, I hear a billion here and a billion there, and eventually it does add up to real money."

We are talking about considerable sums today. Later on when we get to the amending process, this gentleman will revert to his old character and have a couple of amendments to offer. I would not feel comfortable with myself if I did not do that, having come back to serve for a short stint on the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] that he has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say that it is indeed an honor for me to serve on this subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. The gentleman is one of the great chairmen here in the Congress. Over the years that I have served on this subcommittee, it has been one of the greatest honors of my life to serve under his chairmanship.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, SIL CONTE, who does a fantastic job as the minority leader on this subcommittee. It is a real pleasure and honor to serve with him.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5233, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987. As a member of the subcommittee which drafted this bill, I want to say that it continues to be a great privilege to work with the distinguished chairman, WILLIAM NATCHER. He is always hard working and imminently fair when considering programs which are important to the people of this Nation. I personally appreciate his cooperation and consideration. Additionally, I want to express my appreciation to the ranking minority member, SILVIO CONTE. It is a great privilege to serve on this subcommittee with both of these distinguished gentlemen.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1987 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill is perhaps the most important of the 13 appropriations bill that this body will consider this year. This bill contributes to the Nation's health and productivity by helping to sustain the health and well-being of our citizenry. It provides for all segments of our society—the old, the young, the disabled and the infirm. Certainly, residents of my congressional district rely heavily on the services that this bill makes possible.

In total, H.R. 5233 provides $103.7 billion for labor, health, human service and education programs. In general, the committee restored most program activities to the pre-Gramm-Rudman fiscal year 1986 appropriation levels. It should be noted, however, the committee has selected several high priority activities for which additional funding is provided.

For example, under the Labor Department, the bill includes $622.7 million for the Job Corps Program and language that extends the prohibition of job center closings until July 1, 1988. The $622.7 million will be sufficient to keep all 106 centers operational, including the Cleveland Job Corps Center, which last year celebrated 20 years of service to the Cleveland community.

The bill also includes an increase of $50 million for the Dislocated Worker Assistance Program. This program has already provided critical job retraining and location services to hundreds of displaced workers. In my own State of Ohio, the Kaiser Foundation Hospitals recently received a $274,000 grant to assist employees displaced from the closing of the Cleveland Medical Center. With the assistance of the Dislocated Workers Program these employees will be able to find other productive employment. Now, with the recent filing for bankruptcy by the LTV Corp. placing the jobs of thousands of workers in jeopardy, the potential need for the Dislocated Workers Assistance Program has been magnified many times over.

The bill provides $1.820 billion for the employment and training block grant and $664 million for the Summer Youth Employment Program, financing job opportunities for approximately 635,000 youth in the summer of 1988.

Under the Department of Human Services, the bill includes an increase over the fiscal year 1986 enacted appropriation of $663 million for the National Institutes of Health. These funds will sustain the momentum in research on AIDS, hypertension, diabetes, cancer, and other diseases which afflict millions of Americans. The committee has recommended funding levels which will finance 6,200 new and competing research grants as well as maintain important work conducted in research centers. Research centers in my congressional district which will benefit from these resources include the Multipurpose Arthritis Center, the Hypertension SCOR grant, the Cystic Fibrosis Center, and Clinical Research Center at Case Western Reserve University.

Additionally, I strongly support the $212 million recommended in H.R. 5233 for health professions development. Federal health manpower programs are critical in ensuring that our Nation has an adequate and balanced supply of doctors, nurses, dentists, and other health personnel. I am especially pleased the committee adopted my recommendation that the Disadvantaged Assistance Program be funded at $26.5 million, providing a $1.0 million increase above last year's funding level. These additional resources will help to attack the diminishing representation of minorities in health professions schools by removing educational, social and other discriminatory barriers that discourage minorities from pursuing health careers.

Mr. Chairman, in the State of Ohio, essential public health and mental health services to low-income mothers and children are made possible because of the dollars that flow to the State under the major health block grants. H.R. 5233 includes funding for these activities at $478 million for the maternal and child health block grant; $490 million for the alcohol, drug abuse and mental health block grant; and $89.525 million for the preventive health services block grant. The committee has taken note of the considerable interest in the Congress in expanding the maternal and child health block grant and has indicated in the report that additional appropriations will be considered as soon as the authorization ceiling is increased.

In addition to providing for healthy mothers and children, H.R. 5233 also recognizes our elderly citizens. The bill includes $732.7 million for the older American programs. This amount provides an increase of $31 million for senior citizen centers, congregate meals, and home-delivered meals.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to mention the high priority placed on education in this bill. For the chapter 1 program, H.R. 5233 includes $3.999 billion, $311 million over the enacted 1986 level. These funds are needed to restore the 1986 Gramm-Rudman cuts and to offset several years of no inflationary increases in the program. If we are to properly educate our Nation's young people for the 21st century, the

Cleveland public schools and other school districts with a heavy concentration of disadvantaged students must have additional resources to do the job. I am delighted that substantial increases are also provided in the bill for education for the handicapped and vocational education. These funds are an investment in an educated populace and a healthy economy.

Mr. Chairman, millions of Americans and their families will benefit from this legislation. I strongly endorse H.R. 5233 and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to express in general my appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky and my colleague from Massachusetts for the moral leadership they are showing in this bill.

What they are showing is that you can combine fiscal responsibility with a sense of compassion and responsibility. This does not have everything in it that they would like to see or that I would like to see because we are under some constraints. But it does try to recognize the responsibility of this very great Nation to a variety of very important causes, and for the skill with which they have done it and for the fact that they brought forward a bill that is so defensible and is so factually supported.

I want to expresss my appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky and my good friend from Massachusetts who is so important in the accomplishment of these goals.

In particular, I want to note when we talk about across-the-board cuts coming, some very real damage would be done if those across-the-board cuts would come. One area where this subcommittee has shown some great leadership is in combating the terrible illness known as AIDS. We have had a lot of rhetoric about how terrible AIDS is but rhetoric never cured anybody.

It has been this subcommittee that has been one of the few entities of the Federal Government that recognized this early and has taken a lead. Yes, this is an area where more money had been appropriated than the administration had asked for. That is to the discredit of the administration that did not ask for enough.

I would hope when Members vote on across-the-board amendments that might come, which I think in this instance in particular, given this careful bill, would be a substitute for rational thought, that they will look at the particular items for people with illness, for people in dire need who are going to be hurt.

I would hope that the amendments of that sort would be rejected and the first-rate work that has come to us from this subcommittee would be preserved.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING], who is completing his eighth term in the Congress. As we know, the gentleman has announced his retirement. He is another able Member of the House that we are going to miss, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the 16 years that I have served with the gentleman in the Congress and the gentleman from Massachusetts as well, have been particularly gratifying to me because of the ability to associate with the two gentlemen and to watch the gentlemen perform such a marvelous job of leadership for the Congress and for the country.

Mr. Chairman, on January 14, 1986, the President signed into law the resolution ratifying the Compacts of Free Association for the Federated States of Micronesia [FSM] and the Marshall Islands, two Micronesian governments currently still part of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This law sets forth a new political relationship between the United States and these Micronesian governments and sets the groundwork for the termination of the trusteeship by the United Nations.

Included in the public law are provisions to continue certain program and services to these governments for the duration of the compacts. Section 105(h) provides that the programs and services of the Public Health Service shall continue to be providedd to the FSM and the Marshalls.

Section 105(k) provides that the National Health Service Corps shall continue to be provided to the FSM and the Marshalls for as long as these services are available to persons residing in any other areas within or outside the United States.

It was the intention of the Congress, when it acted on the joint resolution last year after many hearings, that these programs cited here would continue on a nonreimburseable basis, and there was unanimity on this critical point, not only between the key Democrats and Republicans who worked on this legislation but also between the two Houses of Congress. Does the subcommittee chairman agree?

Mr. NATCHER. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this matter earlier with the gentleman from Ohio and I wish to assure him here today that I agree with him and that it is the intention of our appropriations subcommittee to carry out congressional intent regarding health care programs in Micronesia.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget has attempted to thwart congressional intent on this matter and is declaring to the agencies and departments that if the Micronesians want these programs, they will have to pay for them because Congress did not specifically state in the act that they were to be nonreimbursable. However, on page 33 of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Report 99-188, dated July 15, 1985, we made it quite clear that the Public Health Service was to continue to make its programs and services available to the Micronesians as they were available as of January 1, 1985, and that meant nonreimbursable.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman's point is well taken and I again reiterate my concern and my desire to see that the Micronesians continue to get these health services as they were available as of January 1, 1985.

Mr. SEIBERLING. If the gentleman will yield further, I would inform the House that because the compact legislation was so complex, difficult and lenghty, we are finding there are still some kinks to be ironed out regarding some ambiguities in the language and we are moving rapidly to clarify and correct these.

For example, through the legislative process, we intend to clarify the fact that the Public Health Service for the Micronesians will continue to be funded and administered by the Public Health Service. The Public Health Service programs were not intended to be budgeted by the Interior Department nor will the Interior Department run these programs, as was interpreted by OMB. Only coordination and monitoring of these will be carried out by the Interior Department.

Mr. NATCHER. I'm glad to hear that those potential problems will be dealt with. It was difficult to comprehend how the Public Health Service Programs could be both budgeted and run by the Interior Department.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, in regards to his comments on the procedure we're using here. I agree with the gentleman. This is a horrible procedure. Here is a subcommittee up there now, with a full committee meeting on HUD and Foreign Operations operations. The other day the same thing happened. The subcommittee was meeting on Foreign Operations. I was down here carrying one of the other appropriations bills and my office was getting calls from Greek Americans in

my district saying that I voted against an amendment that somebody offered in subcommittee markup. And the same thing is going to happen today. There are going to be amendments after amendments and I am not going to be there to be able to vote on those amendments. I want to be there but I am not a twin, I cannot be in two places at once.

It is a terrible procedure. All of the members of the Appropriations Committee should be down here. That is the way it was in the old days but, unfortunately, things are changing around here.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I might add, incidentally, that the authorizing committee is presently in another markup so in both cases people who have vital interest in this legislation are unable to be here.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, in a brief discussion.

The bill under consideration includes funds for the Community Service Employment for Older Americans Program, authorized by title V of the Older Americans Act. This program provides part-time employment in community service activities for unemployed, low-income persons aged 55 and over. As the committee report indicates, the title V program has made a valuable contribution toward alleviating unemployment among older workers, and I commend the committee for maintaining, and slightly increasing, both the funding and the number of anticipated employment positions under this program.

One of the most pressing problems among our senior citizens today is the crisis in health care. The prospective payment system, while designed to address one problem, runaway health care costs, has created another, and that is the fact that more of our senior citizens are being discharged earlier from hospital care. The only alternative for a great many of these elderly people is to be placed in a long-term care institution—a nursing home—and, of course, the major portion of the cost of this care is borne by the Medicaid system.

Many of my colleagues perhaps have faced this personal crisis with elderly parents who live in distant parts of the country far from family members who could otherwise help in their care.

I believe we can encourage a system that allows more of these elderly people to avoid, or certainly delay, going into an institution by providing trained workers who can attend to their routine daily and medical needs in the patients own home for several hours a day.

I encourage my colleagues to look at the title V Community Service Employment Program as a readily available source for this type of worker.

By directing title V employment resources in this manner several objectives can be met: First, we could keep more seniors out of the lonely and dehumanizing atmosphere of the long-term institution; second, lessen the drain on Medicaid funds; and third, provide training in an occupational field to title V workers that would offer a high degree of transferability to private sector employment.

□ 1205

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] as to whether he agrees with my sentiments in this area and whether we can look forward to his cooperation encouraging the targeting of a portion of title V funds to this purpose.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like the distinguished gentleman from Michigan to know that every consideration will be given to his request.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee. I would point out that I have also discussed this with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and the authorizing committee has expressed equal interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my full appreciation and commendation to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] for the outstanding leadership he has once again demonstrated in dealing with the terrible AIDS epidemic. He has provided through his committee an additional $122 million above that which the administration requested to deal with the crisis which has already claimed 12,500 American deaths, with 22,600 total cases. By 1991, it is projected by the Public Health Service, there will be a total of 270,000 cases and perhaps 180,000 deaths. I thank the gentleman for his fine work.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] that we appreciate his help and support all during the time that we have had this matter before our committee.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman. I want to take this occasion to express my support for H.R. 5233, the fiscal year 1987 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, HHS, and Education.

One aspect of the budget which I strongly support is the inclusion of a total of $336.8 million for research and other activities directed at the prevention and treatment of AIDS. Since the first cases of AIDS were reported in 1981 the Centers for Disease Control has reported more than 22,600 cases and over 12,500 deaths. The Public Health Service's grim projections for the next 5 years indicate that we can expect dramatic increases in these figures, with case totals by 1991 as high as 270,000, deaths approaching 180,000, and the number of infected individuals between 1 and 1.5 million. PHS also anticipates a rise in the number of cases in the heterosexual population and an increase in AIDS incidence in areas outside of New York and San Francisco.

These staggering statistics indicate that AIDS is a national crisis demanding Federal leadership. If the PHS projections are at all accurate, the pressure on the Federal Government to deal effectively with this epidemic are going to be enormous. State and local governments and community organizations are not equipped to fight this disease alone; it is imperative that every available Federal resource be channeled into the battle against AIDS.

The administration has called AIDS its No. 1 health priority, but its response to AIDS funding requirements has been consistently inadequate. In fact, the President actually proposed cutting AIDS funding for fiscal year 1987 by almost $30 million—to $213 million—in addition to the $10 million Gramm-Rudman rescission.

This past month, the Public Health Service finally submitted a revised AIDS funding request to the Secretary of HHS, indicating a new spending plan at the level of $337 million. This is hopefully reflective of a growing awareness among Federal officials of the urgent need for a well-coordinated, efficient, and sufficiently funded program to fight this deadly disease. Unfortunately, HHS has failed thus far to forward this critical funding requirement to the Congress. I submit for the record a copy of the PHS funding request.

Once again, under the leadership of Chairman Natcher, Congress has been forced to fill the gaps in AIDS funding left by the administration. The House fiscal year 1987 appropriations bill does include $133.2 million more than the administration's request. The bill appropriates $198.9 million for the National Institutes of Health, $87 million for the Centers for Disease Control, and $47.6 million for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. This money will enable the agencies to conduct important research on AIDS, implement programs for drug development and testing, risk reduction and prevention, drug treatment evaluation, and public health education.

I am greatly pleased that the House fiscal year 1987 budget appropriation increases AIDS funding by over $112 million from this fiscal year, rejecting proposed cutbacks and inadequate requests for funding.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
June 23, 1986.

To: The Secretary.
From: Donald Ian Macdonald, M.D., Acting Assistant Secretary for Health.
Subject: Amendment to Resource Requirements to Address the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) Epidemic.

As you know, we have been reassessing the PHS response to the AIDS epidemic. I have concluded that the FY 1987 PHS resource plan for AIDS needs to be expanded to support new opportunities to prevent and control the spread of this disease.

At this point, we estimate that 1 to 1.5 million Americans are infected with the AIDS virus. We have had over 21,000 cases of AIDS reported in the U.S.A., with over 11,000 deaths. In 1991, we expect a cumulative total of 270,000 cases with 179,000 deaths. Of these, 74,000 will be new cases, developing during the year. In 1991 alone, there will be 145,000 who are ill and seeking treatment; 54,000 will die.

We anticipate that some increase will occur in the percentage of cases in the risk group we have called "heterosexual contacts". We also expect to see AIDS spreading geographically and occurring much more widely outside of the New York City and San Francisco areas. We estimate that the direct health care cost of persons with AIDS will be between $8 to $16 billion in 1991.

These statistics are indeed troubling and make very clear that the PHS research and prevention efforts must be intensified to explore every opportunity to reduce and prevent the spread of this disease.

Accordingly, an FY 1987 revised PHS resource plan for AIDS has been developed. Its implementation will require $351 million, an increase of $138 million over the FY 1987 President's budget level of $213 million. We request that the PHS budget for FY 1987 be amended to add these funds without offset against other PHS programs.

The increase of $138 million is necessary primarily to expand our efforts in the following five major priority areas:

THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTION

An increase of $29 million is included to expand our efforts to identify and develop agents for the treatment and prevention of BTLV-III/LAV (The name human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) has been proposed for these viruses.) infection and associated diseases, including the central nervous system diseases. Much has been learned about this disease but additional efforts are necessary to maximize research opportunities to discover and develop effective treatment.

The increase will support a series of activities aimed at this goal including; establishment of new drug discovery groups, development of quality control systems to permit an accurate assessment of treatment evaluation units, development of new methods to measure the amount of infectious AIDS virus in patients, and several new intramural studies.

HEALTH EDUCATION RISK REDUCTION

An increase of $47 million is included to support this vital activity. In the absence of a vaccine and effective treatment, our most powerful tool to prevent and control the spread of AIDS will be the traditional public health control measure. Therefore, this increase is necessary to support a series of prevention and control strategies to reduce the transmission and spread of this disease by sexual transmission and by drug users. Major new initiatives include: voluntary HTLV-III/LAV testing, counseling and partner referral for at-risk populations, school health education programs, and intensive outreach efforts to reduce HTLV-III/LAV transmission among intravenous drug users.

VACCINE DEVELOPMENT

An increase of $17 million is included to further our efforts to develop a vaccine to prevent AIDs. This increase includes support for exploration of all known methodologies of vaccine development and initial support for vaccine evaluation activities (Phase I).

CO-FACTOR RESEARCH

An increase of $14 million is proposed for FY 1987. The factors that determine the expression and progression of disease in an individual are largely unknown. Recent developments, particularly those that relate to the mechanisms of disease in the central nervous system, require expanded research. Also, research studies on the role that may be played by other factors (including drugs, alcohol, and genetics) are proposed to further understand this disease and its progression. Such information is essential to the development of effective treatment.

EPIDEMIOLOGY AND SURVEILLANCE

An increase of $23 million is included in this area to further clarify the natural history of AIDS and to isolate the patterns and consequences of transmission. Studies to be initiated include: 1) further definition of incidence, prevalence, risk factors in drug users and heterosexual men and women to design strategies to prevent further transmission, 2) determining consequences of infection in children, and 3) further clarifying differences in infection and illness rates among infected groups.

Attached is an FY 1987 summary table of the additional PHS requirements for AIDS by organization and major function. Detailed justifications supporting these requirements have been provided to the Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget together with our FY 1988 requirements.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME—SUMMARY OF INCREASES OVER FISCAL YEAR 1987 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[In millions of dollars]

Organization	Fiscal year 1987 President's budget	Amendment	Total
Food and Drug Administration			
Development and evaluation of blood test (accelerate evaluation and licensing of increased volume of products to screen for AIDS virus and its antibodies)	2.7	+0.5	3.2
Vaccine development and evaluation (expedite vaccine approval attendant to accelerated vaccine development at NIH by improving FDA lab support capabilities)	4.2	+1.2	5.4
Therapeutic intervention (facilitate evaluation of new therapeutic products related AIDS)	2.4	+2.9	5.3
Other activities	.5		.5
Subtotal, FDA	9.8	+4.6	14.4
FTE's	70.0	+32.0	102.0
PRIORITY DISEASE CONTROL AND RESEARCH PROJECTS			
Health Resources and Services Administration			
Health Education/Risk Reduction (AIDS education and training centers for health professionals)		+1.9	1.9
Subtotal, HRSA		+1.9	1.9
FTE's		+5.0	5.0

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME—SUMMARY OF INCREASES OVER FISCAL YEAR 1987 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Organization	Fiscal year 1987 President's budget	Amendment	Total
Center for Disease Control			
Epidemiology, surveillance, and cofactors	18.1	+11.9	30.0
Definition of incidence, prevalence and risk factors for HTLV-III in heterosexual men and women to design and implement prevention strategies in United States and developing countries		+4.8	4.8
Determination of consequences of HTLV-III infection in children and prevention of perinatal infections in target areas		+4.2	4.2
Identification of factors increasing susceptibility to HTLV-III and to illness among infected persons and evaluation for prevention potential		+2.9	2.9
Health education/risk reduction	21.1	+29.7	50.8
HTLV testing, counseling, and partner referral (25 percent of at risk population in 1987 will be tested)		+15.4	15.4
AIDS school curriculum development and school health education programs		+12.8	12.8
Laboratory training courses and seminars on monitoring infection			
Assessment of Nation's laboratories		+1.5	1.5
Other activities	6.2		6.2
Subtotal, CDC	45.4	+41.6	87.0
FTE's	180.0	+26.0	206.0
National Institutes of Health			
NCI:			
Etiologic agent and cofactors (etiologic studies of possible cofactors)	13.6	+.2	13.8
Epidemiology (studies of HTLV I, II, III in cancers in the United States and other countries to determine, (1) magnitude of cancer risk, (2) risk of cancer associated cofactors, and (3) long-term cancer sequelae)	7.2	+1.4	8.6
Development of vaccine (virus production, antigen production, bacterial vector system, mammalian vector system, transgenic mice, new technologies)	6.1	+4.0	10.1
Therapeutic intervention (antisense RNA/complementary oligo-deoxynucleotides for suppression of AIDS)	15.0	+6.7	21.7
Monitoring clinical trials of NCI derived IND		.1	.1
Immunologic studies (cytotoxic effector cells in combination with antivirals in blocking viral infection and eliminating infected cells)	3.3	+.2	3.5
Other activities	2.0	+2.0	4.0
Subtotal NCI	47.2	+14.5	61.7
FTE's	98.0	+22.0	120.0
NHLBI	17.1		17.1
FTE's	2.0	+1.0	3.0
NIAID:			
Etiologic agent and cofactors (HTLV-III in the central nervous system)	2.0	+2.1	4.1
Epidemiology studies	17.0	+5.7	22.7
Georgetown study-virus culture and Western blot		+1.0	1.0
Characterize HTLV-III associated psychiatric and neurologic manifestations in HTLV-III positive individuals		+1.0	1.0
Define epidemiological/clinical parameters for evaluation of drugs, vaccines and other intervention of adults and children		+3.7	3.7
Development and evaluation of vaccine	5.6	+8.5	14.1
Vaccine evaluation units (phase I)		+1.0	1.0
Expand intramural vaccine development unit		+3.1	3.1
Immune status of infection		+1.0	1.0
Evaluate candidate vaccines in chimpanzee models		+1.1	1.1
Genetic variation		+1.1	1.1
Adjuvant research		+1.3	1.3
Therapeutic intervention	34.9	+11.0	45.9
Quality control (includes viral islolations)		+2.6	2.6
Measurement of viral load		+2.1	2.1
Drug penetration to the central nervous system		+2.0	2.0
New drug discovery groups		+3.0	3.0
Intramural antiviral development		+.4	.4
Diagnosis of opportunistic infections		+1.0	1.0
Immunologic studies	6.6	+2.0	8.6
AIDS immunologic studies		+2.0	2.0
Other activities	1.4	+2.0	3.4
Subtotal, NIAID	67.5	+31.3	98.9
FTE's	57.0	+36.0	93.0

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME—SUMMARY OF INCREASES OVER FISCAL YEAR 1987 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Organization	Fiscal year 1987 President's budget	Amendment	Total
NIDR	2.7		2.7
NINCDS: Epidemilogy (CNS—Studies to correlate electrophsyiological tests with extensive virological and immuniological examinations of nerve biopsies and cerebrospinal fluid)	1.6	+.6	2.2
NICHD: Epidemilogy (provides continuing support for a study on the effect of HTLV–III/LAV infection on pregnancy and a study on the clinical spectrum of disease in infants)	.7	+1.5	2.2
NEI	.1		.1
DRR	6.1		6.1
Clinical centers—FTE's	58.0	+36.0	94.0
OD: Therapeutic intervention (supports new coordinated program in development of new antiviral agents based upon a structural biological approach)		+8.0	8.0
Subtotal, NIH	143.0	−56.0	199.0
FTE's	235.0	+103.0	338.0
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration			
Etiologic agent and cofactors	4.8	+12.1	16.9
Research on alcohol as a cofactor in AIDS		+.7	.7
Studies on cofactors related to IV and other drug users, on progression of disease among those who are seropositive, on comparison of clinical course of disease between drug users and non-drug users, and on special populations	2.2	+6.1	8.3
Research on brain dysfunction and the central nervous system	2.6	+4.3	6.9
Epidemiological studies (natural history) (sexual contacts of drug users (esp. IV drug users); positive serologies among drug users, drinking practices of AIDS patients and prevalence of HTLV–III positive among alcohol abusers, training of health and mental health personnel)	1.8	+4.4	6.2
Immunologic studies (studies on marijuana, heroin, and methadone use in the immune system; studies on the interrelationship of immunological and psychological variables, and the psychoimmunological aspects of AIDS)	1.4	+1.6	3.0
Psychosocial factors (identification of behavorial psychosocial factors contributing to the transmission and clinical causes of AIDS; also research focusing on adolescents in correctional institutions and women)	1.7	+1.0	2.7
Bioethics and biosafety	.9		.9
Information dissem./public affairs (prevention and technology transfer efforts concerning drug abusers and AIDS; publishing papers for health care workers; maternal anc psychosocial aspects of AIDS; training of workers associated with AIDS and drug abusers)	1.9	+2.6	4.5
Health education/risk reduction	.7	+12.1	12.8
Intervention research, especially for IV drug users; dissemination of research information concerning alcohol and AIDS	.7	+2.1	2.8
Treatment demonstration programs to test the effectiveness of various strategies for preventing the spread of HTLV–III infection and AIDS among the drug-using populations		+10.0	10.0
Subtotal, ADAMHA	13.7	+33.8	47.6
FTE's	7.0	+35.0	42.0
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health			
Information/dissem./public affairs	1.4		1.4
FTE's	5.0		5.0
Subtotal, priority disease control and research projects	203.4	+133.4	336.8
FTE's	427.0	+169.0	596.0
Total, PHS	213.2	+138.0	351.2
FTE's	497.0	+201.0	698.0

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill before us today, H.R. 5233, increases funding more than $6.6 billion over fiscal 1986 appropriations, and more than $5.9 billion over President Reagan's request. This bill includes about $78 billion in funding for entitlement programs, including the Nation's major welfare programs, unemployment compensation, Social Security, and Medicare. These types of benefits must be paid to anyone who meets eligibility criteria. The bill provides $24.9 billion for discretionary programs, more than $4.1 billion over Reagan's request and $2.2 billion over the amount available in fiscal 1986. Budget requests totalling $8.4 billion were deferred for later consideration because of lack of authorizing legislation at the time the bill was reported from committee. The principal programs in this category are family planning, National Health Service Corps, alcohol and drug abuse research, adolescent family life, low-income energy assistance, educational research, and ACTION volunteer programs.

Of special interest to my home State of West Virginia is the section of the bill which provides almost $1 billion for coal miners suffering form the crippling effects of black lung, and for the widows and children of miners who have lost their lives to black lung.

H.R. 5233 also appropriates some $3.5 billion for employment and training programs. Included are programs for summer youth employment and dislocated workers, and the Job Corps. These programs are vital to the people of West Virginia in view of the fact that our State continues to suffer from an extremely high rate of unemployment.

The National Institutes of Health [NIH] would receive a major increase in funding under the bill. Spurning an administration proposal to cut funding, the bill gives NIH $6.1 billion, up more than $890 million over 1986 funding and more than $1 billion over the administration request. For the second straight year, funding for reaseach on acquired immune deficiency syndrome [AIDS] has been drastically increased. The bill would provide for research, prevention, and treatment activities, an increase of $112.5 million over 1986 funding. AIDS funding has more than tripled since fiscal 1985.

Other appropriations under funding for the Department of Health and Human Services include the following: $732.7 million for aging programs, an increase of $43.6 million over the budget and $61.3 million over fiscal 1986; $445.4 million for Community and Migrant Health Care, an increase of $26.1 million over the President's request and the maximum amount authorized; $478 million for Maternal and Child Health, an increase of $20.6 million over the fiscal 1986 level and the full amount authorized; $518.3 million for Centers for Disease Control, an increase of $93 million over the President's budget and $77.2 million over the fiscal 1986 amount; $929.8 million for alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health programs, an increase of $111.5 million over the President's request; $212 million for the health professions, an increase of $14.1 million over fiscal 1986, in contradiction to the President's proposed elimination of this funding.

Of specific concern to my congressional district are the funding levels for education programs. The bill provides $13.3 billion to the Education Department, up more than $990 million from 1986 funding and more than $1.4 billion from the administration request. Much of that increase would go to remedial education services for the disadvantaged. The chapter 1 program would receive $4 billion, $469 million more than 1986 funding and $311 million more than Reagan requested. The bill also provides $1.5 billion for handicapped education programs, up $144 million from 1986 and $191 million over the administration request. Vocational and adult education would be funded at $1.016 billion, an increase of $511.5 million over the President's budget. The bill provides $3.394 billion for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, an increase of $134 million over fiscal year 1986. And, libraries would receive $130 million to continue programs which the budget proposed to eliminate.

The funding levels of this bill recognize the needs of my fellow West Virginians and all Americans. I am particularly pleased with the program funding levels within the Departments of Labor and Education. Barring the adoption of any amendments which would devastate programs vital to my constituents, it will be my pleasure to support this legislation.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriation bill for fiscal year 1987. Chairman NATCHER and his committee are to be commended for this bill which reasserts our commitment to our children and the future of this Nation.

I am particularly pleased to note that chapter 1, Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, receives the largest appropriation in its history, some $4 billion. Chapter 1 has been proven cost-effective. Data show that the greatest gains in reading on tests administered by the National Assessment of Educational Progress occurred among students targeted for chapter 1: low-achieving children, minority children, and those in disadvantaged rural and urban areas. By increasing funding for chapter 1 by $470 million, Chairman NATCHER and his colleagues have made the wisest investment in our future that I can think of.

I imagine that there may be some Members who believe this appropriation is too high. I would remind them, however, that in real dollars—after adjustment for inflation—the fiscal year 1987 appropriation for chapter 1 is still 11 percent less than that appropriated in fiscal year 1980.

The bill also includes increases in bilingual education, education of the handicapped, impact aid, vocational and adult education, and State block grants.

The bulk of the funding for higher education programs has been deferred pending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. I am pleased that the committee substantially increases the Carl D. Perkins Scholarship Program which provides financial support to outstanding high school graduates interested in teaching careers. It also funds the Christa McAuliffe Fellowship Program in which fellows may use funds for sabbatical study or the development of innovative programs.

Finally, the committee's bill includes an increase for programs included in the Job Training Partnership Act, particularly the Job Corps and dislocated workers. I appreciate these increases. I believe, however, that we must, in the near future, address the larger questions posed for our future by 7 plus percent unemployment.

I would again like to applaud Chairman NATCHER, Mr. CONTE, and the other members of the committee for their efforts in producing this bill. I ask my colleagues to oppose any hostile amendments to it. This is an excellent bill and I urge its adoption.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1987 Labor/HHS/Education appropriation bill, H.R. 5233. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. NATCHER, for his leadership on this important legislation, as well as the ranking Republican, Mr. CONTE. I also want to congratulate the members of the committee for their careful and diligent efforts in preparing this bill for floor consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has placed a greater emphasis on funding for the National Institutes of Health in the coming fiscal year to support a wide variety of research initiatives. Through its 12 institutes and other programs NIH plays an invaluable role in this Nation's efforts to prevent and treat cancer, diabetes, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, heart disease, and sudden infant death syndrome, as well as a multiple of other illnesses.

This legislation also provides funding for a wide variety of vital medical and health research programs, including money for biomedical research. For fiscal year 1987 the committee recommends $317.8 million for research resources and facilities, which funds biomedical investigations into the causes, cure, and prevention of disease. This portion of the bill includes funding for the Biomedical Research Support Grants Program, which strengthens and advances the medical and health related programs of academic and scientific institutions, including the University of Michigan. Without this support, learning institutions around the country could not continue using state-of-the-art research instruments and technologies so critical to biomedical research efforts.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, the committee remains committed to programs of vital importance to the Nation's research of health and safety issues. I am proud that the subcommittee, of which I am a member, produced such a bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation now before us. H.R. 5233, appropriating the many programs administered by the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, is a key piece of legislation, and one on which almost everyone of us in this Nation depends in one way or another.

As ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I am keenly interested in the funding being allocated for the National Institute on Drug Abuse and preventive education programs. While the Alcohol, Mental Health and Drug Abuse block grant has appropriated $490 million for fiscal year 1987, which is the same as the fiscal year 1986 allocation but $26 million more than the post sequestration figure, I regret that we now lack an authorization for drug abuse research. Consequently, this funding, anticipated at $62.5 million, has been deferred. I support the significant increase accorded AIDS research under this particular section, as I believe that it is intravenous related drug use which poses the most serious threat to the community at large in the transfer of this tragic disease.

Yet, under the funding levels appropriated for the Department of Education's Office of Special Programs, only $3 million is once again allocated for alcohol and drug abuse education. This sum represents only a fraction of the program's total of almost $700 million, while drug abuse among our Nation's youth, particularly in the form of crack cocaine, is rising drastically.

I cannot emphasize enough the importance of our need to focus additional resources on drug abuse prevention programs, and while I support the measure in whole, I encourage my colleagues to look to the future.

We will only be able to ensure a drug free tomorrow if we teach our children that drugs are a viable danger to their health and their lives. Legislation I have coauthored would authorize $100 million in each of 5 fiscal years for drug abuse education and training programs, and is, in and of itself, a modest proposal. While I fully applaud the efforts of the House leadership in crafting an omnibus bipartisan narcotics measure which we will be considering on the floor sometime this fall, I urge my colleagues to take a close look at H.R. 4155 and at other pieces of legislation which help our Nation increase the Federal effort in this much needed "war."

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for encouraging in its report an innovative new health care concept.

As many of you may know, the committee has urged HCFA to consider implementing a voucher system for its Medicaid Prescription Drug Program. Currently this drug program—which reimburses pharmacists for medication they distribute to Medicaid beneficiaries—is a bureaucratic nightmare. Although it uses only 8 percent of Medicaid funds, it generates over 50 percent of all the paperwork in the entire Medicaid system. The predictable result is that reimbursements are often made late, claims are sometimes lost altogether, and cases of fraud and abuse are all to common.

The members of the committee have correctly urged that alternatives to this situation be sought. In particular, they suggested a voucher system based on electronic debit cards.

Electronic debit cards are the latest refinement of the voucher concept. They would be very similar to instant cash bank cards. a Medicaid recipient would take his card to the pharmacist of his choice who would in turn insert it in a device installed near his cash register. Through the miracle of modern electronics, the cost of his medication then would be deducted automatically from the Medicaid system and transferred to the pharmacist's bank account.

It would be a simple, accurate, and efficient system. The possibility of fraud would be virtually eliminated, administrative costs would be drastically reduced, rejected claim problems would be minimized, and patient care would be enhanced by the capacity of the electronic cards to store vital medication records.

By taking advantage of the competitive free marketplace, a voucher system holds the promise of cost-effective quality medical care—not bureaucratic waste.

Mr. Chairman, among other things, the Federal Government is the largest single provider of health care in the world. With Medicare and Medicaid, veterans hospitals, the Indian Health Service, CHAMPUS, and other programs, we end up spending hundreds of billions each year providing health care to as many as 60 million Americans. With such a massive committment, it is essential that we explore vouchers and similar concepts that will allow us to continue providing quality health care at a reasonable cost. Only then may we rest assured that we are not squandering the hard-earned money given to us in trust by the taxpayers of the United States. I commend the committee for recognizing this important fact.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman NATCHER for the opportunity to state my support for the funding level in this bill for AIDS research. As a member of the Budget Committee and a proponent for increased AIDS funding, I am very pleased that the committee recognizes the crisis that AIDS presents and has seen fit to appropriate $337 million to fight it.

Since I last wrote you on June 28, 1986, Mr. Chairman, over 1,000 more Americans have died of AIDS. By July 7 of this year, the CDC reported 12,139 deaths with 22,356 reported cases of AIDS. At the current rate, the number of new cases doubles every 10 months.

Despite our best efforts, medical experts still say that major medical breakthroughs are 3 to 5 years away. As yet, there still is no effective treatment against AIDS. For those at risk of infection, an effective vaccine is still estimated to be 5 years away. While there may be as many as 2 million Americans infected with the AIDS virus, the search for an effective antiviral is still in the early phases. Of those 2 million infected with the AIDS virus, anywhere between 20 to 40 percent will go on to develop AIDS. Many more will show symptoms, sometimes debilitating, by developing AIDS related complexes. I believe that the bill before us may prevent some of this tragedy.

Furthermore, according to a study in the January 10, 1986, edition of the Journal of the American Medical Association, the expenditures for hospitalization and the income lost due to disability and premature death totaled $6.3 billion for the first 10,000 cases of AIDS in this country. The economic impact of this epidemic can be expected to grow dramatically unless progress is made in medical research and treatment.

The administration continues to publically state that AIDS is the Nation's No. 1 health priority. Those most directly engaged in the efforts to combat this epidemic, the Public Health Service, requested $351 million to expand their efforts. The House Budget Committee, in recognition of the severity of this situation, included $346 million—a 48-percent increase over last year's level and the single largest percentage increase in the budget.

In addition to the current efforts being carried out, I believe there are several initiatives which must be undertaken. These include: development, expansion and operation of vaccine and drug treatment evaluation units throughout the United States; expansion of

epidemiological studies of the spectrum of HTLV-III infection, including pediatric AIDS, neurological complications and AIDS-related complexes; supplementation of sexually-transmitted disease grants to include agreements to develop and maintain testing confidentiality; development and expansion of education activities for adolescents, minorities, primary health care workers, educators, and public employees; and expansion of demonstration projects to middle- and low-incidence areas of the country for development and support of cost-effective, out-of-hospital care networks. All of these efforts, must be undertaken soon if we are to lessen the human and economic impact of this epidemic.

We must continue to battle this tragic health problem and the Appropriations Committee understands that. For that I am grateful.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987. And I would like to commend our chairman, Mr. NATCHER and the ranking minority member, Mr. CONTE, for their dedication and fairness in considering each part of this bill. Every year it seems the task becomes more difficult to ensure that the programs we put in place to take care of the needs of the elderly, minorities, the poor and the sick, are protected. I am proud to say that this bill achieves this goal and much more.

Of immediate importance is the continuation of Federal support for programs and activities designed to control and eventually eliminate the spread of AIDS. We have been able, in appropriations, to respond to the ever-increasing body of knowledge on AIDS by directing and redirecting the Federal funding emphasis to pursue the areas which show the greatest promise. We are now ready to concentrate some of our effort on public education about AIDS. This bill includes $3 million for a new national AIDS clearinghouse that will provide a centralized source of current and concise information on AIDS health education/risk reduction, including information about HTLV-III/LAV infection, available resources, and effective strategies. The bill also provides sufficient funding to assist community-based organizations, especially high-incidence and minority communities, to initiate or intensify their risk reduction and education activities through high-quality projects.

The committee is also concerned about the serious disparity between the occurrence of diabetes among Hispanics and that of non-Hispanic whites. Hispanics are experiencing an incidence of diabetes three times that of non-Hispanic whites. Among Hispanic women in the barrios, the rate is four times that of suburban Hispanic women. The committee has acted on its concern and recommended to the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases that it initiate a study of the Hispanic population and the suspected risk factors for diabetes among this population, such as obesity, diet, and genetic contribution from Native Americans. The NIDDKD will report on its progress toward this goal by the first of next year.

Additionally, the committee strongly recommended that the Office of Minority Health target adequate funds in fiscal year 1987 to efforts to reduce the incidence of diabetes in Hispanics by promoting culturally sensitive public health education and disease risk reduction activities.

Alzheimer's disease remains a critical committee concern and received special consideration in terms of the funding for expanded research, including full funding of the 10 Alzheimer's research centers, and in the launching of a new initiative—the National Alzheimer's Education Program. Housed in the National Institute on Aging, the National Alzheimer's Education Program, which I sponsored, will finally demonstrate the Federal Government's commitment to making health care providers and the public more aware of the devastating effects of this dreaded disease. Combined with the efforts of organizations like the Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorders Association, this program will help build support for a more aggressive attack on the disease and its burden on caring families.

An exciting prospect for the future is the committee's decision to fund a new NIA research and training initiative in long-term care. NIA will receive funds for research and clinical trials on medical, social, and behavioral interventions and for the training of health professionals, families, and other care givers. This is a first and very important step toward integrating the medical and long-term support needs of older persons and their families.

Our committee further demonstrated its commitment to research by restoring funding for HCFA's Office of Research and Demonstrations and its direction of those funds toward research on Medicare's prospective payment system. Special attention is focused on its impact on health care quality and access. The committee also supported a study of out-of-pocket health care costs for the elderly and the nonelderly. The committee required that the National Medical Expenditures Survey [NMES] be fully funded and include for the first time, a survey of the expenditures of institutionalized persons. It was my intention when I proposed this report language that only $5.5 million of the funds required for NMES come from the National Center for Health Services Research, with the remaining $17 million taken from other funds available to the Secretary, and not disproportionately from the budget of the National Center or any other program or agency. The committee also called for full funding of the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey [HANES].

As chairman of the Committee on Aging, I cannot stress enough just how important the services provided under the Older Americans Act are to the basic health and well-being of America's senior citizens. Since its inception in 1965, its programs have dramatically improved the lives of millions of elderly Americans in the areas of income, nutrition, health, housing, employment, and retirement. This bill recognizes the vital need for these services by including $275 million for supportive services and senior centers, $350 million for congregate nutrition services, $75 million for home-delivered meals, and $326 million to provide nearly 64,000 low-income senior citizens with part-time employment. Additionally, it is my understanding that the bill provides $1 million under title IV to maintain basic legal services assistance and programs.

While even these funding levels do not completely meet the needs of the fastest growing segment of our population, they reaffirm the fact that Older Americans Act programs are the life blood for millions of our Nation's senior citizens. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly support H.R. 5233.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that funds the health programs we consider today, I want to commend our chairman, Mr. NATCHER, and our ranking miniority member, Mr. CONTE, for their leadership in providing for our Nation's health care needs, especially for those of older Americans.

In particular, I want to emphasize our subcommittee's concern about the millions of patients and health care providers that have been inconvenienced the past few months by the significant slowdown in Medicare claims processing. Prior to this year, claims were paid, on the average, within 16 days. This year, however, the average processing time exceeds 30 days.

During the hearings the past few months, we found that there are two major reasons for this current processing delay. First, the number of claims processed by Medicare sharply increased. For instance, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida will process 9 percent more claims this year than in 1985. At the same time, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reduced the funds available for processing claims by 4 percent, or $41.4 million.

Recognizing that older Americans should not have to tolerate the hardship associated with a claims processing system that takes more than 30 days to pay their medical bills, our committee has included in this legislation $1.087 billion to fund Medicare claims-processing contractors in fiscal year 1987. This is an $86.9-million increase over the amount that was available for claims processing this year. In providing for a 9-year increase in funding, the committee took into consideration projections that the number of Medicare claims would increase by 10 percent in 1987.

The committee directed that this increase in funds, the Health Care Financing Administration, which oversees the Medicare Program, require contractors to return to paying Medicare claims in an average 16-day timeframe. The committee rejected a proposal to maintain a slower 27-day claims processing cycle in order to increase interest earned by the Medicare trust funds.

Mr. Chairman, it's my hope that our colleagues in the Senate will join us in our effort to provide adequate resources so that Medicare contractors can return to a system which reimburses patients, doctors, and hospitals for medical services in a timely fashion. This would relieve the undue hardship on patients and providers of medical care that we've experienced these past few months.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill before us corresponds very closely to the budget request from this administration with respect to the agencies in the Federal Government with responsibility for worker health and safety.

There are five specific agencies that have degrees of involvement with occupational

safety and health. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Mine Safety and Health Administration are the two primary agencies in terms of compliance and enforcement.

The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission and the Mine Safety and Health Review Commission are quasi-judicial and review OSHA and MSHA citations when they are challenged.

The fifth agency is the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Its role is research in the area of workplace health and safety.

In his budget request for 1987, the President requested $225.7 million for OSHA, roughly a $7 million increase over OSHA's 1986 appropriation. The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS and Education has allotted OSHA $225.8 million.

In the request for 1987, MSHA was allotted $156.5 million, an increase of just under $5 million from 1986. The Labor, HHS, Education Subcommittee approved a budget for MSHA of $156.5 million.

NIOSH did better, something I personally am in favor of. Instead of the $60 million as requested, NIOSH will get just under $70 million to perform its most vital functions.

Only the two review commissions receive less than requested. The OSHA Review Commission will get $5.6 million instead of $5.8 million and the MSHA Review Commission will get $3.6 million instead of $3.9 million.

All in all, if the Directors of the agencies involved aren't stretching the truth, enough dollars to carry out the functions are assigned to them.

Well, Mr. Chairman, while I applaud the chairman and members of the Labor, HHS, Education Subcommittee for their work and for their continued interest in ensuring safe and healthy workplaces for American workers, I don't believe the agencies are going to perform any better than they have for the past 5 years.

For as long as I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I have heard OSHA, MSHA, and NIOSH Directors say that the funds requested are adequate to do the jobs assigned to them.

And, for as long as I have been chairman of that subcommittee, I have seen these agencies fail to perform either because there weren't enough dollars or because of policy decisions.

OSHA, in particular, seems so far from fulfilling its tasks that it is a wonder it does anything at all. In testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee, the former Acting Assistant Secretary said that OSHA currently had 2,170 employees. Of those, 1,096 were compliance officers, inspectors if you will. He also noted that there might be a decrease in personnel by the end of the year.

In the course of oversight activities by my subcommittee, OSHA has continued to use the number of 1,200 when defining inspectors as if there were actually that many. In fact, that is the number of available compliance officer slots.

So, when the Director of OSHA comes before me and tells me that the agency can oversee the hazard communication standard, the five or six special emphasis programs underway, as well as the regular duties which it is charged to perform, I am going to ask him some very tough questions.

I am going to ask him how he can possibly ensure that the hazard communication standard is operating properly when, experts tell me, a minimum of 115 inspectors and 10 toxicologists would have to be assigned to that program to insure its adequacy.

Just about 2 weeks ago, I commented on this administration with respect to the national commitment to ensuring safe and healthy workplaces for American workers.

I commend the Appropriations Subcommittee for its diligence and I assure the Members of the House that I will continue my insistence that these agencies do what they are supposed to through oversight activities.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5233, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 1987. I commend Chairman NATCHER and the other members of the Committee on Appropriations for bringing this important bill to the House floor.

H.R. 5233 includes $893,434,000 for alcohol and drug abuse and mental health programs in fiscal year 1987. This is an increase of $111,484,000 over the President's budget request and an increase of $86,936,000 over the 1986 appropriation as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse is the lead agency for the development of effective drug prevention strategies. The bill includes $14,437,000 for administration and support costs of the National Institute on Drug Abuse. This is an increase of $254,000 over the amount requested in the President's budget and an increase of $621,000 above the amount available in fiscal year 1986. These funds support staff responsible for the overall planning, coordination and evaluation activities of the Institute as well as technical assistance to local groups in establishing and operating drug abuse prevention programs. These funds will also support maintenance of current position levels. I do not believe, however, that it is good enough just to maintain current position levels at a time when our country is in the midst of a serious cocaine and crack epidemic. While all of NIDA's research activities are important, I would hope that within available manpower limitations more researchers could be devoted to cocaine and crack research.

It is unfortunate that H.R. 5233 does not include funding for NIDA's basic drug abuse research program because of a lack of authorizing legislation. This has the effect of delaying advances in drug abuse research which sometimes translate into improved drug abuse treatment techniques, which can help save lives. H.R. 5233 does contain $1.5 million for research training in drug abuse, and $31,324,000 for research on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome [AIDS]. There is probably no more feared disease in America today than AIDS, and I am hopeful that this nearly $24 million increase over the fiscal year 1986 enacted level will result in significant new research findings to help AIDS victims.

I agree with the Appropriations Committee that:

As the use of illicit drugs continues in the United States it is becoming increasingly clearer that stronger efforts to reduce the demand for drugs are necessary. Accurate up-to-date information about the adverse health consequences of drug abuse must be produced in an understandable format and disseminated widely for use by educators, health care professionals and the general public particularly children and youth.

Mr. Chairman, a billl introduced H.R. 4155, "Drug Abuse Education Act of 1986" would provide $100 million annually each year for 5 years for a program of mandatory drug abuse education in grades kindergarten through 12. Narcotics law enforcement officials are increasingly coming around to the view that an effective program of drug abuse education is essential to curtailing substance abuse in America. I am hopeful that some funding for drug abuse education will be included in the omnibus drug bill, which Members will have an opportunity to consider later this year. It is disgraceful that with 20–22 million regular users of marijuana, 4–6 million regular users of cocaine, and 500,000 heroin addicts that the U.S. Department of Education currently spends only $3 million out of its $18 billion budget on drug abuse education programs.

Mr. Chairman, it is known that well conceived and implemented drug abuse treatment programs work. It is also known that it costs us far more in criminal justice, medical, and lost productivity costs, that it does to pay for effective drug abuse treatment programs. We all pay the costs of substance abuse, the only question is whether we will pay less now or more later. While I would like to see drug abuse funding substantially increased over the levels provided in H.R. 5233, I support the bill as reasonable given the current state of the Federal budget.

The CHAIRMAN. All time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5233

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs, $67,363,000 together with not to exceed $44,763,000 which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, in-

cluding the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act, $3,517,121,000 plus reimbursements, to be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1987, through June 30, 1988, including $2,000,000 for the National Commission for Employment Policy, including $3,000,000 for all activities conducted by and through the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee under the Job Training Partnership Act, and including $10,000,000 for service delivery areas under section 101(a)(4)(A)(iii) of the Job Training Partnership Act in addition to amounts otherwise provided under sections 202 and 251(b) of the Act: *Provided*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for obligation for the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program for the program years 1986 and 1987 the Secretary of Labor may reserve an amount, which, when combined with excess unexpended funds, shall not exceed fifteen percent of the total provided for the program, and allot such funds to the States so that each service delivery area receives, as nearly as possible, an amount equal to its prior year allocation for this program. For the purposes of this provision, "excess unexpended funds" shall mean for program year 1986, any amount unexpended as of September 30, 1986, in excess of 10 percent of the prior year State allotment, and for program year 1987, any amount unexpended as of September 30, 1987, in excess of 10 percent of the prior year State allotment. Reallocations of excess unexpended funds pursuant to this provision shall be accomplished by reducing, by an amount equivalent to the amount of excess unexpended funds, allotments made to the States.

For activities authorized by sections 236, 237, and 238 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, $26,000,000.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

To carry out the activities for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under paragraph (1)(A) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, $254,280,000.

To carry out the activities for grants to States under paragraph (3) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, $71,720,000.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during the current fiscal year of benefits and payments as authorized by title II of Public Law 95-250, as amended, and of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances, as provided by law (part I, subchapter B, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended) $118,000,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That amounts received or recovered pursuant to section 208(e) of Public Law 95-250 shall be available for payments.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For activities authorized by the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U.S.C. 49-491-1; 39 U.S.C. 3202(a)(1)(E)); title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504); necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, and sections 231-238 and 243-244, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended; and as authorized by section 7c of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, necessary administrative expenses under sections 101(a)(15)(H)(ii) and 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), $27,300,000, together with not to exceed $2,485,933,000 which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and of which the sums available for activities authorized by title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504), and the sums available for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, and sections 231-235 and 243-244, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, shall be available for such purposes through December 31, 1987, and of which $22,700,000 together with not to exceed $732,500,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1987, through June 30, 1988, to fund activities under section 6 of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, including the cost of penalty mail made available to States in lieu of allotments for such purpose, and of which $261,942,000 (including not to exceed $4,800,000 which may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980) shall be available only to the extent necessary to administer unemployment compensation laws to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic allocation was based, which cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments based on State obligations as of December 31, 1987.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Labor-Management Services, $62,275,000, of which $1,100,000 shall remain available until expended for a pension plan data base.

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by section 104 of Public Law 96-364, within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program through September 30, 1987, for such Corporation: *Provided*, That not to exceed $36,874,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, $193,709,000, together with $441,000, which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

SPECIAL BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by title V, chapter 81 of the United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; and sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 per centum of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, $263,600,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That in addition there shall be transferred from the Postal Service fund to this appropriation such sums as the Secretary of Labor determines to be the cost of administration for Postal Service employees through September 30, 1987.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, $234,538,000 of which $186,687,000 shall be available until September 30, 1988, for payment of all benefits as authorized by section 9501(d) (1), (2), and (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and of which $25,826,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, Salaries and Expenses, and $21,413,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, and $612,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Office of Inspector General, for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(A) of that Act: *Provided*, That in addition, such amounts as may be necessary may be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation or other benefits for any period subsequent to June 15 of the current year: *Provided further*, That in addition, such amounts shall be paid from this fund into miscellaneous receipts as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be the administrative expenses of the Department of the Treasury for administering the fund during the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(B) of that Act.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, $225,811,000, including not to exceed $54,921,000, which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than fifty percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended for the assessment of civil penalties issued for first instance violations of any standard, rule, or regulation promulgated under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (other than serious, willful, or repeated violations under section 17 of the Act) resulting from the inspection of any establishment or workplace subject to the Act, unless such establishment or workplace is cited, on the basis of such inspection, for ten or more violations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, order or administrative action under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 affecting any work activity by reason of recreational hunting, shooting, or fishing: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to any employer of ten or fewer employees who is included within a category having an occupational injury lost work day case rate, at the most precise Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by such Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of five or more employees, and to take any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by such Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under such Act:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended for the proposal or assessment of any civil penalties for the violation or alleged violation by an employer of ten or fewer employees of any standard, rule, regulation, or order promulgated under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (other than serious, willful or repeated violations and violations which pose imminent danger under section 13 of the Act) if, prior to the inspection which gives rise to the alleged violation, the employer cited has (1) voluntarily requested consultation under a program operated pursuant to section 7(c)(1) or section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 or from a private consultative source approved by the Administration and (2) had the consultant examine the condition cited and (3) made or is in the process of making a reasonable good faith effort to eliminate the hazard created by the condition cited as such, which was identified by the aforementioned consultant, unless changing circumstances or workplace conditions render inapplicable the advice obtained from such consultants: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph may be obligated or expended for any State plan monitoring visit by the Secretary of Labor under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, of any factory, plant, establishment, construction site, or other area, workplace or environment where such a workplace or environment has been inspected by an employee of a State acting pursuant to section 18 of such Act within the six months preceding such inspection: *Provided further*, That this limitation does not prohibit the Secretary of Labor from conducting such monitoring visit at the time and place of an inspection by an employee of a State acting pursuant to section 18 of such Act, or in order to investigate a complaint about State program administration including a failure to respond to a worker complaint regarding a violation of such Act, or in order to investigate a discrimination complaint under section 11(c) of such Act, or as part of a special study monitoring program, or to investigate a fatality or catastrophe: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph may be obligated or expended for the inspection, investigation, or enforcement of any activity occurring on the Outer Continental Shelf which exceeds the authority granted to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration by any provision of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, $156,480,000, including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of major disaster: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 or to carry out that portion of section 104(g)(1) of such Act relating to the enforcement of any training requirements, with respect to shell dredging, or with respect to any sand, gravel, surface stone, surface clay, colloidal phosphate, or surface limestone mine.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, $166,589,000, of which $11,435,000 shall be for expenses of revising the Consumer Price Index, together with not to exceed $37,872,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided*, That $7,206,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1988.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including $2,408,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, $103,852,000, together with not to exceed $263,000 which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed $139,510,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 2001-08 and 2021-26.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $34,833,000, together with not to exceed $6,040,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of the Department of Labor, as authorized by law, $67,000, to remain available until expended. This appropriation shall be available in addition to other appropriations to such agency for payments in foreign currencies.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Appropriations in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for supplies, services, and rental of conference space within the District of Columbia, as the Secretary of Labor shall deem necessary for settlement of labor-management disputes.

SEC. 102. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to grant variances, interim orders or letters of clarification to employers which will allow exposure of workers to chemicals or other workplace hazards in excess of existing Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards for the purpose of conducting experiments on workers' health or safety.

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be obligated or expended for the purpose of closing any Job Corps Center operating under part B of title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act prior to July 1, 1988.

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds appropriated by this Act may be used to execute or carry out any contract with a non-governmental entity to administer or manage a Civilian Conservation Center of the Job Corps which was not under such a contract as of September 1, 1984.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 1987".

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles III, IV, VII, VIII, XIII, and XXI of the Public Health Service Act, section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, and title V of the Social Security Act, $1,267,068,000, of which not to exceed $750,000 to remain available until expended, shall be available for renovating the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center, 42 U.S.C. 247e, as amended by Public Law 99-117: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payment of the costs of medical care, related expenses, and burial expenses hereafter incurred by or on behalf of any person who has participated in the study of untreated syphilis initiated in Tuskegee, Alabama, in 1932, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as prescribed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and for payment, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions, of such costs and expenses hereafter incurred by or on behalf of such person's wife or offspring determined by the Secretary to have suffered injury or disease from syphilis contracted from such person: *Provided further*, That when the Department of Health and Human Services administers or operates an employee health program for any Federal department or agency, payment for the full estimated cost shall be made by way of reimbursement or in advances to this appropriation.

MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND

FEDERAL INTEREST SUBSIDIES FOR MEDICAL FACILITIES

For carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of section 1602 of the Public Health Service Act, $20,000,000, together with any amounts received by the Secretary in connection with loans and loan guarantees under title VI of the Public Health Service Act, to be available without fiscal year limitation for the payment of interest subsidies. During the fiscal year no commitments for direct loans or loan guarantees shall be made.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles III, XVII, and XIX and section 1102 of the Public Health Service Act, sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, and 203 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, and sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, $518,254,000, of which $3,810,000 shall remain available until expended for equipment and construction and renovation of facilities: *Provided*, That training of employees of private agencies shall be made subject to reimbursement or advances to this appropriation for the full cost of such training: *Provided further*, That collections from user fees, including collections from training and reimbursements and advances for the full cost of proficiency testing of private clinical laboratories, may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balance of the $6,900,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1986, to remain available until September 30, 1987 for the purchase and distribution of drugs, shall remain available until expended.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cancer, $1,346,751,000.

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301, title IV, and section 1105 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, $921,410,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to dental diseases, $116,275,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney diseases, $515,455,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL AND COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurological and communicative disorders and stroke, $491,085,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, $403,853,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to general medical sciences, $576,562,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to child health and human development, $368,509,000.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and part F of title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, $219,091,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and 311, and title IV, of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health sciences, $209,872,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to aging, $174,279,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis, and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, $140,225,000.

RESEARCH RESOURCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to research resources and general research support grants, $317,826,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds, with the exception of funds for the Minority Biomedical Research Support program, shall be used to pay recipients of the general research support grants program any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For carrying out the activities at the John E. Fogarty International Center, $11,443,000, of which $1,934,000 shall be available for payment to the Gorgas Memorial Institute for maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information communications, $61,588,000.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

For carrying out the responsibilities of the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, $246,651,000, including purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction of, and acquisition of sites and equipment for, facilities of or used by the National Institutes of Health, $31,900,000, to remain available until expended.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, and alcoholism and the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986, $893,434,000, of which $600,000 for renovation of government owned or leased intramural research facilities shall remain available until expended.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY FOR SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

For a portion of the cost of the maintenance and operation of Saint Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, $36,353,000: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 1987 and thereafter the maximum amount available to Saint Elizabeths Hospital from Federal sources shall not exceed the total of the following amounts: the appropriations made under this heading, amounts billed to Federal agencies and entities by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for services provided at Saint Elizabeths Hospital, and amounts authorized by titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act: *Provided further*, That this amount shall not include Federal funds appropriated to the District of Columbia under "Federal Payment to the District of Columbia" and payments made pursuant to section 9(c) of Public Law 98-621: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services may set rates which in the aggregate do not exceed the estimated total cost of inpatient and outpatient services provided through Saint Elizabeths Hospital as authorized by title 16, sections 2315 and 2320, title 21, sections 511, 513, 522, 545, 902, and 1116, and title 24, sections 301 and 302 of the District of Columbia Code, and may bill and collect from (prospectively or otherwise) individuals, the District of Columbia and other entities for any services so provided: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services may set rates which in the aggre-

gate do not exceed the estimated total cost of inpatient and outpatient services provided through Saint Elizabeths Hospital as authorized by title 24, sections 191, 196, 211, 212, 222, 253, and 324, title 31, section 1535, and title 42, sections 249 and 251 of the United States Code, and may bill and collect (prospectively or otherwise) from individuals, and Federal agencies, and other entities for any services so provided. Amounts so collected shall be credited to the appropriation for Saint Elizabeths Hospital and shall remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE MANAGEMENT

For the expenses necessary for the Office of Assistant Secretary for Health and for carrying out titles III and XVII of the Public Health Service Act, $99,271,000, together with not to exceed $1,050,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds referred to therein and, in addition, amounts received by the National Center for Health Statistics from reimbursable and interagency agreements and the sale of data tapes shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended.

RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

For retirement pay and medical benefits of Public Health Service Commissioned Officers as authorized by law, and for payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and Survivor Benefit Plan and for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C., ch. 55), such amounts as may be required during the current fiscal year.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, title XIX of the Social Security Act, $19,380,359,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, 1987, payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act, for the last quarter of fiscal year 1987 for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

Payment under title XIX may be made for any quarter beginning after June 30, 1986, and before October 1, 1987, with respect to any State plan or plan amendment in effect during any such quarter, if submitted in, or prior to such quarter and approved in that or any such subsequent quarter.

For making payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 1988, $7,100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 217(g), 229(b) and 1844 of the Social Security Act, sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and section 278(d) of Public Law 97-248, $20,826,000,000.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act, $84,533,000, together with not to exceed $1,201,494,000 to be transferred to this appropriation as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds referred to therein: *Provided*, That in addition, $15,000,000 shall similarly be derived by transfer from said trust funds and shall be expended only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates and to meet unanticipated costs of agencies or organizations with which agreements have been made to participate in the administration of title XVIII and after maximum absorption of such costs within the remainder of the existing limitation has been achieved.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 201(m), 217(g), 228(g), 229(b), and 1131(b)(2) of the Social Security Act and section 152 of Public Law 98-21, $500,555,000.

SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

For carrying out title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, including the payment of travel expenses on an actual cost or commuted basis, to an individual, for travel incident to medical examinations, and when travel of more than 75 miles is required, to parties, their representatives, and all reasonably necessary witnesses for travel within the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, to reconsideration interviews and to proceedings before administrative law judges, $693,437,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That monthly benefits when changed shall be paid consistent with section 215(g) of the Social Security Act.

For making, after July 31, of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, for costs incurred in the current fiscal year, such amounts as may be necessary.

For making benefit payments under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 for the first quarter of fiscal year 1988, $252,450,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

For carrying out the Supplemental Security Income Program, section 401 of Public Law 92-603, section 212 of Public Law 93-66, as amended, and section 405 of Public Law 95-216, including payment to the social security trust funds for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, $8,230,068,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any portion of the funds provided to a State in the current fiscal year and not obligated by the State during that year shall be returned to the Treasury.

For making, after July 31 of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title XVI of the Social Security Act, for unanticipated costs incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For carrying out the Supplemental Security Income Program for the first quarter of fiscal year 1988, $2,765,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS PROGRAM

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles I, IV-A and -D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C., ch. 9), $7,023,420,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV-A and -D, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, for the last three months of the current fiscal year, for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States under titles I, IV-A and -D, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 1988, $2,293,615,000, to remain available until expended.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles IV-D and XI of the Social Security Act, $599,633,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under title IV-D of the Social Security Act, for the last three months of the current fiscal year, for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States under title IV-D of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 1988, $187,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not more than $4,011,373,000 may be expended, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein: *Provided*, That travel expense payments under section 1631(h) of such Act for travel to hearings may be made only when travel of more than seventy-five miles is required: *Provided further*, That $160,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be apportioned for use only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates, for automation projects and their impact on the work force, and to meet mandatory increases in costs of agencies or organizations with which agreements have been made to participate in the administration of titles XVI and XVIII and section 221 of the Social Security Act, and after maximum absorption of such costs within the remainder of the existing limitation has been achieved: *Provided further*, That $225,398,000 for automatic data processing and telecommunications activities shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the manufacture, printing, or procuring of social security cards, as provided in section 205(c)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act, where paper and other materials used in the manufacture of such cards are produced, manufactured, or assembled outside of the United States.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For carrying out the Social Services Block Grant Act, $2,700,000,000.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Older Americans Act of 1965, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, section 404 of Public Law 98-473, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (title III of Public Law 98-457), $925,017,000.

FAMILY SOCIAL SERVICES

For carrying out parts B and E of title IV and section 1110 of the Social Security Act, and title II of Public Law 95-266 (adoption opportunities), $1,005,223,000.

WORK INCENTIVES

For carrying out a work incentive program, as authorized by part C of title IV of the Social Security Act, including registration of individuals for such programs, and for related child care and other supportive services, as authorized by section 402(a)(19)(G) of the Act, including transfer to the Secretary of Labor, as authorized by section 431 of the Act, $200,000,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for transfer to the Secretary of Labor and to which the States may become entitled pursuant to section 403(d) of such Act, for these purposes.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for general departmental management, including hire of six medium sedans, $108,319,000 together with not to exceed $27,500,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General, $30,016,000 together with not to exceed $40,000,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, $15,285,000 together with not to exceed $4,000,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

POLICY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, research studies under section 1110 of the Social Security Act, $8,200,000: *Provided*, That not less than $2,200,000 shall be obligated to continue research on poverty conducted by the Institute for Research on Poverty.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. None of the funds appropriated by this title for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any State which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

SEC. 202. Funds appropriated in this Act for the National Institutes of Health shall be used to support no fewer than 6,200 new and competing research project grants.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this Act for the Health Resources and Services Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, the Health Care Financing Administration, and Departmental Management shall be available for expenses for active commissioned officers in the Public Health Service Reserve Corps and for not to exceed two thousand four hundred commissioned officers in the Regular Corps; expenses incident to the dissemination of health information in foreign countries through exhibits and other appropriate means; advances of funds for compensation, travel, and subsistence expenses (or per diem in lieu thereof) for persons coming from abroad to participate in health or scientific activities of the Department pursuant to law; expenses of primary and secondary schooling of dependents in foreign countries, of Public Health Service commissioned officers stationed in foreign countries, at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and for the transportation of such dependents, between such schools and their places of residence when the schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation; expenses for medical care for civilian and commissioned employees of the Public Health Service and their dependents, assigned abroad on a permanent basis in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may provide; rental or lease of living quarters (for periods not exceeding five years), and provision of heat, fuel, and light and maintenance, improvement, and repair of such quarters, and advance payments therefor, for civilian officers, and employees of the Public Health Service who are United States citizens and who have a permanent station in a foreign country; purchase, erection, and maintenance of temporary or portable structures; and for the payment of compensation to consultants or individual scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to section 207(f) or section 207(g) of the Public Health Service Act, at rates established by the Assistant Secretary for Health, or the Secretary where such action is required by statute, not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; not to exceed $9,500 for official reception and representation expenses related to any health agency of the Department when specifically approved by the Assistant Secretary for Health.

SEC. 204. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

SEC. 205. Funds advanced to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund from appropriations in this Act shall be available for the expenses of sharing medical care facilities and resources pursuant to section 327A of the Public Health Service Act.

SEC. 206. Funds appropriated in this title for the Social Security Administration and the Office of Child Support Enforcement shall be available for not to exceed $10,000 for official reception and representation expenses related to income maintenance or child support enforcement activities of the Department when specifically approved by the Commissioner of Social Security.

SEC. 207. Funds appropriated in this title for the Health Care Financing Administration shall be available for not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration.

SEC. 208. No funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, by this or any other Act, may be used to pay basic pay, special pays, basic allowance for subsistence and basic allowances for quarters of the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service described in section 204 of title 42, United States Code, at a level that exceeds 110 percent of the Executive Level 1 annual rate of basic pay: *Provided*, That amounts received from employees of the Department in payment for room and board may be credited to the appropriation accounts "Health Resources and Services", National Institutes of Health "Office of the Director", "Disease Control", and "Federal Subsidy for Saint Elizabeths Hospital".

SEC. 209. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used to transfer the general administration of programs authorized under the Native American Programs Act from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 210. Funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total amount for such contracts is obligated in the year for which the funds are appropriated.

SEC. 211. The Secretary shall make available through assignment not more than 50 employees of the Public Health Service, who shall be exempt from all FTE limitations in the Department, to assist in child survival activities through and with funds provided by the Agency for International Development, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund or the World Health Organization. In addition, commissioned officers assigned under this section shall be exempt from all limitations on the number and grade of officers in the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 1987".

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, as amended, $3,999,163,000, of which $6,246,000 shall be used for purposes of section 555(d) of said Act to provide technical assistance and evaluate programs, and the remaining $3,992,917,000 shall become available on July 1, 1987, and remain available until September 30, 1988: *Provided*, That of these remaining funds, no funds shall be used for purposes of section 554(a)(1)(B), $264,524,000 shall be available for purposes of section 554(a)(2)(A), $150,170,000 shall be available for purposes of section 554(a)(2)(B), $32,616,000 shall be available for purposes of section 554(a)(2)(C) and $38,607,000 shall be available for purposes of section 554(b)(1)(D).

IMPACT AID

For carrying out title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. ch. 13), $675,000,000, of which $22,000,000 shall be for entitlements under section 2 of said Act, $10,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, shall be for payments under section 7 of said Act and $643,000,000 shall be for entitlements under section 3 of said Act of which $513,000,000 shall be for entitlements under section 3(a) of said Act: *Provided*, That payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(b) of said Act to

any local educational agency in which 20 per centum or more of the total average daily attendance is made up of children determined eligible under section 3(b) shall be at 60 per centum of entitlement and payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(b) of said Act to any local educational agency in which less than 20 per centum of the total average daily attendance is made up of children determined eligible under section 3(b) shall be ratably reduced from 100 per centum of entitlement: *Provided further,* That payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(a) to any local educational agency whose children determined eligible under section 3(a) amount to at least 48 per centum of such agency's total average daily attendance shall be at 100 per centum of entitlement: *Provided further,* That payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(a) to any local educational agency whose children determined eligible under section 3(a) amount to at least 35 per centum but less than 48 per centum of such agency's total average daily attendance shall be at 95 per centum of entitlement: *Provided further,* That payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(a) to any local educational agency whose children determined eligible under section 3(a) amount to at least 20 per centum but less than 35 per centum of such agency's total average daily attendance shall be at 90 per centum of entitlement: *Provided further,* That payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(a) to any local educational agency whose children determined eligible under section 3(a) amount to at least 15 per centum but less than 20 per centum of such agency's total average daily attendance shall be at 75 per centum of entitlement: *Provided further,* That payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(a) to any local educational agency whose children determined eligible under section 3(a) amount to at least 10 per centum but less than 15 per centum of such agency's total average daily attendance shall be at 60 per centum of entitlement: *Provided further,* That payment with respect to entitlements under section 3(a) to any local educational agency whose children determined eligible under section 3(a) amount to less than 10 per centum of such agency's total average daily attendance shall be ratably reduced from 100 per centum of entitlement: *Provided further,* That payments on behalf of children who reside on property which is described in section 403(1)(C) of said Act shall be at 15 per centum of the respective payment level specified in each of the preceding six provisions: *Provided further,* That the provisions of section 5(c) of said Act shall not apply to funds provided herein: *Provided further,* That no payments shall be made under section 7 of said Act to any local educational agency whose need for assistance under that section fails to exceed the lesser of $10,000 or 5 per centum of the district's current operating expenditures during the fiscal year preceding the one in which the disaster occurred.

For carrying out the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. ch. 19), $25,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, shall be for providing school facilities as authorized by said Act, of which $10,000,000 shall be for awards under section 10 of said Act, $10,000,000 shall be for awards under sections 14(a) and 14(b) of said Act, and $5,000,000 shall be for awards under sections 5 and 14(c) of said Act.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS

For carrying out the consolidated programs and projects authorized under chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, as amended, $533,909,000, of which $33,909,000 shall be for programs and projects authorized under subchapter D of said Act, including $10,700,000 for programs and projects authorized under subsection 583(a)(1) of said Act; $4,000,000 for carrying out a rural education program by the nine regional educational laboratories; $3,052,000 shall be used for awards, which, except for educational television programming, are not to exceed a cumulative amount of $1,000,000 to any recipient for national impact demonstration or research projects; $7,000,000 for activities authorized under subsection 583(b)(1) of said Act; $3,157,000 for programs authorized under subsection 583(b)(2) of said Act; $3,000,000 for programs authorized under subsection 583(b)(3) of said Act; and $3,000,000 for activities authorized under subsection 583(b)(4) of said Act: *Provided,* That $500,000,000 to carry out the State block grant program authorized under chapter 2 of said Act shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1987, and shall remain available until September 30, 1988.

For grants to State educational agencies and desegregation assistance centers authorized under section 403 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, $24,000,000.

For carrying out activities authorized under title IX, part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, $6,000,000.

For carrying out activities authorized under section 1524 of the Education Amendments of 1978, $4,785,000.

For carrying out activities authorized under section 1525 of the Education Amendments of 1978, $1,914,000.

For carrying out activities authorized under Public Law 92-506, as amended, $1,700,000: *Provided,* That said sum shall become available on July 1, 1987, and shall remain available until September 30, 1988.

For carrying out the provisions of title VII of the Education for Economic Security Act, relating to magnet schools assistance, $75,000,000: *Provided,* That not more than $4,000,000 in the fiscal year may be paid to any single eligible local educational agency.

For carrying out the provisions of title VI of the Education for Economic Security Act, $2,392,000 to remain available until expended.

For carrying out the provisions of title II of the Education for Economic Security Act, $43,066,000 to become available on July 1, 1987, and to remain available until September 30, 1988.

For carrying out the provisions of title IX of Public Law 98-558, $7,177,000, to become available July 1, 1987, and to remain available until September 30, 1988.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title VI of the Education Amendments of 1984, and title IV, part E of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, $179,637,000, of which $99,161,000 shall be for part A, $10,300,000 shall be for part B, and $36,490,000 shall be for part C of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and $30,000,000 shall be for the Emergency Immigrant Education Program authorized by title VI of the Education Amendments of 1984.

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

For carrying out the Education of the Handicapped Act, $1,494,420,000, of which $1,300,000,000 for section 611 and $31,000,000 for section 619 shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1987, and shall remain available until September 30, 1988.

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND HANDICAPPED RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Helen Keller National Center Act, $1,152,656,000, of which $1,147,356,000 shall be for allotments under section 100(b)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act, $1,000,000 shall be for activities under section 110(b)(3) of the Rehabilitation Act, and $4,300,000 shall be for continued operation of the Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, and the Adult Education Act, $1,016,433,000 which shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1987, and shall remain available until September 30, 1988: *Provided,* That $12,000,000 shall be available for title IV of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act including $6,000,000 for section 404 of said title: *Provided further,* That $7,300,000 shall be available for State councils under section 112 of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act: *Provided further,* That $7,500,000 shall be made available to carry out title III-A and $31,633,000 shall be made available for title III-B of said Vocational Education Act.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

For necessary expenses under title IV, part B of the Higher Education Act, $3,394,000,000 to remain available until expended.

HIGHER EDUCATION

For carrying out section 406 C of the General Education Provisions Act, and parts E and F of title V and part E of title IX of the Higher Education Act, $29,500,000.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

The aggregate amount of commitments for loans made from the fund established pursuant to title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1749), for the fiscal year 1987 shall not exceed the total of loan repayments and other income available during such period, less operating costs. Payments of interest insufficiencies for the fiscal year 1987 as may be required by the Government National Mortgage Association, as trustee, on account of outstanding beneficial interests or participations issued pursuant to the Participation Sales Act of 1966 (section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1717(c))) shall be made from the fund established pursuant to title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1749-1749c) using loan repayments and other income available during such fiscal year. During the fiscal year 1987 and within the resources and authority available, gross commitments for the principal amount of direct loans shall be $60,000,000.

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 406 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, $8,747,000.

71-059 O-87-14 (Pt. 13)

LIBRARIES

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, titles I, II, III, and VI of the Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C., ch. 16), $130,000,000: *Provided*, That $25,000,000 of the sums appropriated shall be used to carry out the provisions of title II of the Library Services and Construction Act and shall remain available until expended.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U.S.C. 101-106), including provision of materials to adults undergoing rehabilitation on the same basis as provided in 1985, $5,510,000.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

For carrying out the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act (20 U.S.C. 681 et seq.), $32,000,000.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

For carrying out the Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act (80 Stat. 1027) and for the partial support of Gallaudet College authorized by the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 265), including continuing education activities, existing extension centers and the National Center for Law and the Deaf, $60,737,000.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For partial support of Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $170,230,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for an endowment matching grant in accordance with the Howard University Endowment Act (Public Law 98-480) and shall remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Department of Education Organization Act, including rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and hire of three passenger motor vehicles, $241,692,000: *Provided*, That $500,000 shall be available for carrying out the National Summit Conference on Education Act of 1984.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, as authorized by section 203 of the Department of Education Organization Act, $38,185,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General, as authorized by section 212 of the Department of Education Organization Act, $16,378,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. None of the funds appropriated by this title for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any State which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

SEC. 302. Funds appropriated in this Act to the American Printing House for the Blind, Howard University, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and Gallaudet College shall be subject to audit by the Secretary of Education.

SEC. 303. No part of the funds contained in this title may be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to force on account of race, creed or color the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force the transfer or assignment of any student attending any elementary or secondary school so desegregated to or from a particular school over the protest of his or her parents or parent.

SEC. 304. (a) No part of the funds contained in this title shall be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to require the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force on account of race, creed or color the transfer of students to or from a particular school so desegregated as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal funds otherwise available to any State, school district or school.

(b) No funds appropriated in this Act may be used for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system, or for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to carry out a plan of racial desegregation of any school or school system.

SEC. 305. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to require, directly or indirectly, the transportation of any student to a school other than the school which is nearest the student's home, except for a student requiring special education, to the school offering such special education, in order to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For the purpose of this section an indirect requirement of transportation of students includes the transportation of students to carry out a plan involving the reorganization of the grade structure of schools, the pairing of schools, or the clustering of schools, or any combination of grade restructuring, pairing or clustering. The prohibition described in this section does not include the establishment of magnet schools.

SEC. 306. No funds appropriated under this Act may be used to prevent the implementation of programs of voluntary prayer and meditation in the public schools.

SEC. 307. Section 402(c) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out in clause (9) "October 1, 1986" and inserting in its place "October 1, 1987".

SEC. 308. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Department of Education for the purpose of attempting to collect a refund from the State of Illinois of funds provided to such State under the Library Services and Construction Act pursuant to final audit determinations for the period July 1, 1977 through December 31, 1980 (audit control numbers 05-30009 and 05-30006).

This title may be cited as the "Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1987".

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

PUBLIC BROADCASTING FUND

For payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as authorized by the Communications Act of 1934, an amount which shall be available within limitations specified by that Act, for the fiscal year 1989, $214,000,000: *Provided*, That no funds made available to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by this Act shall be used to pay for receptions, parties, or similar forms of entertainment for government officials or employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available or used to aid or support any program or activity from which any person is excluded, or is denied benefits, or is discriminated against, on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel and boards of inquiry appointed by the President, hire of passenger motor vehicles, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and for expenses necessary pursuant to Public Law 93-360 for mandatory mediation in health care industry negotiation disputes and for convening factfinding boards of inquiry appointed by the Director in the health care industry; and for expenses necessary for the Labor-Management Cooperation Act of 1978 (29 U.S.C. 125a); and for expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Civil Service Reform Act, Public Law 95-454 (5 U.S.C. chapter 71), $22,656,000.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission (30 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), $3,651,000.

NATIONAL AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE COMMISSION

NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

Funds appropriated for the "National Center for the Study of Afro-American History and Culture" in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, and related agencies Appropriations Act, 1986 shall remain available until expended.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, established by the Act of July 20, 1970 (Public Law 91-345), $660,000.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Council on the Handicapped as authorized by section 405 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, $732,000.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 141-167), and other laws, $129,055,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize

or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2(3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U.S.C. 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and as defined in section 3(f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U.S.C. 151-188), including emergency boards appointed by the President, $6,401,000.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the expenses necessary for the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, $5,647,000.

PHYSICIAN PAYMENT REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out section 1845(a) of the Social Security Act, $1,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1988, to be transferred to this appropriation from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT ASSESSMENT COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out section 601 of Public Law 98-21, $3,421,000 to be transferred to this appropriation from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

DUAL BENEFITS PAYMENTS ACCOUNT

For payment to the Dual Benefits Payments Account, authorized under section 15(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974, $380,000,000, all of which shall be credited to the account in 12 approximately equal amounts on the first day of each month in the fiscal year.

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS

For payment to the accounts established in the Treasury for the payment of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act for unnegotiated checks, $3,100,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for payments pursuant to section 417 of Public Law 98-76: *Provided*, That these funds shall remain available through September 30, 1988.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, $56,634,000 to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts: *Provided*, That such portion of the foregoing amount as may be necessary shall be available for the payment of personnel compensation and benefits for not less than 1,217 full-time equivalent employees: *Provided further*, That $500,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates and after maximum absorption of the costs of such workloads within the remainder of the existing limitation has been achieved: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no portion of this limitation shall be available for payments of standard level user charges pursuant to section 210(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(j); 45 U.S.C. 228a-r).

LIMITATION ON RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION FUND

For further expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, for administration of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, not less than $14,694,000 shall be apportioned for fiscal year 1987 from moneys credited to the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund, and of this amount $2,106,000 shall be derived from contributions credited to the railroad unemployment insurance account and shall be credited to the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund as authorized by section 11(a)(iv) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act: *Provided*, That such portion of the foregoing amount as may be necessary shall be available for the payment of personnel compensation and benefits for not less than 336 full-time equivalent employees.

LIMITATION ON REVIEW ACTIVITY

For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board for audit, investigatory, and review activities, as authorized by section 418 of Public Law 98-76 not more than $1,167,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts and rail unemployment insurance administration fund.

SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home permanent fund, $34,022,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Board of Commissioners and the Surgeon General of the Army.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For construction and renovation of the physical plant, to be paid from the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home permanent fund, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), pursuant to any obligation for services by contract, unless such executive agency has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and regulations promulgated thereunder.

SEC. 503. Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18.

SEC. 504. Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 505. Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

SEC. 506. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of or any remuneration whatever to any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at, or doing research at an institution of higher education who has engaged in conduct on or after August 1, 1969, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curricula, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials, or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution.

SEC. 507. The Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education are authorized to transfer unexpended balances of prior appropriations to accounts corresponding to current appropriations provided in this Act: *Provided*, That such transferred balances are used for the same purpose, and for the same periods of time, for which they were originally appropriated.

SEC. 508. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, for the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any grant or contract recipient, or agent acting for such recipient, related to any activity designed to influence legislation or appropriations pending before the Congress.

SEC. 510. The Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education are each authorized to make available not to exceed $7,500 from funds available for salaries and expenses under titles I, II, and III, respectively, for official reception and representation expenses; the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $2,500 from the funds available for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service"; and the Chairman of the National Mediation Board is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $2,500 from funds available for "Salaries and expenses, National Mediation Board".

SEC. 511. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay for any research program or project or any program, project, or course which is of an experimental nature, or any other activity involving human participants, which is determined by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction to present a danger to the physical, mental, or emotional well-being of a participant or subject of such program, project, or course, without the written, informed consent of each participant or subject, or a participant's parents or legal guardian, if such participant or subject is under eighteen years of age. The Secretary shall adopt appropriate regulations respecting this section.

SEC. 512. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between his domicile and his place of employment, with the exception of the Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and medical officers and other health personnel on out-patient medical service who are exempted from such limitations under 31 U.S.C. 1344.

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies Appropriations Act, 1987".

Mr. NATCHER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objections to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order against the bill? The Chair hears none.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] rise?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee would be agreeable to setting a time limitation on all debate on amendments to the bill and amendments thereto, the debate to end at 2:10?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent, pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, with which we agree, that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto conclude not later than 10 minutes after 2 o'clock.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as far as I know, there are only two debatable amendments at the desk. I would ask the distinguished subcommittee chairman to rephrase his unanimous-consent request to allow at least 20 minutes debate time for my amendment and 40 minutes for the gentleman from Illinois. That would leave an hour of voting time and general discussion under the 5-minute rule. I am asking the gentleman if he may be willing to rephrase his request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might point out to the gentleman that there are other amendments at the desk.

Mr. FRENZEL. I understand that, Mr. Chairman. I believe on those amendments, however, arrangements have been made to accept those amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Chair might also state that there could be arrangements made even within the limitation that the gentleman from Kentucky is seeking.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as I understand it, we have one or two amendments we know about that will require very little time. The only time that we know of that will be consumed as far as this bill is concerned is on the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] will then offer a substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time limitation request we are making is more than ample, and I want both gentlemen to know they will be protected. We want them to offer their amendments.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, my problem with the suggestion as it is offered now is that we have a number of members of the committee ready to proceed. Those of us who are not on the committee understand that we are last recognized in the due course of business.

If there are a couple of votes, 2 hours will be easily chewed up and we have no security—at least I do not—under the suggestion of the gentleman. If he will not agree to protect me, at least to the extent of 20 minutes, which is a tiny request for a bill that has $100 billion in it and which used to take 3 days to do and now we presume to do it in 3 hours, I will object.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman would go along with us because that takes an hour of the whole 2 hours, and I am sure they are not going to take time. He wants 20 minutes for his amendment, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] wants 40 minutes for his amendment. I am sure that neither of them is going to take it, and we will be out of here at 2:10.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understand the request of the gentleman from Minnesota, it is that of the 2 hours time limit that we are requesting, there would be 1 hour set-aside for the amendment and the substitute for the amendment. Is that correct?

If that is the situation, Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that.

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

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Accordingly, all debate will cease at 10 minutes past 2 o'clock.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. COUGHLIN

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. COUGHLIN:

On page 31, line 7, strike "$4,011,373,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,373,000".

On page 42, line 17, strike "$533,909,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$544,909,000".

On page 42, line 18, strike "$33,909,000" and insert in lieu thereof $44,909,000".

On page 43, line 4, strike "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,000,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, these amendments, which are offered on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and myself, would transfer $11 million to the Secretary of Education's discretionary fund for the purpose of drug abuse education. We would intend that these funds be used to produce, publicize, and distribute to every elementary and secondary school in these United States audio-visual materials on the drug abuse.

In particular, Mr. Chairman, we expect them to be used to educate on the danger of cocaine and its derivative, "crack." We know that cocaine kills.

Yet we are faced today with a peculiar confluence of events where in many quarters cocaine is considered to be a harmless executive high despite extensive evidence that it is extremely addictive and can kill. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, cocaine and crack are becoming more plentiful and cheaper so they are available to people of all ages and of all income levels.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want the distinguished gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to know that we appreciate the fact that he and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] discussed this matter in detail with both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and me, as well as other members of the subcommittee. We knew that the amendment was to be offered and we believe we can accept this amendment as now presented.

Further, Mr. Chairman, earlier this month the subcommittee was informed by Social Security that they expect to lapse $168,365,000 in fiscal year 1986.

□ 1215

This results from a number of factors, including lower outlays in their computer modernization project and lower use of overtime by Social Security field personnel. This means that the 1986 base used by the executive branch and reviewed by the subcommittee in making its initial recommendation was overstated. We feel, therefore, that a reduction can be made.

This does not change any of the substantive recommendations of the subcommittee relating to staffing levels or numbers of Social Security offices. It merely reflects a reestimate of the amount of funding necessary to implement these recommendations.

I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and to the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], that we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment deals with one of the most serious problems in this country today, the epidemic of drug use which has affected so many of our young people. As Members know, both the executive and legislative branches are currently reviewing this issue with the intention of developing a comprehensive program to deal with every aspect of the drug problem including drug interdiction, drug abuse treatment and drug abuse prevention. The recent deaths of two of this country's most promising young athletes has heightened our awareness of the problem and our commitment to deal with this tragic situation.

As we understand the amendment it would provide additional funds to develop a drug abuse prevention film for use in the public schools. I would point out to the gentleman there is already $6,000,000 in the bill which could be used for this and similar purposes. There is already $3,000,000 under the Department of Education's chapter 2 program. This money is earmarked in the bill for drug abuse and alcohol education as part of the Secretary's discretionary fund. There is also $3,000,000 for a new prevention intiative at the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. This money will be used by the National Institute of Drug Abuse and I quote "for the development and dissemination of drug abuse prevention manuals and programs for elementary and senior high schools."

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

I would just like to continue to establish some legislative history here for a moment, if I might.

We have available role models in the sports and entertainment field, former drug abusers, who are anxious to cooperate in an effort to produce this kind of audio-visual effort to combat drug abuse.

I had in my district just last fall, Carl Eller, the former Minnesota Vikings football star. People like that who are role models are willing to help produce this kind of audio-visual effort in drug abuse education that I think is so important.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to serving on the Appropriations Committee, I serve on the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control as the second ranking Republican. I applaud the efforts that have been made here in the area of drug abuse. Just yesterday we saw the Coast Guard drug interdiction effort increased to a minimum of $372 million, which is $60 million more than last year.

I applaud the efforts of the administration to get at the cocaine laboratories that are really the choke points of the cocaine trade. Crop substitution efforts are difficult and expensive; coca is grown by poor campesinos in remote areas, and it is difficult to outbid narcotics traffickers. Interdiction of cocaine shipments to the United States is also failing because of the drug's small bulk and high concentration.

Although reducing the supply through eliminating laboratories is key to the supply side of the cocaine problem, the demand side is also important. Compared to what we are spending on eradication, interdiction and law enforcement, we spend a pitfully small portion of our resources indeed on reducing demand, and that is what we are trying to rectify with this amendment.

I have called for a four-point program that would increase the grassroots effort with local organizations, increase the State and local effort, increase the effort through the Advertising Council, and finally to include the U.S. Department of Education in producing a real drug abuse program that can go to every school in the country.

I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

I just want to thank the gentleman for his efforts on behalf of this amendment. The gentleman is doing something that I think is very valuable, transferring money out of a lower priority account into drug abuse education. I congratulate the gentleman for those efforts. I appreciate the fact the gentleman has carried this amendment to the floor and I think we are going to have great success with it.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by both gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN and Mr. WALKER. They have both consulted me and the good chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] in what they propose to do. It is acceptable to us.

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

(At the request of Mr. CONTE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. COUGHLIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. COUGHLING. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would further strengthen our efforts in this bill to provide drug education programs for children in elementary and secondary education.

Mr. Chairman, the funds for this increased effort would not add to the totals of the bill. We reduce the amount provided for administrative costs of the Social Security Administration, increase the amount of the bill for drug education.

Mr. Chairman, the administrative account in Social Security will lapse about $168 million this year. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and I will be watching that account very, very closely, to make sure there is always plenty of money in it.

So we support the amendment.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking minority member and urge support of my colleagues for this amendment to help produce a real drug abuse education program in the Department of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAW

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAW: In title V, on page 63, after line 7, add the following new section:

SEC. 513. No funds under title III of this Act shall be used by any educational institution which does not have a program for the prevention of drug abuse.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment, along with my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

This amendment prohibits Federal funds from going to schools without drug abuse programs. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, in this House, we are in the process of a bipartisan assault on the drug problem in this country. What better place to start than in our schools, where so many young people are exposed to dangerous, highly addictive narcotic drugs, every day.

In my home State of Florida, we are discovering many children are regular users of drugs. Our law enforcement officials tell us that 20 percent of the users of crack, the purified and inexpensive and immediately addictive form of cocaine, are younger than 18 years old. This is a shocking statistic. We must prevent what will certainly become a whole new generation of drug abusers. The best chance we have is dramatic and effective drug education programs.

The Members of this House have approved millions of dollars to prevent drugs from making their way into this country. What we must do also is to stop the demand for illegal narcotics.

Antidrug programs in the schools are our best line of defense against the drug peddlers in the playground, against the glamourized view of drugs on television and against the role models of entertainers and athletes who openly abuse drugs.

In our Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, of which I am a member, just a few weeks ago, we had a young lady testify before us. She told us, after having been an addict, reformed addict from the use of cocaine, she said that if only someone in her condition had appeared before her in the form of drug education 10 years before, she would not have become a cocaine user.

We need to scare our children into seeing the truth about drugs. Our schools must have effective antidrug programs and we should not provide Federal money to schools that do not.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman as one of the real leaders in this House and in the select committee in working on narcotics abuse programs.

You know, what this is going to do is require every school board and every administrator to at least sit down and say, "Well, now we have this requirement. We have to do this if we are going to get Federal dollars.

"What is our drug program? Do we have a drug program? What are we doing? How can we comply with the requirements of this amendment and at the same time do something for the children of America?"

I think it will be a great attention-getter and I think we will have some good creative programs developed because of this legislation.

I want to thank the gentleman and thank the chairman also for being so gracious and the ranking member for allowing this legislation to come forward.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for his participation in this particular bill.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] to know and also the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] that we appreciate the fact that these gentlemen have discussed this matter with us in detail before presenting it.

Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his assistance.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I concur with my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. We agree on the amendment and we do appreciate the consultation beforehand, not only with the gentleman in the well, but the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] who is also, I believe, interested in this program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment passes.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman for his amendment.

As the gentleman well knows, this kind of effort grows out of some suggestions by the Department of Education in the personage of Secretary Bennett, who suggested that this might be a way to really begin to get education to focus on the need to do something about drugs in their own schools.

The gentleman has picked up on that idea and brought it to the floor and gotten real action on what Secretary Bennett suggested just a matter of a few weeks ago.

I think it is great that the House has a chance to act on this and I thank the gentleman for bringing the amendment to us.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his skillful job also and his participation in bringing this bill to us.

I would also like to remind the House that this bill certainly does have jaws to it. It is not a symbolic gesture.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in commending the gentleman on his amendment. I think, as the gentleman has said, the demand side is terribly important to address and this is certainly one way of assuring that we do that.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the amendment that he just had passed before. This will assure that the gentleman's amendment will be implemented all across the country by schools to all of our young people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a series of amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MICHEL:

Page 20, line 17, strike out "$1,346,751,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,211,857,830".

Page 20, line 22, strike out "$921,410,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$835,232,150".

Page 21, line 4, strike out "$116,275,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$101,054,330".

Page 21, line 9, strike out "$515,455,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$446,524,570".

Page 21, line 14, strike out "$491,085,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$425,414,720".

Page 21, line 19, strike out "$403,853,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$351,065,200".

Page 21, line 23, strike out "$576,562,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$507,164,790".

Page 22, line 5, strike out "$368,509,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$316,975,290".

Page 22, line 9, strike out "$219,091,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$192,103,240".

Page 22, line 14, strike out "$209,872,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$194,553,610".

Page 22, line 17, strike out "$174,279,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$154,111,690".

Page 22, line 22, strike out "$140,225,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$114,044,690".

Page 23, line 1, strike out "$317,826,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$299,474,560".

Page 23, line 9, strike out "$11,443,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,219,790".

Page 23, line 16, strike out "$61,588,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$56,931,190".

Page 23, line 19, strike out "$246,651,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$185,032,290".

Page 23, line 25, strike out "$31,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,184,710".

Mr. MICHEL (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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendments which I am offering here provide a 3-percent inflationary increase for each of the Institutes out at the National Institutes of Health; in other words, a 3-percent increase over the current year's spending level. In total, it will provide a $157 million increase over this current fiscal year, but it would produce savings of $735 million below the figure reported by the committee. That is no small amount. It is very significant.

If the committee does not fully agree with the priorities of the amendment which I have offered here, in other words an equal increase for each Institute, why then I would certainly defer to the wisdom of the subcommittee in conference to make a determination between Institutes as they see fit.

I would apologize at the very outset, as a new junior member of the committee, for proposing significant changes in the committee product after having just rejoined the committee. I have no doubt forgotten many of the intricacies of this committee and the specific figures; nevertheless, I think I am reasonably well informed from those prior years in which I served on the committee.

The bill provides for an overall increase of 17 percent for the National Institutes of Health. Some of the individual Institutes have been increased as much as 20 and 30 percent. I have to ask the question, Is this the way we plan to meet our spending targets under Gramm-Rudman or under the budget resolution or anything else that would indicate that we ought to have some restraint in Federal spending around here?

The committee seems intent on negating the benefits of sequestering that we gained this past March by restoring all the funds cut and adding several-fold increases on top of that.

In the bill, the committee is planning to fund a total of 6,200 new and competing renewal grants. I can remember the time when I served on the subcommittee not very long ago when all the interest groups were pushing us to fund 5,000 new grants a year. They would say, "If only we get this figure up to 5,000, that is all we are going to ask for so that we can keep the program on an even keel."

Well, I think at the time when we were making that point, we were funding roughly 3,800 new grants per year. Now the bill is up to 6,200 and climbing. These are simply the new grants. There are another 13,000 continuing grants out there being funded. That is almost 20,000 grants a year.

When do we draw the line?

It should be noted that the cost of individual research grants has risen 48.9 percent over the past 5 years, far above the rate of inflation. The average has risen from $98,000 to $147,000. The Department of Health and Human Services says the primary cause of this increase is higher salaries and higher indirect costs.

□ 1230

In other words, what is happening is that the researchers and universities are cranking into their grants some pay increases for themselves, and everybody here seems to be looking the other way.

I am not aware of any significant increases like that taking place around this body—in our staff or among Members—or in the Federal service, or in the private sector generally. More and more people are charging their time against these grants in the universities. Ninety percent of the doctorate-level staff charged salary against the grants in 1985, versus only 57 percent back in 1981.

Indirect costs have been a bug with me all during the time I served on the subcommittee. These are charges that the university bills to the grants, even though they have little to do with the grants—such as deans' salaries, libraries, and fuel costs. They have grown 63 percent since 1980, versus a 42-percent increase for direct costs. In other words, some $2 billion of the $6 billion that we are now appropriating for NIH in this bill is going for purposes only indirectly related at best to the health research that we think we are funding.

By way of reference, again I cannot help but make mention of this. I said $6 billion for NIH. When I first came on that subcommittee many years ago, and John Fogarty was the chairman and Mel Laird was the ranking minority member, it was $200 million for all of NIH. It has grown from $200 million to now $6 billion.

We certainly do not tighten up the administration of a program by granting it massive funding increases. My amendment provides for a 3-percent inflationary increase for each Institute, which I think both meets their needs and at the same time recognizes the need to do something about the deficit.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment, my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] served for many years on the Committee on Appropriations. He is the minority leader in the House and one of the able Members of the House. He was one of the best members that we had on our subcommittee, which makes recommendations for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education.

I cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, that my friend, Mr. BOB MICHEL, would want to cut biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health by $735,329,000. I cannot believe that he would want to cut it that amount. If this amendment is adopted, the reduction in cancer research would be $134,893,000.

If this amendment were adopted, there would be a reduction in the Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of $86,178,000.

After 14 weeks of hearings, careful hearings, we marked this bill up. This bill, Mr. Chairman, could be called "the people's bill." In this bill we have most of our money for health and most of our money for education.

We come in here year after year, Mr. Chairman, and we have a request for the Defense Department of $295 billion, $300 billion, or $320 billion. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anyone in Kentucky who wants to impair the security of our country, but I can tell you of a lot of them in my home State and throughout the United States who are not in favor of an amendment to reduce funding for biomedical research by $735 million.

Dental Institute—$15,221,000. For diabetes and kidney diseases, $68,930,000 would be the reduction if this amendment were accepted. For neurological and communicative disorders and stroke, the reduction if the amendment were adopted would be $65,670,000; from $491,085,000 we would have a $65,670,000 reduction.

For allergy and infectious diseases, after carefully considering all of the evidence from all of the witnesses, we placed in the bill $403,853,000, and if the amendment of my friend, Mr. BOB MICHEL, is adopted, that amount would be reduced $52,788,000. For general medical sciences we have in the bill $576,562,000; we would have a reduction here of $69,397,000.

For child health, Mr. Chairman, we have in the bill $368,509,000. This amendment would reduce this amount

by $51,534,000 for the children in this country. As far as the Eye Institute is concerned, if the amendment is adopted, there would be a reduction of $26,988,000, down from $219,019,000.

The Institute on Aging, Mr. Chairman, has $174,279,000 in the committee bill. The amendment offered by my friend, Mr. BOB MICHEL of Illinois, would reduce it $20,168,000. For arthritis, a problem that hundreds of thousands of people in this country have right now, we bring that amount under this amendment down from $140,225,000, bring it down $26,180,000. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that a member of this committee would want to reduce that item $26 million.

AIDS, acquired immune deficiency syndrome, is one of the most serious diseases confronting the people in this country today. After we carefully considered the matter, we placed in this part of this bill $198 million for AIDS. This amendment if adopted would reduce that $198 million by $60,231,000.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that it really pains me to oppose my leader, Mr. BOB MICHEL. He has been my dear and beloved friend for 28 years. I do not think that a finer man has ever served this House of Representatives than the gentleman from Peoria.

Mr. Chairman, I have to differ with him on this one. We have worked hard and long on this bill, as he knows and as he mentioned, and we think that we came out with a fair and very responsible bill.

Let me give you some facts that no one seems to pay much attention to. I was looking at some figures the other day and I made a chart for speaking purposes back home.

The budget for agriculture in 1980 was $17,570 million. Do you know what the budget for agriculture was in 1987? It was $41,776 million. Do you know what kind of an increase that is? Hear this. It is a 138.4-percent increase.

Let us take another one—defense.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have this quite a bit. For the record, more than 50 percent of the funds for agriculture are for consumer programs.

The cost of the farm programs have increased greatly because the Government is having the farmer sell at below his cost of production, and depend upon a check from the Treasury to help make up the difference. The buyer gets the profit.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, all I know is that there is not going to be enough money, and there are not going to be enough machines in the Bureau of Engraving, to take care of that latest farm bill that we just passed.

We just passed an agriculture appropriation bill here last week. I got up on the floor of the House and said that it was a phony. It was a phony; they only had $16.808 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation in there. But you are going to have more supplementals on the Commodity Credit Corporation to take care of that farm bill. These figures which I am presenting here are anemic.

Let me give some more. Defense in 1980 was $137,208 million. Oh ho ho ho ho. Hear this. Hear this. Defense in 1987, $274 billion—and it went up over that, with the supplementals and all, to $440 million—an increase of 100 percent.

Now listen to poor Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. Now you want to whack them again. For 1980, discretionary funds, $33,506 million.

□ 1240

In 1987, allocations are $35,551 million. That is an increase of 6.1 percent.

Defense: 100-percent increase in that period of time, 1980 to 1987.

Agriculture: 138.4 percent.

Labor, HHS and Education, 6.1 percent.

This is the most important agency of the Federal Government. Taking care of the sick, research and development for all these dreadful diseases that are out there. This amendment would cut $135 million from the National Cancer Institute. Here is where we have already seen positive results, not only in cancer research and identification. Recent findings have resulted in rapid identification of AIDS virus and the development of rapid screening techniques for that disease.

An $86 million cut in heart, lung, and blood, including research in coronary heart disease, the leading cause of death in America today. Recent findings link blood cholesterol with coronary heart disease.

We are on the brink. We are on the threshold of something big here to reduce heart disease.

Here are some other examples of the effects of this amendment.

$15.2 million cut from dental research.

$69 million cut from diabetes, digestive and kidney diseases—there go the O'BRIEN centers, along with the positive fundings on new drugs for treatment of ulcers.

$66 million cut from neurological and communicative disorders and stroke—this is the new Alzheimer's research money. In addition, we're on the brink here on funding a successful treatment for multiple sclerosis.

$53 million cut from allergy and infectious diseases. Here again, we're close to understanding the virus causing AIDS.

$69.4 million from general medical sciences.

$51.6 million cut from child health and human development. Here is research into some of the Nation's most costly health problems, including: infant mortality, birth defects, mental retardation.

$2.7 million from the Eye Institute.

$15.3 million cut from environmental health sciences, cuts in research to protect the Nation from the risks of toxic chemicals, including the effects of acid rain.

$20 million from the Aging Institute, where scientists are examining, through new techniques the fundamental brain processes of healthy persons, Alzheimer's victims and those afflicted with Down's syndrome. This basic, necessary research into the aging process.

$26 million cut from arthritis musculoskeletal and skin disease. This is for fundamental research into arthritis, osteoporosis, and lupus, diseases that cripple millions of Americans.

$18.4 million cut from research resources.

$224,000 from John Fogarty International Center. Once again, AIDS research will be affected in our coordination efforts throughout the world.

$4.6 million cut from National Library of Medicine.

$61.6 million from the Office of the Director, where most of the AIDS money is located.

And $17.3 million from the buildings and facilities account.

The farm bill. What do you do? You just shove it down somebody's throat. Those cows out there and everybody else. You have corn, wheat, commodities coming out of your ears. We are going to get defense now. We are trying to get defense to take some of those commodities.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member defending their handiwork. In that handiwork, they have raised appropriations by 13.5-percent at a time when we estimate inflation to be less than 3 percent.

Perhaps this is some kind of emergency program. I do not think that it is.

These programs are worthy operations. Our friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], who brings us the amendment is not asking for

sacrifice. Let us keep the programs going at the same level. These are great institutions. Mr. MICHEL asks not for sacrifice, but for sanity.

Why would we incraese spending in these programs by 4 times the cost of inflation?

In fact, some of the items that the distinguished chairman mentioned, particularly arthritis, up 20 percent, child health and human development up 20 percent have been increased by well over the 13.5 percent average.

When you get done averaging them, there is a 13.5 percent increase.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] says we have been exercising very close control. The whole mandatory portion is up only 6 percent. The whole discretionary portion is up 9 percent this year alone.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot let this bill masquerade under the guise of fiscal sanity.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman has got to go back further than last year. I am going back to 1980. If you look at appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education in 1980, we appropriated $33.506 billion. In 1986, we appropriated $32.276 billion. That is a minus 3.7 percent.

I am taking it over that span of time. It is a 3.7-percent loss, whereas defense is nearly 100 percent and agriculture is a 178-percent increase.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

I went back a whole year to 1986, and I computed a 9.14-percent increase in discretionary.

I will tell the distinguished gentleman, I voted against the agricultural appropriation simply because it was a masked appropriation. There is plenty more spending coming behind it in supplementals, and the House could not determine that fact from the bill.

I will tell the gentleman that I usually vote against the military appropriation because that is too expensive, too. I agree with the gentleman, until when he comes in here to say, we can raise spending more than 9.1 percent. I do not think the public is looking for that kind of action.

I think the public supports these Institutes of Health. I support them, but I do not think they have earned double-digit increases at a time when we are trying to reduce our deficit.

I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for trying to restore some fiscal sanity. The gentleman is not asking for sacrifice; he is asking for good sense.

I think his plea ought to be heeded. I intend to support his amendment and I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here we are going to one of the most prestigious Institutes in the Federal Government, one of the most prestigious Institutes in the world, was the most a few years back.

The proponents of this amendment come in and they talk percentages. They talk a percentage of this and a percentage of that, just what the budget is. What the committee listens to, year after year, is testimony where it is suggested that West Germany, Japan, and others are passing the United States in their commitment to basic biomedical research.

We should learn from what has happened in the automobile industry, what has happened in computer research, computer chips, that you have to spend money to save money.

We go to our districts. We look, we identify problems everywhere. Everyone talks about AIDS. We have to have a discovery program. We do not know what it is. We have to develop a vaccine. You have to educate the people.

When you go into this particular area, you cut, in this area, with this amendment, $60 million.

You go to clinical trials. Last year, we did not do that many. We started no new clinical trials or very few.

When Dr. Wyngaarden was before the committee this year, in the testimony, it was brought out what we are doing. We are doing very little. Sure, it is expensive; $6 billion.

If we are going to declare war on anything, if we are going to lead the world, we should declare war on diseases.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], and yes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], when he was a ranking member, know of this. You have to make commitments.

It was only a few years back that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] the then ranking member, whom I respect very much, brought up this issue of overpaid investigators. I think there was a flock of people going to his particular district and coming to the committee and suggesting to the committee that they are not overpaid. I suggest to this full House that they are not overpaid. If anything, they are underpaid.

These are the people who sit in the rooms with their research equipment, with their mice, with their rabbits, whatever they are, and they do a tedious job.

To reduce these accounts at all is totally irresponsible.

Mr. Chairman, we go to aging. Here we have an amendment that is going to cut $20 million from the National Institute on Aging. We just identified a few years ago that Alzheimer's is a disease. It can be treated. It can be corrected. We have been talking about the elderly. All we do is put them in nursing homes. No one wants that.

We should be findng out what causes hardening of the arteries; what causes loss of memory. In World War II, we had a drug, physostigmine, with which we could restore the memory for 20 minutes. There were a lot of negative effects of that, but we have not developed that.

We have not developed that because we have not put the resources into it.

Mr. Chairman, I say to this House, if there is anything that I think would be going in a bad direction, that would not be a saving of the dollars, it is this particular amendment.

There is so much to be done. If we are going to lead the world, we should lead it in this area. The people are at NIH to do this. We have to give them the tools to do it.

□ 1250

We cannot just go into our district and say we want to fight arthritis or diabetes or cancer or whatever and not give them the funds to do it. I suggest that what we have in the bill, in the bill now, is not half the amount of money we need to do the job.

I hope the amendment is rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRENZEL) there were—ayes 4, noes 8.

So the amendments were rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to invite the attention of the public and the Members of this body that we are engaged in the debate of a bill that is going to cost taxpayers over $100 billion. We are making important decisions on the basis of 8-to-4 votes. That's a pretty feeble showing in terms of the number of Members participating.

Earlier, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] pointed out the scheduling difficulties that the House was having. When the leadership casts our schedule a week in advance, important items are left out. They suddenly appear on our schedule without notice.

We do all our work on appropriations bills within a 2-week period. Some of these bills like the one before us now really ought to have 2 weeks of debate all by themselves.

I think that the distinguished minority leader made an awfully good point. The point is basically this: The management of the House with respect to

the budget and the appropriations process leaves much to be desired. It is an embarrassment for us all to be deciding hundreds of millions of dollar-decisions on the basis of 8 versus 4.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: Page 63, after line 4, insert the following new section:

SEC. 513. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds which are not required by previously enacted law to be appropriated or made available shall be appropriated or made available by this Act in amounts which exceed by more than 3 percent the fiscal year 1986 post-sequestration amounts appropriated or made available for such accounts.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto will cease in 1 hour.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, this amendment would basically cap all discretionary programs in the bill at a 3-percent inflationary increase over the fiscal year 1986 funding level. Any discretionary program currently funded below a 3-percent increase in the bill would stay where it is; but any program with an increase exceeding 3 percent would have the increase reduced to 3 percent.

Discretionary programs in the bill, as has been pointed out during the course of general debate, aggregate at roughly $24.9 billion. Specifically, they are being increased by $2,276,493,000 over the 1986 level. That represents in excess of a 10-percent increase, the figure alluded to just a few moments ago by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] in that exchange with our friend, Mr. CONTE.

The bill leaves out 9.8 billion dollars' worth of unauthorized programs including such spending favorites as Head Start, refugee assistance, and most higher education programs. We can only imagine what further increases in spending we will be faced with once these programs are funded.

Now, under my amendment, the total increase would be $679.2 million, and the net savings from the levels in the bill then would be nearly $1.6 billion.

It is ridiculous that when we are seeking to cut the deficit and meet our responsibilities under Gramm-Rudman, we should have a bill come before us with an aggregate increase of over 10 percent; nearly four times the rate of inflation, as has been alluded to several times.

It appears as though the committee is seeking to add back all the reductions we made in the sequestering bill we passed in this body just 2 weeks ago by a vote, incidentally, of 339 to 72. Is that how we really intend to address the deficit around here? Cut with one hand and then add back with the other?

I just think we have got to come to grips with this issue. Yes; you can reduce spending on the defense item, which has been alluded to; that is going to be done, no question about it, but then we cannot just completely open the door on the other side of the equation.

I am just trying to invoke a little bit of sanity here, and reasonableness, in the amount of increases for these very laudable programs which frankly are sensitive, which touch home, reach every household and practically every human being in this country.

I think each and every one of us have to come to grips with that deficit out there, that is in the neighborhood of $200 billion; and under Gramm-Rudman, we are supposed to be getting down to $144 billion.

I am going to meet later on today, Mr. Chairman, with the Director of OMB just to get the latest figures and projections on where we are, and I do not think he is going to give me any optimistic answer to my questions. I think the problem is going to be exacerbated over and above what we thought it was.

Here is one of those big, budget-busting bills that in my judgment has got to be addressed. So that is the spirit in which I offer the amendment. Like I say, we are not cutting anybody down or out; we are giving them a 3-percent increase, which is roughly what the rate of inflation is these days.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in my opening remarks, we have labored long and hard to put this bill together. Our subcommittee held hearings, morning and afternoon, for 33 days. In that time, we heard from more than 680 witnesses, including 98 Members of this body who either testified in person or wrote to us with their requests. Our published hearings cover 10 volumes and total more than 13,000 pages. It is a complete record, and it is the basis of the bill we have presented to the committee.

Now I know full well that the extent of our labors will not be enough to sway some of you from voting for this cut. If you vote for this cut, try and explain that one to the thousands of low-income, disadvantaged kids who will stay undereducated because of this amendment. I am sure the hundreds of single mothers who will bear underweight, at-risk babies will understand, as will the unemployed factory workers and farmers who can't be retrained, and the millions who have waited so long for cures to cancer, diabetes, and other diseases. They will understand that our priorities have been met.

Let me point out another thing to the ladies and gentlemen of this body before they prepare to vote on this amendment. A little over 1 month ago, this body voted 333 to 43 to pass the conference report on the budget resolution. The bill we present to you today is within the targets set by that resolution. The House spoke—the House set its priorities—and we have met them in this bill.

Don't be fooled by what is being sold as a minor cut here today to save possible deeper cuts later on. If you vote for this amendment, you will be cutting a total of $1.8 billion from the bill. You will be saying: "Cut $106 million from our fight against AIDS; cut $735.3 million from the National Institutes of Health; cut $105.5 million from educating handicapped children; cut $125.7 million from employment and training opportunities for the unemployed and needy; cut $6.8 million from funds to assist low-income mothers deliver healthy babies."

This across-the-board cut is very real. And it is one that will be felt more harshly, and impact on individuals more directly, than any of the cuts that have been proposed on these bills the last 2 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, every one of the last 3 years, we have gotten the Labor/HHS bill signed into law. In all that time, we have held to, or under, the levels assigned to us in the budget resolution. Sometimes that has even meant making selected cuts here on the floor after the bill has come back from conference. I say to the members, we will do our best to do all those things again this year. Don't tie our hands, and don't undo the priorities you voted for 1 month ago when you passed the budget resolution. This is a brutal cut, and it should be defeated by the same margin by which the budget resolution was adopted. Vote down this amendment.

□ 1300

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENZEL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 63, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 513. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by previously enacted law is hereby reduced by 9.14 percent."

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to explain the amendment.

The gentleman from Illinois has reduced the discretionary expenditures in the bill down to an increase of only

3 percent. That means he has taken approximately 6 percent off of each discretionary item in the bill. But he has gone only two-thirds of the way toward glory.

My amendment takes it the rest of the way so that each of the discretionary items in the bill is reduced by 9.14 percent.

BOB MICHEL's amendment reduces the whole bill by about $1.6 billion. My amendment is 50 percent higher, a reduction of $2.276 billion. It eliminates all of the increase over fiscal year 1986 appropriations.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois on his fiscal responsibility. I only say that he is being too timid in raising his amendment because I believe we need a little bolder action.

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is that we are going to be faced with a budget deficit that far exceeds the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target. If we do not make the reductions which I have been urging on this body over the past couple of weeks, we are going to be faced with a resolution of sequester that is too large.

The Congress is likely to choke on it. We will not make our budget target, and we will then be perceived by the country as unable to get a handle on our fiscal problem.

You will recall it was only last fall that the country's confidence was restored in us because we did pass Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and assured the people that we could control fiscal policy.

If we do not go to at least a freeze, we are going to be in big trouble when that sequester resolution comes around.

What I am offering the House is a chance to get a little bit ready, be a little bit more prepared. Like the gentleman from Illinois, I cut across the board. I do not cut the mandatories, which are three-quarters of this bill. I know the committee has no room to move on those. The only way to cut the mandatories is in the authorizing committee, in the reconciliation process.

I would also add that the Congress, particularly this House, has flunked the course in reconciliation and in the authorizing process because they have made no important reductions but instead have relied on the sale of assets and new taxes and things like that to fake the deficit reduction. But we can make at least modest reductions there if my amendment is adopted.

Now, first of all, I will concede to the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Massachusetts that these are all wonderful programs. Everybody endorses them from top to bottom with unanimous acclaim.

On the other hand, I do not think everybody endorses a 13.5-percent increase in the account we just talked about on the amendment that was just defeated.

I do not know if everybody in the world endorses a 13.57-percent increase in the Labor Management Service Administration or a 13.56-percent increase in Family Social Services or a 10.58-percent increase in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, or 12.9-percent increase in Vocational and Adult Education, or 12.17-percent increase in Educational Research and Improvement, or a 7.4-percent increases in salaries and expenses of Education Department management.

Now, those are not programs that are being delivered to the people. Those are accounts that are mostly concerned with bureaucratic salaries.

In the past years, we have learned that we cannot solve problems by throwing the taxpayers' money at them. So we have slowed down or changed the direction of many of the Great Society programs. But there still exist people around here who believe that, by throwing money at agriculture or military or at good things like the National Institutes of Health, that we somehow are solving problems.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has pointed out that, instead, we are throwing money at incompetent contractors, at deans' salaries, who do not do any of the research that we are talking about, on indirect costs, on salaries for the bureaucrats.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRENZEL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRENZEL. What the gentleman from Illinois is saying in a more modest way and what I am saying, in the way that I think is more realistic, is that just because the programs are for good purposes does not give this body any license to spend money to raise our deficits by huge increases in these spending accounts. This 9.14-percent increase across the board in discretionary spending is profligate.

Yes, I know the committee works hard. I have been before that committee many times, often asking for things for myself. There are things in this bill which I think should be higher. But overall there is no way in the world that any Member, any representative Member, can say that we should be increasing the discretionary account by 9.14 percent. It just does not makes sense.

We are going to wind up this fiscal year, the current one, with a deficit well over $200 billion. We promised ourselves it would be $175 billion. This kind of appropriation bill and the feeble reconciliation that we are now involved in are going to carry us well over $200 billion for next year unless we are willing to bite that bullet of the sequester resolution.

Based on our track record, which shows that we have swallowed and chewed nothing tougher than a marshmallow, we are not going to measure up to that bullet-biting operation, and we are going to find ourselves and our country in severe fiscal problems again. I do not see any other way to meet Gramm-Rudman-Hollings goals than to make some cuts.

The defenders of the program, and they are wise and able legislators, tell us how important this bill is, that the programs are wonderful, and that we are cutting children and health and other wonderful programs. Actually, we are only freezing. There is, however, no way to lower the bill's spending without reducing something.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FRENZEL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FRENZEL. Whether you are a hawk and want to spend more money for defense, or whether you are a road builder and want more bridges is really irrelevant. Our problem is that, altogether, we have spent too much. We have to cut back spending trend lines whether they are health or whether they are defense or anything else.

Mr. Chairman, I know the House is not going to accept my substitute amendment. I have no choice but to offer it. I weep for the situation that all of us have gotten ourselves into, that we cannot control our expenditures. Since the people are not willing to give to us more taxes, we are obliged to borrow money to satisfy our debt needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment even though I know it will not be adopted.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill that we present today includes total budget authority of $103,710 million including $78,793,369,000 for mandatory accounts and $24,916,647,000 for discretionary accounts. We were allocated, as the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, knows, the sum of $35,551 million for discretionary programs under the budget resolution and under the committee's section 302(b) report.

I repeat that in this bill we recommend $24,916,647,000 for discretionary items. The bill in total is below our 302(b) allowance by $11,274 million. The bill is $10,634 million below for

discretionary programs and $640 million below for entitlements.

This results because the subcommittee has deferred consideration, Mr. Chairman, of programs which are not currently authorized for fiscal year 1987. The President's budget request of $8,414 million for these unauthorized programs, which received $9,809 million for fiscal year 1986. With respect to outlays the bill includes $112,971 million for fiscal year 1987 including $97,802 million for entitlements and $15,119 million for the discretionary programs. This is $4,812 million below our ceiling for outlays including $4,180 million below for discretionary items.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we presented all of the facts to the members of the committee and the Members of the House. We have said to them, this is a good bill. We hold back over $11 billion for unauthorized programs, programs that we would like to pass on at this time but which are not authorized. When these are considered, we believe we have reserved enough budget authority and outlays to cover these items.

Now, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] is adopted, he would cut $2,276,493,000 out of discretionary programs. If this substitute amendment is adopted, it would cut $448,535,000 out of the Department of Labor. For the Job Corps, a program that nearly every Member in this House is in favor of, Mr. FRENZEL would cut $60,571,000. The Older Workers Employment Program would be cut $29,796,000.

The Department of Health and Human Services, Mr. Chairman, under the amendment offered by my friend from Minnesota, would be cut $967,538,000.

Mr. Chairman, for cancer research, research on a dread disease, a disease that all of our people are worried about, his substitute if adopted would cut $123,093,000. The Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute would be reduced $83 million. Mental health research, Mr. Chairman, if this substitute is adopted, would be cut $20,931,000.

Mr. Chairman, maternal and child health grants would be cut $43 million. Community health centers would be cut $36,560,000.

□ 1315

Mr. Chairman, for aging programs administered by the Administration on Aging would be cut $66,675,000. Elderly feeding, Mr. Chairman, think about it, people who need a little help. During the noon hour, they go and are served a nice, clean, wholesome meal. They are people who have a lot of pride, Mr. Chairman, our people. If this substitute is adopted, it would cut elderly feeding programs by $38 million.

Mr. Chairman, for the Department of Education, if this substitute is adopted, the Department of Education program would be cut $806 million. Federal funding supports only 9 percent for education. Education in this country costs the taxpayers at the local and State level about $200 billion. The amendment offered by the gentleman would cut $806 million from the Federal contribution to education in this country.

Mr. Chairman, vocational education, if the substitute is adopted would cut $83 million.

Think about it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NATCHER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. NATCHER. Library services in this country, if this substitute is adopted, would be cut $11,882,000.

The substitute that is offered would cut this bill across the top 9.14 percent. Mr. Chairman, this substitute and the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois should be defeated.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Members of the House Committee on Appropriations on the addition of language in their report on H.R. 5233, the Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies appropriation bill for 1987, that recognizes the urgent need in rural communities for emotional counseling and family support services.

Report language for H.R. 5233 urges Secretary Bowen to direct the National Institute of Mental Health to utilize a portion of its increased funding under research for fiscal year 1987 to work with State governments in setting up demonstration programs of mental health support and services to rural residents and communities suffering the emotional effects of the farm crisis.

The prospect of losing the family farm affects the social and emotional well-being of farm families as profoundly as it affects their financial well-being. I think it is important for my urban colleagues to understand that giving up a farm that's been theirs for generations evokes the same feelings of failure anyone would feel when a business that's been in the family for years goes under.

At a time when farm families need the support and assistance of their family and community most, a recent study of displaced farmers in a rural Missouri community found distressed families were painfully on their own. Neighbors and people in the community were afraid to intrude and generally stayed away, and only 12 percent of the farmers participating in the study indicated that any church, government agency, or other organization had offered or provided them any assistance.

Sixty-six percent of the families who participated in the study said they had tried to talk with someone about their problems, but found the person lacking in concern and understanding.

Most families, too ashamed, unwilling or unable to verbalize their needs, are responding to their own pain by withdrawing from friends and the community. Even family communication is breaking down at a time when it is critically needed. Decisions are not being made and as family members withdraw into themselves, they are unable to give each other the emotional support they need.

The chronic depression and withdrawal these families experience is evidenced by the shocking rise in family violence, drug abuse, teenage runaways, and suicide in rural communities.

We must reach out to farm families and provide the emotional and social support they need to make it through this traumatic period of transition. With the help of these funds, we can develop programs that are tailored to meet the special needs of rural families.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for those kind remarks. The gentleman certainly can help us out by voting against both of these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I have the same objections to this amendment as I did to the last one, so I am not going to take the time that I used against the Michel amendment. This one is even worse. While the Michel amendment takes a dagger and puts it to my heart and sits just on the edge of the tissue, the Frenzel amendment plunges it all way, and I am left gasping for breath.

Let me tell you what the amendment does. Again, I see my chairman there of the full Committee on Agriculture. Let me repeat those figures, though.

In 1980 this Congress appropriated $17.5 billion for agriculture. In 1986 they appropriated $48.7 billion for agriculture, and increase of 177 percent.

Defense, $137 billion in 1980, and $270 billion in 1986, a 97-percent increase.

Now, listen to this. If you adopt the Frenzel amendment, the Labor and Health and Human Services and Education bill, for which we appropriated in 1980 $33.5 billion, you would appropriate today $32.2 billion, a decrease

of 3.7 percent. Now whose hide do you want to keep taking it out of? Let us take it out of defense. Let us take it out of agriculture. Let us take it out of some of these fat cats. They have been going up like crazy. Let us not take it from the ones that have been going down. We are all skin and bones here.

I am on one leg. I am on one leg and you want to pull the other leg, and you know what will happen. That is what is going to happen to a lot of these programs.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I hope that you will not buy either one of these amendments. It would do such irreparable harm to some of these programs.

There has been so much talk about sequester, and what will happen. I voted against Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. I said it was a bad idea. I was one of 11 who brought suit and we went to the Supreme Court on sequester. It is a bad idea to cut across the board.

That is what you are doing here. This is sequester. You are cutting across the board. You are cutting the good programs as well as the bad programs. That is wrong.

Let us face it. I know a lot of them voted the other day for sequester on the Gramm-Rudman of the 4.3-percent cut. I did not. I was one of the 72. And I stand up and I talk this way to my people back home, and they agree with me. Everyone who voted for Gramm-Rudman is going to have egg on their face come September. There are not going to be enough bushes in the District of Columbia to hide under. We are going to get sequester no matter what you cut on these bills.

Do you know what you need? You need some revenue. That committee that is meeting with the Senate over there right now on the tax bill propose a revenue neutral bill. That is ridiculous. They should raise the necessary revenue to meet that target, that great target of $144 billion under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. That is what we are going to have to eventually face up to.

Mr. BROOKS and Mr. MYERS of Indiana and others will join with me in September. That is the only way out of it; not by cutting these programs that have been cut enough. They are skin and bones.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise to both of these amendments to cut the money that is in the programs.

The amendment that we are now on cuts $2,300 million from this bill. If $2,300 million sounds to you like a lot of money, it is, depending, of course, on what agency you are talking about.

It is not really much money for the Pentagon. We started our deliberations today in this Chamber at 10 o'clock. If we had started the Pentagon spending clock ticking at 10 o'clock, the Pentagon will spend by 10 o'clock Saturday evening, this Saturday evening, all of the money that is proposed to be cut from this bill, $2,300 million. Between our start this morning and 10 o'clock this weekend on a Saturday evening, the Pentagon will have spent all of this money.

What do these Federal efforts do with that money? There is a myth that has been perpetuated so often by the other side of the aisle even they are beginning to believe it. The myth is that these Federal efforts which this amendment seeks to cut are overblown with money, that we are gagging money down the throat of domestic discretionary program spending.

Let us stop for a minute and take a look at it. We know that America's children, far too many of them, particularly moderate- and low-income children of America, are not doing as well as they should, and perhaps not doing as well as they have done in the past in the important discipline of what we call the three R's, "reading, writing, and rithmetic." The Federal Government and the States and localities have come together some years ago and formed this program called chapter 1. It used to be called title I. It provides that education for low- and moderate-income schools.

My friends, if we count all of the children who are in schools in America that offer that chapter 1 service, that basic-skills education, if we count all of those children, and then we take the ones who are way behind of their peers, in other words, if they are operating in the 25 percentile—or to put it another way, 75 percent of their peers in school are doing better in these basic skills than they are doing—if we count all of those children who go to schools that offer this program, those schools are only able to provide those services to 40 percent of those children in need.

□ 1325

You know why? The children are going to the schools with the chapter 1 program in place but we do not have enough money to hire the teachers and we do not have enough money to buy the equipment. You know what the answer is? We have got a good thought out program and we need to, yes, let us say it: Throw some money at it.

We have got a program that works. It does not have enough money and too many of our children are dropping out and are not getting the basic skills because we do not have enough money in this program.

Handicapped education. When we started handicapped education a couple of decades ago, we said that the Federal Government was going to help the localities by paying 40 percent of the cost of providing appropriate education to America's disabled students. The Federal, in the final year of Jimmy Carter, managed to provide 12.5 percent of the cost. We never got anywhere near the 40 percent. We only got to 12.5 percent, and the funds in this bill will only make it at 8 percent. But some on the other side want to cut that back.

We know that unemployment is a problem in this country and yet we know that there is a lot of elderly Americans who have a great deal to offer their country and could get and hold a little job and be of real help. They want to cut that program, that Older Americans Employment Program, as if we are gagging money down the throat of that program.

Do you know what percent of the eligible elderly population that could take a job is served by this Federal effort? One percent. One percent of the American elderly population that can work and would like to get help through this program is being served. Does that sound as if we are gagging money at social spending?

We know we have a job training problem for young people and middle-aged people. The great hardhats of America, the blue-collar workers who are out of a job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, all of us understand that the problems in this country of unemployment are not mainly associated with the elderly but rather the hardhats and the blue-collar workers and those who simply need retraining in order to get and hold another job.

We hear a lot about how much we spend in this country through the Federal Government for job training. Do you know what percent of the population we serve? Three percent. Three percent of those needing help are getting it. We spend less money in this bill, without this cut, than we spent in this country on job training 11 years ago. We spent less money.

We know that young people are having terrible difficulty on the streets of the inner cities in America today, and they want to cut the program that already does not serve enough young people that need a little help with summer youth employment.

Under this bill as it stands without the cut we would serve 185,000 fewer young people than we served last year. We know that American infants need to be immunized and preschoolers and those just starting school need to be immunized against those terrible, dread diseases like polio. This amendment would cut that program. Yet, we know that every dollar that we spend

to prevent a young person from getting polio saves the taxpayer $90 on treatment costs. Are we immunizing all the young kids in America? No. A full third of the young people in this country that need immunization cannot get it.

We have got the doctors, we have got the hospitals, we have got the health care personnel. We have got the schools where we can do the inoculation. You know what we need to do? It is time to say it: We need to throw a little money at it. We have got a program that works; we have got to throw a little money at it so that we can get more personnel, more vaccine, more people to do the immunization.

If the Frenzel amendment passes, and, as I said, I am against both of them, then we are going to reduce the chapter 1 funding, the reading, writing, and arithmetic for those low-income kids and moderate-income children in America, we are going to reduce that $55 million below what we spent last year.

We are going to reduce impact aid to our schools $47 million below what we spent last year. We are going to reduce vocational rehabilitation $101 million below what we spent last year. We are going to reduce job training $117 million below what we spent last year.

Is it a freeze? No. This is a cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not a freeze; it is a cut in the fabric of America's already too-short effort to take care of our own people here at home. To provide the education, the nutrition, and the health services that the American public insists upon. This would cut below the meager effort that the Federal Government now makes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his very strong statement and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud as chairman of the full committee to be a member of this subcommittee and to support this bill. May I say here that the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member and all of the members of this subcommittee have done a great job through the years.

When you deal with public health and education, you just cannot find a subject that deserves more attention. We have given attention to these issues in this bill.

As you know, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have to, at the beginning of the session, determine how we will allocate the funds that are allocated to us by the budget. We have done that and those allocations are published in our 302(b) report. We have allocated these funds to the subcommittees and to the various Departments and agencies. The labor, HHS, and education bill is within the budget and within the 302(b) ceiling for both budget authority and outlays.

Let us look at some of the benefits that we have in this bill. I shall not discuss all items because that has been done by the ranking member and the chairman.

In this bill we have provided $906 million vocational education which is many times what it was back in 1941 when I came to Congress. What has happened? In 1940, you had some training on agriculture and homemaker training in vocational education, but because we have changed that to meet changing conditions, vocational education programs train employees of all the industrial plants and other activities. It is handled at the local level with this Federal financial assistance.

Not only that, but since 1940 the life expectancy in this country has increased from 62.9 years to 74.7 years. This can be attributed in part to the funds for health and human services in this bill. I could go on and on and show all the benefits that we have here. But I want to say again and I want to compliment the members of this subcommittee and other members for the work they have done in H.R. 5233. I support the bill and I oppose both amendments to cut the bill.

□ 1335

I rise at this point to ask a question of the chairman, if I might. We deal with big problems and little problems, but little problems are big to those that have them. A question has recently been raised within the Office of the General Council of the Department of Health and Human Services, with respect to the interpretation of section 858 of the Public Health Service Act. This section provides for the recovery of construction grant funds for nursing schools when a nursing school is closed. As you know, I have such a school, Mississippi Valley State, in my State. Section 858(d) provides that such a recovery may be waived by the Secretary if the Secretary determines that there is good cause for such a waiver. Mississippi Valley State has requested such a waiver based on extreme financial distress. Mr. Chairman, is it your interpretation of this section of the law that financial distress would be an appropriate basis for such a waiver?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have, at your request, carefully reviewed the matter. Section 858(d) provides broad authority for the Secretary to waive recovery and it is clear that financial distress, such as we understand to be the case at Mississippi Valley State, would be an appropriate basis for a waiver.

Mr. WHITTEN. The general council at the Department has expressed concern that Mississippi Valley State would not qualify because its situation is covered by section 858(a)(1) of the law rather than (a)(2). This interpretation seems in error to me. Can the gentleman tell us his views on this matter.

Mr. NATCHER. As I indicated before, we have reviewed this matter carefully. Based on this analysis, the interpretation that the Mississippi Valley State request falls under section (a)(1) is in error. Mississippi Valley State, the owner, continues in operation as a public school. It is, therefore, clear to us that the Mississippi Valley State application is appropriate under section 858(d) and we would hope that the Secretary could act quickly on the request. We have checked this matter with Chairman WAXMAN of the authorizing committee who we understand agrees with our interpretation of this section of the law.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] indicated that he was talking about the bill, and he did so. I assume his time does not come out of the time specifically allotted to the two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the time does come out of that.

Mr. FRENZEL. It does?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Even though his remarks were directed to the bill itself?

The CHAIRMAN. No Member made a point of order against the gentleman. He moved to strike the last word.

Mr. FRENZEL. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

My understanding of the unanimous-consent request was that we would have an hour directed at the amendments and an hour for miscellaneous discussion. Now, is the Chair telling us that all miscellaneous discussion is being allocated to the Michel and Frenzel amendments, and that we will not even get our hour's worth?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that unless a point of order is made, then the Chair has no way to determine whether a Member intends to speak generally for the bill or for a specific amendment.

Mr. FRENZEL. Then as a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, am I obliged to make a point of order to get an honest count here?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] have been extremely fair about the presentation of the amendment and the substitute. We do not agree with either one of them, Mr. Chairman, but they have been fair about it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the 5 minutes just consumed not come out of the debate time that we agreed on with the two gentlemen.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Frenzel amendment as it amends the Michel amendment. I also rise in support of the Michel amendment, but I think the Frenzel amendment is the more appropriate of the two.

The Congress is not at a crossroads today, but the Congress is clearly at a V in the road, and we are going to have to choose fairly soon, I would think, whether we are going to follow some fiscal discipline in this House or whether we are going to confront fiscal discipline being forced on the House. The Frenzel amendment is an attempt to make that choice versus having that choice forced upon us by the sequester process.

This has been, I think, a very disappointing week for those of us who are concerned about some semblance of fiscal responsibility. We have seen a series of appropriation bills roll through this House, bills which have been a thundercloud of bad news for those of us who want to see some discipline exercised and which have forebode for us as a country and as a House a budget which is going to be excessively in deficit.

It seems to me that the process that we are confronting today is an opportunity to try to redirect what has been a clear failure of the House up until now to address the question of spending and how it is going to relate to the Gramm-Rudman process.

We are looking at a bill today which on the discretionary side is approximately $2.2 billion over what it was last year. It represents a 9-percent increase. If Gramm-Rudman occurs, if sequester occurs—and it is going to have to occur as a result of the appropriation bills which have already been passed in this House—we are going to see a cut of at least that much in the various programs, including the various discretionary programs in all functions of the Federal Government. In order to avoid that, we are going to have to make the decisions now.

Some of the members of the Appropriations Committee have gotten up and stated in response to specific amendments on reducing spending that those specific amendments are inappropriate in that they cut the heart out of specific programs. We have heard arguments about children, about widows, about spouses, and about the need for various programs for specific health purposes. When these specific amendments have been offered, and as a result of those arguments, these amendments have been rejected.

Now we have the Frenzel amendment, which is an attempt to cut across the board and which is being rejected by the members of the Appropriations Committee specifically because it is an amendment which is across the board. It seems to me that the Appropriations Committee and those Members who are supporting the Appropriations Committee as it proceeds down this road are trying to have their cake and eat it too. They are rejecting the specific amendments on the ground that they impact specific programs, and they are rejecting the across-the-board amendments because they claim they are too broad-brushed and are not specific enough.

They cannot have it both ways. Having just rejected a specific amendment, it seems to me that we have to go on to the across-the-board amendments, and that is what the Frenzel amendment is. It is an attempt to address this significant increase in various functions which come within this bill by an across-the-board amendment.

As has been pointed out, in a number of functions in this bill we have increases that are of a double digit percentage basis. We have the Labor-Management Services Administration going up 13.5 percent, we have the National Institutes of Health going up 13.5 percent, we have Family and Social Services going up 13.5 percent, we have Vocational and Adult Education going up almost 13 percent, and we have the Office of Educational Research and Improvement going up 12 percent.

This is a time when we are going to face a budget deficit significantly in excess of the $154 billion level which will energize the sequester motion.

Where is the Congress on this issue? It appears to me that we have as a body over the last week decided to bury our heads in the specifics of each bill and ignore the broad issue of the question of sequester. We have decided, rather than address, the policy matter of reducing the deficit, that we are going to address the specific questions of each program as they come through the House.

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

Mr. GREGG. I will be happy to yield in just a second.

Mr. OBEY. Could the gentleman say how much defense is going up?

Mr. GREGG. I will be happy to yield in just a second, as soon as I finish my statement.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we in the House are either going to ignore our responsibility to the American people and continue to vote these appropriation bills out in excess of the Gramm-Rudman levels or we are going to have the courage to stand up and draw the line. It is ironic that the only bill on which we seem to have drawn the line is the District of Columbia bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to both the Michel amendment and the Frenzel amendment.

I would first like to salute the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and thank him for the fine work he has done with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] on this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, how many times has each of us gone back to our districts or stood here in the well and said how important education is to the future of this Nation? I say to the Members that we can measure our words by our vote on this amendment. If we vote to cut these programs, we are voting to cut successful programs that educate our children and prepare for our Nation's future.

Those of us who have taken the time to see the chapter 1 program in application, who have visited with the teachers, the children and the parents involved, know that it is a resounding success.

To come in and propose cutbacks in these programs is to guarantee that these children will not be equipped to compete in tomorrow's world. It is as simple as that.

For those who say that we must meet budget targets, I ask them, What good is that if the next generation of Americans is not equipped to lead in the world economy and to lead fruitful and productive lives?

□ 1345

Another issue in this bill that is very important and close to home to me is the dislocated worker. In Illinois and across the Midwest, we have lost so many manufacturing jobs under this administration—105,000 in Illinois, to be exact. If we are going to give these

people hope, retraining, and a future, we have got to put money where our speeches are. This bill does it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his remarks.

I would hope that people would understand what this amendment is all about. This amendment is really a wholesale attack on the American family. This amendment attacks the aspirations of the newly married couple for a healthy child because it attacks maternal and child health, where we are now seeing a downturn in the number of children afflicted with handicaps, with mental retardation.

This amendment attacks the aspirations of a parent, a low-income parent, who wants to see their child break poverty and enter the chapter 1 program, where we know when their children enter that program they read better, they write better, they compute better. This amendment attacks those aspirations.

This amendment attacks the aspirations of our friends and neighbors who have handicapped children. They know that if they get help for their handicapped child, that child will have a better chance of getting a job and getting an education. That child will be able to get up out of that wheelchair and take their place in this society, and this amendment attacks that.

This is a cowardly amendment because it hides behind a percentage cut, because they know there is not a majority vote in this House in the Republican Party or in the Democratic Party to vote individually to cut these programs.

Let us not hide behind this amendment and dash the aspirations of parents all over this country who seek a better life for their children.

This amendment is an attack on that. It is an attack on the parent who has a depressed teenager. We see teenagers taking their own lives at record rates. And what do we do? The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] would come along and slash mental health research.

We have made the streets of our country the mental health wards of this country. Do we want to continue that?

Mr. Chairman, I ask you to vote against this amendment and let us stand for the support of families who many times through no fault of their own need the help of a compassionate Government, need the help of a compassionate Congress, so that their children may have an opportunity to live a better life than they will.

Keep this up and they will have no opportunity, no chance, and they will be relegated forever to the cycle of poverty and public assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will vote against the amendment and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to reiterate, in contrast to a prior speaker, this bill is within Gramm-Rudman limitations. It is within the budget.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it may seem a bit odd that one who is the author of an amendment also supports the substitute to his own amendment.

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

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express strong support for the Medicaid prescription drug program study urged by the committee report.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I support the substitute, frankly, out of loyalty to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, who has done such yeoman service all during the course of this Congress trying to prick the conscience of this House every once in awhile on where we are headed.

I am reminded in the whole discussion over a freeze of what I was attempting to do or wanted to do and was dissuaded from doing so on opening day as we got sworn in on January 3, 1985. At that time I had proposed that knowing how bad the deficit was increasing and how badly we were doing on the expenditure side, to propose an across-the-board freeze for everything, everything right across the board. I was dissuaded from doing so by members of my own administration, by hard liners on defense.

They said, "Bob, if you vote for an across-the-board freeze, look how you are going to devastate defense."

Well, as the year unfolded in 1985, they fared much worse even on the defense figure.

We would not have had to have Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, we would have fared so much better had I simply persisted in that effort that I had originally proposed and I regret that.

Now, my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, makes another point with respect to the validity of across-the-board freezes or the lack of that versus prioritizing. What we have here, frankly, we are respecting the priority of the subcommittee and the full committee to made these determinations on individual line items. You have already done your work. You have done it well and we respect you for all that you have done.

We understand the pressures. I have been there. Oh, how many times I have had to fend off this pressure and that pressure and say, "I can't do it, I can't do it."

The House out here, however, every once in awhile says, but notwithstanding the good job that you did, now what we have got to do is get that overall figure down because, frankly, they are not adding up. That is what we are doing by an across-the-board swipe.

It is not all that tragic. We are still permitting members of the subcommittee and the committee to do that prioritizing.

What we are simply doing is saying that we have got to make some adjustment here in the way we are doing business.

By way of quick review now, in summary, the total spending in this bill is $103.7 billion, which exceeds the 1986 level by $6.7 billion and the President's budget by $6 billion.

This does not include $9.8 billion of unauthorized deferred spending at all that will come along the way.

The amount of discretionary authority in the bill is $24.9 billion. While this exceeds the President's budget by $4.1 billion, it might be expected since some of the proposed cuts of the administration would never go anyplace here in this House. I understand that.

The key point, however, is that this discretionary total also exceeds the 1986 level by $2.3 billion. That represents a nearly 9- or 10-percent increase at a time when inflation is running at 2 to 3 percent.

Now, a few of the major discretionary program increases over fiscal year 1986 are as follows:

Job training, 7-percent increase, $207 million.

Disease control, we got a 16-percent increase here. Yes, that is a problem. Sixteen percent. Do we need $77 million?

I made the case earlier on NIH, an $893 million increase or 17 percent, now aggregating $6 billion. Whether or not that is justified at this time when we are trying to make some savings in other places is a question.

Alcohol and drug abuse is up by 11 percent. We are going to have some increases there. We are not altogether sure it has to be that much.

Education for disadvantaged, title I, 13-percent increase you have got in there, $469 million.

Education for the handicapped, a 12-percent increase, $144 million.

Vocational education, a 13-percent increase.

And the Carl Perkins scholarships, up 120 percent, $21 million, in honor of one of our former colleagues.

Now, I will tell you, folks, when you get to adding these things up and when we get into September and then are about to adjourn in October and we have really got the crunch, something has got to give someplace. When we are considering these bills on a day-to-day basis, we have no alternative but to at least offer some measure of hope out there and some alternative for Members to express their feelings.

I hope the Members will support the substitute, and if not, support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to announce that under the unanimous-consent request, there are 10 minutes remaining. If the proponents and opponents would like to divide their closing remarks, they may do so.

Mr. NATCHER. That would meet with approval on this side, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished chairman and I could divide the time, we would appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 5 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment to make across-the-board cuts in the 1987 Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill.

The programs funded by this appropriations bill represent the heart of services we provide to millions of people in this country. Investments in these programs are investments in the future of this Nation. And while defense spending has almost doubled in the last 5 years, this amendment asks us to cut programs for job training and employment, education, seniors, research on cancer, heart disease and many other programs that directly help the people in my district and across this country.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal during the past few weeks about the problem of drug abuse. The Speaker has called for an all-out bipartisan program against drugs. I support this initiative and believe that programs in this bill provide opportunities to deal with this problem.

One of the best ways to fight drugs is by giving people incentives to participate in society. Jobs are the most direct link to this participation. This is particularly important to our youth—where providing jobs gives them hope for the future. A sense of personal worth and value, and the opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to their community.

For the last 2 years, the budget resolution designated the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) as a high priority and to recieve an inflationary increase from the summer of 1986. I am particularly concerned that over the past 4 years, there has been a decline in the number of participants provided for in this program. From this summer to the next, we will loss 150,000 participants. This loss is continued through the summer of 1988.

I have spoken to the chairman of the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. NATCHER to ask him to work to restore sufficient funds in SYEP that would permit the same number of participants we had in the summer of 1986. The chairman agrees that drug abuse is a serious problem. The chairman assures me that when he considers funding for other programs within his jurisdiction but not in this bill, that within the constraints of the budget, he will work to restore sufficient funds in order to increase the number of participants in the Summer Youth Employment Program.

If the amendment to cut this appropriations bill is adopted, any efforts to restore support for the summer youth employment program are threatened, and this program, an important element to combat drugs, is further compromised.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were adopted, we would be forced to cut import programs under the Older Americans Act, including the Meals on Wheels Program which we fought so hard to keep operating at levels needed for our seniors. Education would also be seriously hurt. Chapter 1, which provides compensatory education to our children in reading and math would be cut by $470 million, and programs for our handicapped children would be cut by $144 million.

Mr. Chairman, only 1 month ago, this Congress overwhelming passed a budget resolution. I would remind Members that the resolution established education, job training and employment, programs for our seniors and for the disadvantaged as a high priority. This appropriations bill is well within the budget authority and the outlays allowed in budget resolution. Now is the time to keep the promises we made in June. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], a member of the subcommittee and a member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is really not about cutting. This amendment is really about switching, because really what the authors of this amendment hope to do is to reduce funding for programs that are crucial to the future economic and social health of this country and use that money for foreign assistance and use that money for an increased military budget.

The administration asked this Congress to increase the military budget by $34 billion. They asked us to increase foreign assistance by $2 billion, almost all of which was military rather than development assistance. And to compensate for those increases they asked us to cut in cancer research, to cut in AIDS, to cut in heart disease research, to cut 25 percent out of student aid opportunty, to cut job training.

Only 1 out of 20 workers who are eligible for aid, displaced workers who have been displaced by foreign competition or other job loss because of shrinkage of the economy, only 1 out of those 20 workers is going to get some financial help out of the Government with the budget as it is, and they want to cut it some more.

I do not think those are the priorities of the country. I do not think they are the priorities of this House. I do not think they are the priorities of either party in this House.

I urge you to stick with the committee. I urge you not to decimate the major bill that we bring out on the floor of this House each year to fund the programs for the people of America.

I urge you to recognize that this is a question of priorities. This bill is within the budget resolution. It is within Gramm-Rudman requirements and I urge you to stick with it.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out just one additional matter to the members of the committee. As the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has just said, we are below the section 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and for outlays.

This is a good bill. Both the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, should be defeated.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Chairman GRAY of the Budget Committee has already told us that meeting 302(b) allocations means a $25 billion sequestration. We can avoid that $25 billion bitter pill if we can get $15 billion in cuts from the appropriation bills. We can do that with amendments like these and others that have been offered as we go across all the appropriation bills.

This is under a 10-percent cut for these programs. Certainly it is painful, not as painful as a 13-percent cut will be under sequestration.

The choice is either to take our medicine now or to swallow a terribly, terribly bitter pill, with far more deep cuts, far more devastating blows to all these programs in October when we are forced to fulfill the promise we made to deficit reduction when we passed Gramm-Rudman in this body.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COATS].

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise in support of the attempts of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] to bring about some fiscal discipline to the process here, not only in this appropriation, but in the whole appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, the point has been made in this debate that a vote for the Frenzel and/or the Michel amendment is a vote against children, families, youth, the poor, handicapped, and oppressed. The implication is that anyone supporting these amendments simply has no concern for the human needs of our society. Mr. Chairman, to characterize a favorable vote for these amendments is both wrong and a misrepresentation.

Many of us who support the Michel/Frenzel approach do so precisely because we do care about the children, youth, and families of our Nation. We say that nothing impacts harder on our children and families and the poor, handicapped, and downtroden of our society than continued massive deficit spending. We fear the adverse effects of massive deficits on employment, and we know that it is the poor, the less fortunate that suffer the fastest and the most in times of recession, high interest and inflation.

We also know that the specter of automatic across-the-board cuts await us if we fail to meet the deficit reduction targets we agreed to on a bipartisan basis last December. We are only deceiving ourselves if we think we are saving these many worthwhile programs from serious and automatic cuts. We are not. By our failure to exercise any discipline whatsoever, we jeopardize the very programs we seek to save.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments merely freeze spending for all discretionary programs under this bill at current levels. No cuts are made, no slashes in programs as some have alleged. Everybody gets the same next year as they have this year. With inflation practically nonexistent, this is a reasonable request.

Do some programs deserve increases? The answer is yes. Do some deserve decreases, or even termination? The answer is, again, yes. But the appropriating committee refuses to exercise the discipline necessary to prioritize the programs and still keep overall spending at current levels. We will never reduce the deficit, nor remove the risk of severe hardship on our children, families, poor, and others that deficit spending imposes.

I submit that those who truly care about children, those who truly care about families, those who truly care about the poor, the handicapped, the downtrodden, are those who look beyond the approach of merely throwing a few more Federal dollars at the problem and instead weight the adverse consequences of deficit spending on those in our society that can least afford the results of continued deficit spending.

Let's have the courage to avoid the easy way out of pretending to care merely by appropriating more money. Let's have the foresight to take a broader view of the problem and balance the legitimate funding needs of worthy programs with the equally legitimate need to reduce this terrible Federal deficit. Only by doing both do we truly care for the children, youth, and families of our Nation.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, the debate has been instructive on these two amendments, but most recently we have heard attacks from the proponents of the bill against the two amendments, my own and that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], that these are terrible cuts and slashes, and that they will hurt families and children. Therefore, say the bills admirers, anyone who supports a reduction from the committee's exalted and imperial level is somehow against children, families, the poor, the oppressed, and so forth.

I would like to deal with those criticisms, because they are inaccurate and they cause the debate to be considered in terms which are irrelevant.

In the first place, we are not slashing or cutting anything. My amendment holds our appropriations where they are. It neither raises nor reduces expenditures.

If you take the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, it in fact gives an increase. Neither is a cut. So much for cutting and slashing.

Item No. 2: Somehow any kind of reduction from the committee's wisdom is also antithetical to the well-being of our constituents. Let me just describe what is going to happen when that sequester resolution comes along, if we have not adopted some amendments. Then we will have real cuts.

We are going to have enormous cuts, at that point, unless we can find a way to duck the sequester resolution. So if we do not make adjustments now, we are going to pay more dearly later. We will pay then with less discrimination, and ways in which the committee never intended.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about the family concerns in a little different way. The Members that support these amendments are Members who have just as much, or maybe greater, concern for children and youth and families in the United States than those who would throw money at them.

We believe that it is important that the United States does not suffer a recession, and that those people who are at the bottom end of the scale—who suffer most mightily in recessions, in times of high interest rates, at times when there are not any jobs—ought to have opportunities. We believe that the best way that those children and families are going to have opportunities, are going to be able to increase their condition in these United States of America, is that this Congress exercise some fiscal responsibility and provide an environment in which there is growth and continued recovery in this country.

Members can have it either way they want. They can go the way the committee did, and ask for a recession and fewer jobs. They can throw money at some problems, and create some dependencies.

Or they can go our way with some fiscal responsibility. If so, I believe those families are going to be taking care of themselves.

Going back to my first point one more time, nothing in either amendment cuts anything. One maintains spending; one increases it. Both are responsible. I hope that Members will vote for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], my distinguished coach and mentor, wrongheaded as he may be on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] for his graciousness. He makes a point. We come out here and we say, "Oh, boy, don't touch our figures, because we've worked on these things for 3 or 4 months, and we feel that these are the right figures."

Well, he is right; we do feel that they are the right figures. We have put a lot of thought and time and effort into these, and we can justify these figures.

Now let us take his committee, the Committee on Ways and Means. They come out here with a closed rule. They will not even let Members offer amendments. Is the gentleman willing to start letting me offer amendments to his bills?

Mr. FRENZEL. You bet.

Mr. CONTE. Well, that is great. I would like to see that happen, the days that Ways and Means comes out here and says that 430 other guys or 425 other guys and gals can go and offer an amendment to their bill. But they say, "My God, don't touch it; we've worked on it, and you cannot even try to offer an amendment to the Ways and Means Committee."

Now if Members vote for the Frenzel substitute, they will cut over $2.2 billion from this bill. Let me tell them what they will do—he says it is an increase; they will then bring this bill, Health and Human Services and Education—which happens to be the most

important bill, I think, that comes to the floor of the House—down to 3.7-percent less than what they appropriated in 1980.

Do you mean to tell me anybody wants to do that? I do not believe so.

As I said here earlier, we have increased, between 1980 and 1986, defense 100 percent. We have increased the agricultural budget appropriation by over 100 percent. And now Members want to stand up here and cut the National Institutes of Health, cancer, heart, lung, diabetes, arthritis, and the rest of them, by 3.7-percent below 1980? They want to cut higher education, elementary and secondary education, by 3.7-percent below 1980? I do not believe that they do.

As I said earlier when I spoke against the Michel amendment, that did a lot of damage, but the Frenzel amendment is completely destructive. It drives that stiletto right through your heart, where the Michel amendment takes that stiletto and puts it to the tip of your heart. Both of these amendments should go down in resounding defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the amendment and on the substitute thereto.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 99, noes 321, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

AYES—99

Archer
Armey
Badham
Barnard
Bartlett
Barton
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Coble
Combest
Cooper
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Frenzel
Gekas
Gibbons
Gingrich
Gradison
Gregg
Hall, Ralph
Hansen
Hartnett
Hiler
Hopkins
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Ireland
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Latta
Loeffler
Lott
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Monson
Montgomery
Moorhead
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Petri
Porter
Ray
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Walker
Weber
Whittaker

NOES—321

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bateman
Bates
Bellenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Clinger
Cobey
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Conyers
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hillis
Holt
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldon
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—11

Barnes
Bedell
Boner (TN)
Breaux
Carney
Clay
Fowler
Grotberg
Lundine
Moore
Stark

□ 1420

Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ROE, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. COBEY, and Mr. WYLIE changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PACKWOOD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 253, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—164

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Badham
Barnard
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bliley
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Cooper
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Frenzel
Gekas
Gibbons
Gingrich
Gradison
Gregg
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Henry
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Monson
Montgomery
Moorhead
Nichols
Nielson
Olin
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Petri
Pickle
Porter

Quillen
Ray
Regula
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Roth
Roukema
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Wortley
Young (AK)

NOES—253

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Annunzio
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bates
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hendon
Hertel
Hillis
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McDade
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—14

Anthony
Barnes
Bedell
Boner (TN)
Breaux
Carney
Clay
Conyers
Fowler
Grotberg
Lundine
Moore
Waldon
Williams

□ 1430

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT] having assumed the chair, Mr. FUQUA, 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. 5233) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

□ 1445

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF OHIO

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Yes, in its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Ohio moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5233, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—ayes 328, noes 86, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—328

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hillis
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hutto
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley

Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOES—86

Archer
Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bliley
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Chappie
Cheney
Combest
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
DeLay
DeWine
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Fiedler
Fields
Frenzel
Gekas
Gradison
Gregg
Hall, Ralph
Hansen
Hiler
Holt
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Ireland
Kindness
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lightfoot
Lott
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Monson
Moorhead
Nielson
Olin
Oxley
Packard
Petri
Ray
Roberts
Roth
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Solomon
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst

NOT VOTING—17

Barnes
Bedell
Boner (TN)
Bonker
Breaux
Callahan
Carney
Clay
Conyers
Fowler
Gingrich
Grotberg
Hartnett
Kemp
Lundine
Moore
Waldon

□ 1455

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to recommit was laid on the table.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a detailed table showing the amounts in H.R. 5233, the bill just passed, for each of the programs funded in the bill together with appropriate comparisons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
SUMMARY								
Title I - Department of Labor:								
Federal Funds	6,541,215,000	6,303,652,000	5,897,429,000	5,524,294,000	-1,016,921,000	-779,358,000	-373,135,000	
Trust Funds	(2,704,717,000)	(2,588,411,000)	(2,747,345,000)	(2,751,696,000)	(+46,979,000)	(+163,285,000)	(+4,351,000)	
Title II - Department of Health and Human Services:								
Federal Funds (all years)	78,149,991,000	77,554,843,000	79,336,916,000	84,001,567,000	+5,851,576,000	+6,446,724,000	+4,664,651,000	
Current year	(66,676,237,000)	(66,081,089,000)	(66,738,851,000)	(71,403,502,000)	(+4,727,265,000)	(+5,322,413,000)	(+4,664,651,000)	
1988 advance	(11,473,754,000)	(11,473,754,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	---	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(4,361,618,000)	(4,175,522,000)	(3,908,210,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust Funds	(5,226,689,000)	(5,029,303,000)	(5,297,867,000)	(5,289,417,000)	(+62,728,000)	(+260,114,000)	(-8,450,000)	
Title III - Department of Education:								
Federal Funds	12,793,298,000	12,377,434,000	11,911,099,000	13,380,231,000	+586,933,000	+1,002,797,000	+1,469,132,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(5,582,386,000)	(5,489,023,000)	(4,354,782,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Title IV - Related Agencies:								
Federal Funds (all years)	832,568,000	805,054,000	599,321,000	814,924,000	-17,644,000	+9,870,000	+215,603,000	
Current year	(618,568,000)	(591,054,000)	(469,321,000)	(600,924,000)	(-17,644,000)	(+9,870,000)	(+131,603,000)	
1989 advance	(214,000,000)	(214,000,000)	(130,000,000)	(214,000,000)	---	---	(+84,000,000)	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(151,287,000)	(144,781,000)	(151,115,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust Funds	(74,802,000)	(71,586,000)	(74,121,000)	(76,916,000)	(+2,114,000)	(+5,330,000)	(+2,795,000)	
Sec. 515 reserves (P.L. 99-190):								
Federal Funds	12,531,000	11,702,000	---	---	-12,531,000	-11,702,000	---	
Trust Funds	(919,000)	(919,000)	---	---	(-919,000)	(-919,000)	---	
Total, all titles:								
Federal Funds (all years)	98,329,603,000	97,052,685,000	97,744,765,000	103,721,016,000	+5,391,413,000	+6,668,331,000	+5,976,251,000	
Current year	(86,641,849,000)	(85,364,931,000)	(85,016,700,000)	(90,908,951,000)	(+4,267,102,000)	(+5,544,020,000)	(+5,892,251,000)	
1988 advance	(11,473,754,000)	(11,473,754,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	---	
1989 advance	(214,000,000)	(214,000,000)	(130,000,000)	(214,000,000)	---	---	(+84,000,000)	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(10,095,291,000)	(9,809,326,000)	(8,414,107,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust Funds	8,007,127,000	7,690,219,000	8,119,333,000	8,118,029,000	+110,902,000	+427,810,000	-1,304,000	
SECTION 302B RECAP								
Federal Funds (all years)	98,329,603,000	97,052,685,000	97,744,765,000	103,721,016,000	+5,391,413,000	+6,668,331,000	+5,976,251,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(10,095,291,000)	(9,809,326,000)	(8,414,107,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Discretionary, current appropriations	23,615,212,000	22,640,154,000	20,798,416,000	24,927,647,000	+1,312,435,000	+2,287,493,000	+4,129,231,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(9,910,020,000)	(9,631,262,000)	(8,273,702,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Mandatory, total in bill	74,714,391,000	74,412,531,000	76,946,349,000	78,793,369,000	+4,078,978,000	+4,380,838,000	+1,847,020,000	
Less advances for subsequent years	-11,687,754,000	-11,687,754,000	-12,728,065,000	-12,812,065,000	-1,124,311,000	-1,124,311,000	-84,000,000	
Plus advances provided in prior years	11,010,269,000	11,010,269,000	11,673,754,000	11,673,754,000	+663,485,000	+663,485,000	---	
Subtotal, Mandatory, current appropriations	74,036,906,000	73,735,046,000	75,892,038,000	77,655,058,000	+3,618,152,000	+3,920,012,000	+1,763,020,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(185,271,000)	(178,064,000)	(140,405,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Total, adjusted current year	97,652,118,000	96,375,200,000	96,690,454,000	102,582,705,000	+4,930,587,000	+6,207,505,000	+5,892,251,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(10,095,291,000)	(9,809,326,000)	(8,414,107,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
TITLE I. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR								
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION								
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION 1/								
Job training programs	7,866,000	7,528,000	7,871,000	7,871,000	+5,000	+343,000	---	D
Employment security	1,324,000	1,306,000	686,000	2,585,000	+1,261,000	+1,279,000	+1,899,000	D
Trust funds	(15,446,000)	(14,780,000)	(23,944,000)	(18,944,000)	(+3,498,000)	(+4,164,000)	(-5,000,000)	TF
Financial control and management systems	16,736,000	16,026,000	14,577,000	14,932,000	-1,804,000	-1,094,000	+355,000	D
Trust funds	(8,880,000)	(8,497,000)	(8,063,000)	(8,063,000)	(-817,000)	(-434,000)	---	TF
Executive direction and administration	3,182,000	3,045,000	3,188,000	3,188,000	+6,000	+143,000	---	D
Trust funds	(2,465,000)	(2,359,000)	(2,475,000)	(2,475,000)	(+10,000)	(+116,000)	---	TF
Regional operations	29,059,000	27,885,000	23,608,000	25,758,000	-3,301,000	-2,127,000	+2,150,000	D
Trust funds	(15,760,000)	(15,081,000)	(15,281,000)	(15,281,000)	(-479,000)	(+200,000)	---	TF
Apprenticeship services	12,813,000	12,260,000	13,029,000	13,029,000	+216,000	+769,000	---	D
Less work incentives 1/	-3,427,000	-3,427,000	---	---	+3,427,000	+3,427,000	---	D
Total, Program Administration	110,104,000	105,350,000	112,722,000	112,126,000	+2,022,000	+6,786,000	-596,000	
Federal funds	67,553,000	64,623,000	63,959,000	67,363,000	-190,000	+2,740,000	+4,404,000	
Trust funds	(42,551,000)	(40,717,000)	(49,763,000)	(44,763,000)	(+2,212,000)	(+4,046,000)	(-5,000,000)	
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES								
Grants to States:								
Block grant	1,863,151,000	1,783,085,000	1,820,000,000	1,820,000,000	-43,151,000	+36,915,000	---	D
Summer youth employment and training program: (Summer, 1987 and 1988)	664,549,000	635,976,000	428,000,000	664,549,000	---	+28,573,000	+236,549,000	D
Dislocated worker assistance	100,000,000	95,702,000	100,000,000	150,000,000	+50,000,000	+54,298,000	+50,000,000	D
Federally administered programs:								
Native Americans	62,243,000	59,567,000	60,060,000	60,060,000	-2,183,000	+493,000	---	D
Migrants and seasonal farmworkers	60,357,000	57,762,000	58,240,000	58,240,000	-2,117,000	+478,000	---	D
Job Corps	640,000,000	612,430,000	351,736,000	662,700,000	+22,700,000	+50,270,000	+310,964,000	D
Veterans' employment	9,667,000	9,251,000	10,494,000	10,494,000	+827,000	+1,243,000	---	D
National activities:								
Pilots and demonstrations	20,694,000	19,808,000	40,698,000	40,698,000	+20,000,000	+20,890,000	---	D
Research, demonstration and evaluation	14,361,000	13,743,000	25,190,000	25,190,000	+10,829,000	+11,447,000	---	D
Other	26,019,000	24,107,000	15,190,000	25,190,000	-829,000	+1,083,000	+10,000,000	D
Subtotal, National activities	61,078,000	57,658,000	81,078,000	91,078,000	+30,000,000	+33,420,000	+10,000,000	
Subtotal, Federal activities	833,345,000	796,718,000	561,608,000	882,572,000	+49,227,000	+85,854,000	+320,964,000	
Total, Job Training Partnership Act	3,461,045,000	3,311,481,000	2,909,608,000	3,517,121,000	+56,076,000	+205,640,000	+607,513,000	
Trade adjustment program activities	26,000,000	24,882,000	---	26,000,000	---	+1,118,000	+26,000,000	D
Total, Training and Employment Services	3,487,045,000	3,336,363,000	2,909,608,000	3,543,121,000	+56,076,000	+206,758,000	+633,513,000	
COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS	326,000,000	312,002,000	326,000,000	326,000,000	---	+13,998,000	---	D
FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES								
Trade adjustment assistance	5,000,000	5,000,000	---	114,000,000	+109,000,000	+109,000,000	+114,000,000	M
Unemployment assistance and payments under other Federal unemployment programs	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	---	M
Total, FUBA	10,000,000	10,000,000	4,000,000	118,000,000	+108,000,000	+108,000,000	+114,000,000	

1/ FY 1986 WIN funds considered under Dept. of Health and Human Services.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS								
Unemployment Compensation (Trust Funds):								
State Operations	(1,149,961,000)	(1,100,512,000)	(1,221,865,000)	(1,221,865,000)	(+71,904,000)	(+121,353,000)	---	TF
State integrity activities	(222,500,000)	(212,933,000)	(245,754,000)	(245,754,000)	(+23,254,000)	(+32,821,000)	---	TF
National Activities	(2,908,000)	(2,783,000)	(2,039,000)	(2,039,000)	(-869,000)	(-744,000)	---	TF
Contingency	(283,531,000)	(271,340,000)	(261,942,000)	(261,942,000)	(-21,589,000)	(-9,398,000)	---	TF
Subtotal, Unemployment Compensation(trust funds)	(1,658,900,000)	(1,587,568,000)	(1,731,600,000)	(1,731,600,000)	(+72,700,000)	(+144,032,000)	---	
Employment Service:								
Allotments to States:								
Federal funds	22,700,000	21,724,000	22,700,000	22,700,000	---	+976,000	---	D
Trust funds	(769,500,000)	(736,411,000)	(732,500,000)	(732,500,000)	(-37,000,000)	(-3,911,000)	---	TF
Subtotal	792,200,000	758,135,000	755,200,000	755,200,000	-37,000,000	-2,935,000	---	
National Activities:								
Federal funds	900,000	861,000	700,000	4,600,000	+3,700,000	+3,739,000	+3,900,000	D
Trust funds	(27,840,000)	(26,643,000)	(21,833,000)	(21,833,000)	(-6,007,000)	(-4,810,000)	---	TF
Subtotal, Employment Service	820,940,000	785,639,000	777,733,000	781,633,000	-39,307,000	-4,006,000	+3,900,000	
Federal funds	23,600,000	22,585,000	23,400,000	27,300,000	+3,700,000	+4,715,000	+3,900,000	
Trust funds	(797,340,000)	(763,054,000)	(754,333,000)	(754,333,000)	(-43,007,000)	(-8,721,000)	---	
Total, State Unempl. Ins. and Empl. Ser. Opers.	2,479,840,000	2,373,207,000	2,509,333,000	2,513,233,000	+33,393,000	+140,026,000	+3,900,000	
Federal Funds	23,600,000	22,585,000	23,400,000	27,300,000	+3,700,000	+4,715,000	+3,900,000	
Trust Funds	(2,456,240,000)	(2,350,622,000)	(2,485,933,000)	(2,485,933,000)	(+29,693,000)	(+135,311,000)	---	
ADVANCES TO UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS	465,000,000	464,785,000	413,000,000	---	-465,000,000	-464,785,000	-413,000,000	M
Total, Employment & Training Administration	6,877,989,000	6,601,697,000	6,271,663,000	6,612,480,000	-265,509,000	+10,783,000	+337,817,000	
Federal funds	4,379,198,000	4,210,358,000	3,738,967,000	4,081,784,000	-297,414,000	-128,574,000	+342,817,000	
Trust funds	(2,498,791,000)	(2,391,339,000)	(2,535,696,000)	(2,530,696,000)	(+31,905,000)	(+139,357,000)	(-5,000,000)	
LABOR - MANAGEMENT SERVICES								
SALARIES AND EXPENSES								
Labor-management relations service	4,755,000	4,551,000	4,904,000	4,904,000	+149,000	+353,000	---	D
Labor-management standards enforcement	23,670,000	22,652,000	23,735,000	23,735,000	+65,000	+1,083,000	---	D
Pension and welfare benefit programs	28,869,000	27,628,000	33,636,000	33,636,000	+4,767,000	+6,008,000	---	D
Total, LMS	57,294,000	54,831,000	62,275,000	62,275,000	+4,981,000	+7,444,000	---	
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION								
Program Administration (Trust Funds)	(32,753,000)	(31,345,000)	(36,874,000)	(36,874,000)	(+4,121,000)	(+5,529,000)	---	TF
EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION								
SALARIES AND EXPENSES								
Enforcement of wage and hour standards	73,251,000	71,590,000	76,058,000	76,058,000	+2,807,000	+4,468,000	---	D
Federal contractor EEO standards enforcement	45,355,000	43,993,000	45,935,000	46,935,000	+1,580,000	+2,942,000	+1,000,000	D
Federal programs for workers' compensation	58,717,000	54,085,000	58,105,000	58,105,000	-612,000	+4,020,000	---	D
Trust funds	(406,000)	(389,000)	(441,000)	(441,000)	(+35,000)	(+52,000)	---	TF
Executive direction and support services	12,015,000	11,492,000	12,611,000	12,611,000	+596,000	+1,119,000	---	D
Total, salaries and expenses	189,744,000	181,549,000	193,150,000	194,150,000	+4,406,000	+12,601,000	+1,000,000	
Federal funds	189,338,000	181,160,000	192,709,000	193,709,000	+4,371,000	+12,549,000	+1,000,000	
Trust funds	(406,000)	(389,000)	(441,000)	(441,000)	(+35,000)	(+52,000)	---	
SPECIAL BENEFITS								
Federal employees compensation act benefits	254,900,000	232,057,000	259,000,000	259,000,000	+4,100,000	+26,943,000	---	M
Longshore and harbor workers' benefits	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	---	---	---	M
Total, Special Benefits	259,500,000	236,657,000	263,600,000	263,600,000	+4,100,000	+26,943,000	---	

H R 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND								
Benefit payments and interest on advances	942 868,000	938,209,000	910,838,000	186,687,000	-756,181,000	-751,522,000	-724,151,000	M
Employment Standards Admin., salaries & expenses	25,380,000	24,284,000	25,826,000	25,826,000	+446,000	+1,542,000	---	M
Departmental Management, salaries and expenses	19,697,000	18,850,000	21,413,000	21,413,000	+1,716,000	+2,563,000	---	M
Departmental Management, inspector general	376,000	360,000	612,000	612,000	+236,000	+252,000	---	M
Subtotal, Black Lung Disabity. Trust Fund, apprn	988,321,000	981,703,000	958,689,000	234,538,000	-753,783,000	-747,165,000	-724,151,000	
Treasury administrative costs (indefinite)	756,000	756,000	756,000	756,000	---	---	---	M
Total, Employment Standards Administration	1,438,321,000	1,400,665,000	1,416,195,000	693,044,000	-745,277,000	-707,621,000	-723,151,000	
Federal funds	1,437,915,000	1,400,276,000	1,415,754,000	692,603,000	-745,312,000	-707,673,000	-723,151,000	
Trust funds	(406,000)	(389,000)	(441,000)	(441,000)	(+35,000)	(+52,000)	---	
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION								
SALARIES AND EXPENSES								
Safety and health standards	5,839,000	5,576,000	6,011,000	6,011,000	+172,000	+435,000	---	D
Enforcement:								
Federal Enforcement	86,727,000	85,634,000	90,198,000	90,198,000	+3,471,000	+4,564,000	---	D
State programs	53,021,000	50,741,000	54,921,000	54,921,000	+1,900,000	+4,180,000	---	D
Technical Support	13,133,000	12,547,000	14,658,000	14,658,000	+1,525,000	+2,111,000	---	D
Compliance Assistance	35,214,000	31,063,000	36,040,000	36,040,000	+826,000	+4,977,000	---	D
Safety and health statistics	17,975,000	17,200,000	18,609,000	18,609,000	+634,000	+1,409,000	---	D
Executive direction and administration	5,198,000	4,993,000	5,374,000	5,374,000	+176,000	+381,000	---	D
Total, OSHA	217,107,000	207,754,000	225,811,000	225,811,000	+8,704,000	+18,057,000	---	
MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION								
SALARIES AND EXPENSES								
Enforcement:								
Coal	75,587,000	72,301,000	78,528,000	78,528,000	+2,941,000	+6,227,000	---	D
Metal/nonmetal	30,582,000	29,266,000	30,698,000	30,698,000	+116,000	+1,432,000	---	D
Standards development	897,000	858,000	1,104,000	1,104,000	+207,000	+246,000	---	D
Assessments	1,755,000	1,680,000	1,835,000	1,835,000	+80,000	+155,000	---	D
Educational policy and development	11,629,000	11,129,000	11,686,000	11,686,000	+57,000	+557,000	---	D
Technical support	18,402,000	17,611,000	20,173,000	20,173,000	+1,771,000	+2,562,000	---	D
Program administration	12,394,000	11,879,000	12,456,000	12,456,000	+62,000	+577,000	---	D
Total, Mine Safety and Health Administration	151,246,000	144,724,000	156,480,000	156,480,000	+5,234,000	+11,756,000	---	
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS								
SALARIES AND EXPENSES								
Employment and Unemployment Statistics	55,417,000	53,034,000	52,303,000	58,433,000	+3,016,000	+5,399,000	+6,130,000	D
Labor Market Information (Trust Funds)	(36,309,000)	(34,748,000)	(36,506,000)	(37,872,000)	(+1,563,000)	(+3,124,000)	(+1,366,000)	TF
Prices and cost of living	50,650,000	48,467,000	52,997,000	53,358,000	+2,708,000	+4,891,000	+361,000	D
Wages and industrial relations	17,860,000	17,091,000	20,499,000	20,729,000	+2,869,000	+3,638,000	+230,000	D
Productivity and technology	4,911,000	4,699,000	5,038,000	5,104,000	+193,000	+405,000	+66,000	D
Economic growth and employment projections	3,197,000	3,059,000	3,035,000	3,067,000	-130,000	+8,000	+32,000	D
Executive direction and staff services	13,417,000	12,851,000	14,463,000	14,463,000	+1,046,000	+1,612,000	---	D
Consumer Price Index Revision	13,186,000	12,616,000	11,055,000	11,435,000	-1,751,000	-1,181,000	+380,000	D
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	194,947,000	186,565,000	195,896,000	204,461,000	+9,514,000	+17,896,000	+8,565,000	
Federal Funds	158,638,000	151,817,000	159,390,000	166,589,000	+7,951,000	+14,772,000	+7,199,000	
Trust Funds	(36,309,000)	(34,748,000)	(36,506,000)	(37,872,000)	(+1,563,000)	(+3,124,000)	(+1,366,000)	

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT								
SALARIES AND EXPENSES								
Executive direction	13,328,000	12,843,000	12,195,000	12,195,000	-1,133,000	-648,000	---	D
Legal services	39,878,000	38,163,000	41,003,000	41,003,000	+1,125,000	+2,840,000	---	D
Trust funds	(252,000)	(241,000)	(263,000)	(263,000)	(+11,000)	(+22,000)	---	TF
International labor affairs	4,220,000	4,039,000	4,388,000	4,388,000	+168,000	+349,000	---	D
Administration and management	21,796,000	20,858,000	24,038,000	24,038,000	+2,242,000	+3,180,000	---	D
Adjudication	11,124,000	10,646,000	10,843,000	10,843,000	-281,000	+197,000	---	D
Promoting employment of the handicapped	2,136,000	2,044,000	2,408,000	2,408,000	+272,000	+364,000	---	D
Women's Bureau	5,441,000	5,207,000	5,785,000	5,785,000	+344,000	+578,000	---	D
Civil Rights Activities	3,383,000	3,237,000	3,192,000	3,192,000	-191,000	-45,000	---	D
Total, Salaries and expenses	101,558,000	97,278,000	104,115,000	104,115,000	+2,557,000	+6,837,000	---	
Federal funds	101,306,000	97,037,000	103,852,000	103,852,000	+2,546,000	+6,815,000	---	
Trust funds	(252,000)	(241,000)	(263,000)	(263,000)	(+11,000)	(+22,000)	---	
VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING								
State Administration:								
Disabled Veterans Outreach Program	(64,903,000)	(62,112,000)	(69,450,000)	(69,450,000)	(+4,547,000)	(+7,338,000)	---	TF
Local Veterans Employment Program	(55,073,000)	(52,705,000)	(48,947,000)	(56,932,000)	(+1,859,000)	(+4,227,000)	(+7,985,000)	TF
Subtotal, State Administration	(119,976,000)	(114,817,000)	(118,397,000)	(126,382,000)	(+6,406,000)	(+11,565,000)	(+7,985,000)	
Federal Administration	(12,999,000)	(12,440,000)	(13,128,000)	(13,128,000)	(+129,000)	(+688,000)	---	TF
Total, Trust Funds	(132,975,000)	(127,257,000)	(131,525,000)	(139,510,000)	(+6,535,000)	(+12,253,000)	(+7,985,000)	
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL								
Audit:								
Federal funds	20,393,000	19,471,000	19,233,000	19,233,000	-1,160,000	-238,000	---	D
Trust funds	(2,704,000)	(2,590,000)	(4,792,000)	(4,792,000)	(+2,088,000)	(+2,202,000)	---	TF
Investigation:								
Federal funds	6,351,000	6,102,000	5,566,000	5,566,000	-785,000	-536,000	---	D
Trust funds	(527,000)	(502,000)	(1,248,000)	(1,248,000)	(+721,000)	(+746,000)	---	TF
Office of Labor Racketeering	6,675,000	6,403,000	6,323,000	6,323,000	-352,000	-80,000	---	D
Executive Direction and Administration	5,045,000	4,834,000	3,711,000	3,711,000	-1,334,000	-1,123,000	---	D
Total, Office of the Inspector General	41,695,000	39,902,000	40,873,000	40,873,000	-822,000	+971,000	---	
Federal funds	38,464,000	36,810,000	34,833,000	34,833,000	-3,631,000	-1,977,000	---	
Trust funds	(3,231,000)	(3,092,000)	(6,040,000)	(6,040,000)	(+2,809,000)	(+2,948,000)	---	
SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM	47,000	45,000	67,000	67,000	+20,000	+22,000	---	D
Total, Departmental Management	276,275,000	264,482,000	276,580,000	284,565,000	+8,290,000	+20,083,000	+7,985,000	
Federal funds	139,817,000	133,892,000	138,752,000	138,752,000	-1,065,000	+4,860,000	---	
Trust funds	(136,458,000)	(130,590,000)	(137,828,000)	(145,813,000)	(+9,355,000)	(+15,223,000)	(+7,985,000)	
Total, Labor Department	9,245,932,000	8,892,063,000	8,644,774,000	8,275,990,000	-969,942,000	-616,073,000	-368,784,000	
Federal funds	6,541,215,000	6,303,652,000	5,897,429,000	5,524,294,000	-1,016,921,000	-779,358,000	-373,135,000	
Trust funds	(2,704,717,000)	(2,588,411,000)	(2,747,345,000)	(2,751,696,000)	(+46,979,000)	(+163,285,000)	(+4,351,000)	

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
TITLE II--DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION								
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES								
Health Care Delivery and Assistance:								
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant	478,000,000	457,446,000	478,000,000	478,000,000	---	+20,554,000	---	D
Community health centers	400,000,000	396,000,000	375,000,000	400,000,000	---	+4,000,000	+25,000,000	D
Migrant health	45,400,000	44,946,000	44,300,000	45,400,000	---	+454,000	+1,100,000	D
Black lung clinics	3,400,000	3,254,000	3,300,000	3,400,000	---	+146,000	+100,000	D
Family planning (unauthorized)	(142,500,000)	(136,372,000)	(142,500,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
National Health Service Corps (unauthorized)	(58,313,000)	(55,797,000)	(46,996,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Direct loans (non-add) (unauthorized)	(1,000,000)	(957,000)	(1,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	NA
Home health demonstrations and training	1,500,000	1,435,000	---	---	-1,500,000	-1,435,000	---	D
Hansen's disease services (Carville)	19,103,000	18,282,000	19,103,000	19,103,000	---	+821,000	---	D
Payment to Hawaii for treatment of Hansen's Dis.	3,300,000	3,158,000	2,500,000	3,300,000	---	+142,000	+800,000	D
Pediatric emergency care	---	2,000,000	---	---	---	-2,000,000	---	D
Total, Health Care Delivery & Assistance	950,703,000	926,521,000	922,203,000	949,203,000	-1,500,000	+22,682,000	+27,000,000	
Health Professions:								
Health professions student assistance:								
National Health Service Scholarships (unauth).	(2,300,000)	(2,201,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Exceptional need scholarships	7,000,000	6,699,000	---	7,000,000	---	+301,000	+7,000,000	D
Health professions institutional assistance:								
Financial distress	4,100,000	3,924,000	---	3,800,000	-300,000	-124,000	+3,800,000	D
Public health/health administration:								
Public Health capitation	5,000,000	4,785,000	---	5,000,000	---	+215,000	+5,000,000	D
Health Administration grants	1,500,000	1,436,000	---	1,500,000	---	+64,000	+1,500,000	D
Public Health traineeships	3,000,000	2,871,000	---	3,000,000	---	+129,000	+3,000,000	D
Health Administration traineeships	500,000	479,000	---	500,000	---	+21,000	+500,000	D
Preventive medicine residencies	1,600,000	1,531,000	---	1,600,000	---	+69,000	+1,600,000	D
Subtotal, PH/HA	11,600,000	11,102,000	---	11,600,000	---	+498,000	+11,600,000	
Family Med/Gen Dentistry res. & trns	35,960,000	34,412,000	---	35,960,000	---	+1,548,000	+35,960,000	D
General Internal Medicine and Pediatrics	18,500,000	17,704,000	---	18,500,000	---	+796,000	+18,500,000	D
Family medicine departments	7,000,000	6,699,000	---	7,000,000	---	+301,000	+7,000,000	D
Physician assistants	4,800,000	4,594,000	---	4,800,000	---	+206,000	+4,800,000	D
Area health education centers	17,955,000	17,181,000	---	17,955,000	---	+774,000	+17,955,000	D
Health professions data analysis	2,000,000	1,914,000	---	2,000,000	---	+86,000	+2,000,000	D
Disadvantaged Assistance	25,500,000	24,403,000	---	26,500,000	+1,000,000	+2,097,000	+26,500,000	D
Health professions spec ed initiatives 1/	8,000,000	7,656,000	---	7,500,000	-500,000	-156,000	+7,500,000	D
Two year medical schools	500,000	479,000	---	500,000	---	+21,000	+500,000	D
Nurse training:								
Advanced nurse training	16,500,000	15,790,000	---	16,500,000	---	+710,000	+16,500,000	D
Nurse practitioner	12,000,000	11,484,000	---	12,000,000	---	+516,000	+12,000,000	D
Special projects	9,500,000	9,092,000	---	9,500,000	---	+408,000	+9,500,000	D
Traineeships	11,500,000	11,005,000	---	11,500,000	---	+495,000	+11,500,000	D
Nurse Anesthetists	800,000	766,000	---	800,000	---	+34,000	+800,000	D
Special projects for new purposes	1,350,000	1,292,000	---	1,350,000	---	+58,000	+1,350,000	D
Faculty fellowships	550,000	526,000	---	550,000	---	+24,000	+550,000	D
Natl Center for Nursing Research: 2/								
Research grants	9,700,000	9,283,000	---	14,700,000	+5,000,000	+5,417,000	+14,700,000	D
Fellowships	2,000,000	1,914,000	---	2,000,000	---	+86,000	+2,000,000	D
Subtotal, Natl Center for Nursing Research	11,700,000	11,197,000	---	16,700,000	+5,000,000	+5,503,000	+16,700,000	
Subtotal, Nurse training	63,900,000	61,152,000	---	68,900,000	+5,000,000	+7,748,000	+68,900,000	
Total, Health professions	206,815,000	197,919,000	---	212,015,000	+5,200,000	+14,096,000	+212,015,000	

1/ Includes geriatrics
2/ To be transferred to NIH; $5 million initial appropriation provided in FY85 to remain available through FY86.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
HMO and Resources Development:								
Health Planning	28,106,000	26,897,000	---	---	-28,106,000	-26,897,000	---	D
Organ transplants	3,000,000	2,871,000	---	6,800,000	+3,800,000	+3,929,000	+6,800,000	D
Disaster construction grants	5,000,000	4,785,000	---	---	-5,000,000	-4,785,000	---	D
Health teaching facilities	1,200,000	1,148,000	---	---	-1,200,000	-1,148,000	---	D
Total, HMO & Resources Development	37,306,000	35,701,000	---	6,800,000	-30,506,000	-28,901,000	+6,800,000	
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)	---	---	---	1,900,000	+1,900,000	+1,900,000	+1,900,000	D
Buildings and facilities	750,000	718,000	750,000	750,000	---	+32,000	---	D
Program management / Program support, HRSA 1/	98,962,000	94,707,000	60,221,000	96,400,000	-2,562,000	+1,693,000	+36,179,000	D
User fees	---	---	-10,000,000	---	---	---	+10,000,000	D
Total, Health Resources and Services	1,294,536,000	1,255,566,000	973,174,000	1,267,068,000	-27,468,000	+11,502,000	+293,894,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(203,113,000)	(194,370,000)	(189,496,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND	25,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	---	M
HMO LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE FUND:								
Loan disbursements (non-add)	(700,000)	(700,000)	---	---	(-700,000)	(-700,000)	---	NA
HEAL loan guarantees (non-add) 2/	(275,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(290,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+190,000,000)	NA
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL								
DISEASE CONTROL								
Preventive Health Services Block Grant	91,483,000	87,549,000	89,525,000	89,525,000	-1,958,000	+1,976,000	---	D
Prevention centers	1,500,000	1,436,000	---	1,500,000	---	+64,000	+1,500,000	D
Sexually transmitted diseases:								
Grants	46,511,000	44,511,000	45,510,000	56,511,000	+10,000,000	+12,000,000	+11,001,000	D
Direct operations	9,774,000	9,354,000	9,943,000	9,943,000	+169,000	+589,000	---	D
Subtotal	56,285,000	53,865,000	55,453,000	66,454,000	+10,169,000	+12,589,000	+11,001,000	
Immunization:								
Grants	47,359,000	45,323,000	47,666,000	57,666,000	+10,307,000	+12,343,000	+10,000,000	D
Direct operations	8,093,000	7,739,000	8,346,000	8,346,000	+253,000	+607,000	---	D
Vaccine stockpile	4,000,000	3,828,000	---	4,000,000	---	+172,000	+4,000,000	D
Subtotal	59,452,000	56,890,000	56,012,000	70,012,000	+10,560,000	+13,122,000	+14,000,000	
Infectious disease (including AIDS)	101,655,000	97,292,000	81,767,000	123,365,000	+21,710,000	+26,073,000	+41,598,000	D
Tuberculosis grants	5,000,000	4,785,000	---	7,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,215,000	+7,000,000	D
Chronic & environmental disease prevention	30,373,000	29,065,000	24,425,000	30,425,000	+52,000	+1,360,000	+6,000,000	D
Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH):								
Research	58,702,000	56,168,000	60,036,000	60,036,000	+1,334,000	+3,868,000	---	D
Training	8,760,000	8,383,000	---	9,900,000	+1,140,000	+1,517,000	+9,900,000	D
Subtotal, NIOSH	67,462,000	64,551,000	60,036,000	69,936,000	+2,474,000	+5,385,000	+9,900,000	
Epidemic services	51,281,000	49,074,000	53,131,000	53,131,000	+1,850,000	+4,057,000	---	D
Buildings and facilities	3,797,000	3,634,000	1,810,000	3,810,000	+13,000	+176,000	+2,000,000	D
Program management	3,092,000	2,959,000	3,096,000	3,096,000	+4,000	+137,000	---	D
Less prior year budget authority	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	---	---	+10,000,000	+10,000,000	---	D
Total, Disease Control	461,380,000	441,100,000	425,255,000	518,254,000	+56,874,000	+77,154,000	+92,999,000	

1/ Includes funds for HMO and nursing programs to be transferred in FY 1987.

2/ Authorization ceiling.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH								
National Cancer Institute	1,223,206,000	1,176,561,000	1,158,089,000	1,346,751,000	+123,545,000	+170,190,000	+188,662,000	D
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	847,370,000	810,905,000	785,697,000	921,410,000	+74,040,000	+110,505,000	+135,713,000	D
National Institute of Dental Research	102,523,000	98,111,000	96,482,000	116,275,000	+13,752,000	+18,164,000	+19,793,000	D
National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive, and Kidney Diseases	452,181,000	433,519,000	418,971,000	515,455,000	+63,274,000	+81,936,000	+96,484,000	D
National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke	431,594,000	413,024,000	399,351,000	491,085,000	+59,491,000	+78,061,000	+91,734,000	D
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	356,164,000	340,840,000	330,551,000	403,853,000	+47,689,000	+63,013,000	+73,302,000	D
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	514,528,000	492,393,000	471,533,000	576,562,000	+62,034,000	+84,169,000	+105,029,000	D
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	321,581,000	307,743,000	309,119,000	368,509,000	+46,928,000	+60,766,000	+59,390,000	D
National Eye Institute	194,893,000	186,508,000	179,201,000	219,091,000	+24,198,000	+32,583,000	+39,890,000	D
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	197,379,000	188,887,000	187,995,000	209,872,000	+12,493,000	+20,985,000	+21,877,000	D
National Institute on Aging	156,352,000	149,623,000	145,829,000	174,279,000	+17,927,000	+24,656,000	+28,450,000	D
National Institute of Arthritis and Musculosketal and Skin Diseases	116,543,000	110,723,000	106,733,000	140,225,000	+23,682,000	+29,502,000	+33,492,000	D
Research Resources	303,822,000	290,752,000	234,192,000	317,826,000	+14,004,000	+27,074,000	+83,634,000	D
John E. Fogarty International Center	11,390,000	10,893,000	11,305,000	11,443,000	+53,000	+550,000	+138,000	D
National Library of Medicine	57,759,000	55,273,000	56,408,000	61,588,000	+3,829,000	+6,315,000	+5,180,000	D
Office of the Director (including AIDS)	187,715,000	179,643,000	179,691,000	246,651,000	+58,936,000	+67,008,000	+66,960,000	D
Buildings and facilities	14,898,000	14,257,000	8,000,000	31,900,000	+17,002,000	+17,643,000	+23,900,000	D
Total, National Institutes of Health	5,489,898,000	5,259,655,000	5,079,147,000	6,152,775,000	+662,877,000	+893,120,000	+1,073,628,000	
ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION								
ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH								
Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant	490,000,000	468,930,000	490,000,000	490,000,000	---	+21,070,000	---	D
Mental Health:								
Community Support Program, (CSP)	12,500,000	11,962,000	---	15,000,000	+2,500,000	+3,038,000	+15,000,000	D
Research	209,480,000	200,444,000	194,890,000	229,000,000	+19,520,000	+28,556,000	+34,110,000	D
Research training	18,000,000	17,225,000	15,847,000	18,000,000	---	+775,000	+2,153,000	D
Clinical training	20,000,000	19,140,000	---	10,000,000	-10,000,000	-9,140,000	+10,000,000	D
Protection and advocacy	10,000,000	9,570,000	---	10,300,000	+300,000	+730,000	+10,300,000	D
Direct operations	33,266,000	31,836,000	31,749,000	33,266,000	---	+1,430,000	+1,517,000	D
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)	5,279,000	5,051,000	6,169,000	13,859,000	+8,580,000	+8,808,000	+7,690,000	D
Subtotal, mental health	308,525,000	295,228,000	248,655,000	329,425,000	+20,900,000	+34,197,000	+80,770,000	
Drug Abuse:								
Research (unauthorized) 1/	(68,181,000)	(65,238,000)	(67,405,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Research training	1,500,000	1,436,000	1,355,000	1,500,000	---	+64,000	+145,000	D
Direct operations	14,437,000	13,816,000	14,183,000	14,437,000	---	+621,000	+254,000	D
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)	7,425,000	7,107,000	7,564,000	31,324,000	+23,899,000	+24,217,000	+23,760,000	D
Subtotal, drug abuse	23,362,000	22,359,000	23,102,000	47,261,000	+23,899,000	+24,902,000	+24,159,000	
Alcoholism:								
Research (unauthorized)	(56,822,000)	(54,371,000)	(56,618,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Research training	1,500,000	1,436,000	1,327,000	1,500,000	---	+64,000	+173,000	D
Direct operations	11,658,000	11,157,000	10,876,000	11,658,000	---	+501,000	+782,000	D
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)	---	---	---	2,370,000	+2,370,000	+2,370,000	+2,370,000	D
Subtotal, alcoholism	13,158,000	12,593,000	12,203,000	15,528,000	+2,370,000	+2,935,000	+3,325,000	
Buildings and facilities	100,000	96,000	600,000	600,000	+500,000	+504,000	---	D
Program management, ADAMHA	7,620,000	7,292,000	7,390,000	7,620,000	---	+328,000	+230,000	D
Prevention initiative (sec.301)	---	---	---	3,000,000	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	D
Total, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health	842,765,000	806,498,000	781,950,000	893,434,000	+50,669,000	+86,936,000	+111,484,000	
(Unauthorized)	(125,003,000)	(119,609,000)	(124,023,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
ST. ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL:								
Total obligations	132,845,000	128,049,000	136,754,000	136,754,000	+3,909,000	+8,705,000	---	D
Less reimbursements	-89,227,000	-86,310,000	-100,401,000	-100,401,000	-11,174,000	-14,091,000	---	D
Subtotal, St. Elizabeth's Hospital	43,618,000	41,739,000	36,353,000	36,353,000	-7,265,000	-5,386,000	---	
Total, ADAMHA	886,383,000	848,237,000	818,303,000	929,787,000	+43,404,000	+81,550,000	+111,484,000	

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE MANAGEMENT								
Health Services Research and Technology Assessment:								
Research	14,757,000	14,120,000	17,116,000	17,116,000	+2,359,000	+2,996,000	---	D
Trust funds	(1,050,000)	(1,050,000)	(1,050,000)	(1,050,000)	---	---	---	TF
Program support	1,638,000	1,568,000	1,663,000	1,568,000	-70,000	---	-95,000	D
Subtotal	17,445,000	16,738,000	19,829,000	19,734,000	+2,289,000	+2,996,000	-95,000	
Health Statistics:								
Program operations	43,378,000	41,508,000	46,825,000	50,094,000	+6,716,000	+8,586,000	+3,269,000	D
Program support	3,193,000	3,056,000	3,193,000	3,056,000	-137,000	---	-137,000	D
Subtotal	46,571,000	44,564,000	50,018,000	53,150,000	+6,579,000	+8,586,000	+3,132,000	
Adolescent family life (unauthorized)	(14,610,000)	(13,978,000)	(14,722,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Smoking and health	3,352,000	3,201,000	3,471,000	3,471,000	+119,000	+270,000	---	D
Health promotion	2,900,000	2,771,000	2,973,000	3,541,000	+641,000	+770,000	+568,000	D
Physical fitness and sports	1,363,000	1,304,000	1,361,000	1,361,000	-2,000	+57,000	---	D
Health Service Management	18,510,000	17,714,000	18,736,000	17,714,000	-796,000	---	-1,022,000	D
AIDS coordinator	---	---	1,350,000	1,350,000	+1,350,000	+1,350,000	---	D
Total, PHS management	89,091,000	85,242,000	96,688,000	99,271,000	+10,180,000	+14,029,000	+2,583,000	
PRIORITY DISEASE CONTROL AND RESEARCH PROJECTS (AIDS) (NON-ADD) 1/								
Health Resources and Services Administration	---	---	---	(1,900,000)	(+1,900,000)	(+1,900,000)	(+1,900,000)	
Centers for Disease Control	(64,925,000)	(62,133,000)	(45,409,000)	(87,007,000)	(+22,082,000)	(+24,874,000)	(+41,598,000)	
National Institutes of Health	(140,723,000)	(134,672,000)	(142,990,000)	(198,943,000)	(+58,220,000)	(+64,271,000)	(+55,953,000)	
National Institute of Mental Health	(5,279,000)	(5,051,000)	(6,169,000)	(13,859,000)	(+8,580,000)	(+8,808,000)	(+7,690,000)	
National Institute on Drug Abuse	(7,425,000)	(7,107,000)	(7,564,000)	(31,324,000)	(+23,899,000)	(+24,217,000)	(+23,760,000)	
National Institute of Alcohol & Alcohol Abuse	---	---	---	(2,370,000)	(+2,370,000)	(+2,370,000)	(+2,370,000)	
Office of Assistant Secretary for Health	---	---	(1,350,000)	(1,350,000)	(+1,350,000)	(+1,350,000)	---	
General Departmental Management	(16,000,000)	(15,312,000)	---	---	(-16,000,000)	(-15,312,000)	---	
Total, Priority disease control & res. proj.	(234,352,000)	(224,275,000)	(203,482,000)	(336,753,000)	(+102,401,000)	(+112,478,000)	(+133,271,000)	
RETIREMENT PAY AND MED. BENEFITS FOR COMM. OFFICERS								
Retirement payments	70,169,000	67,996,000	70,060,000	70,060,000	-109,000	+2,064,000	---	M
COLA	---	---	2,222,000	2,222,000	+2,222,000	+2,222,000	---	M
Survivors benefits	3,564,000	3,450,000	3,671,000	3,671,000	+107,000	+221,000	---	M
Dependent's medical care	9,781,000	9,360,000	10,329,000	10,329,000	+548,000	+969,000	---	M
Reserve Fund	---	---	5,000,000	---	---	---	-5,000,000	M
Total, Retirement pay and medical benefits	83,514,000	80,806,000	91,282,000	86,282,000	+2,768,000	+5,476,000	-5,000,000	
Total, Public Health Service	8,329,802,000	7,995,606,000	7,503,849,000	9,073,437,000	+743,635,000	+1,077,831,000	+1,569,588,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(342,726,000)	(327,957,000)	(328,241,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION								
GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID								
Medicaid current law benefits	22,650,284,000	22,650,284,000	24,532,467,000	24,532,467,000	+1,882,183,000	+1,882,183,000	---	M
State and local administration	1,247,716,000	1,247,716,000	1,347,892,000	1,347,892,000	+100,176,000	+100,176,000	---	M
Subtotal, current law	23,898,000,000	23,898,000,000	25,880,359,000	25,880,359,000	+1,982,359,000	+1,982,359,000	---	
Legislative proposals	---	---	-1,172,237,000	---	---	---	+1,172,237,000	M
Total, MEDICAID current year program level	23,898,000,000	23,898,000,000	24,708,122,000	25,880,359,000	+1,982,359,000	+1,982,359,000	+1,172,237,000	

1/ Requested in consolidated account not approved by the Committee.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
Less funds advanced in prior year	-5,980,000,000	-5,980,000,000	-6,500,000,000	-6,500,000,000	-520,000,000	-520,000,000	---	M
Indefinite such sums	542,484,000	542,484,000	---	---	-542,484,000	-542,484,000	---	M
Total appropriation, current request	18,460,484,000	18,460,484,000	18,208,122,000	19,380,359,000	+919,875,000	+919,875,000	+1,172,237,000	
Subsequent year advance appropriation	6,500,000,000	6,500,000,000	7,100,000,000	7,100,000,000	+600,000,000	+600,000,000	---	M
PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS								
Supplemental medical insurance	18,197,000,000	18,197,000,000	19,816,000,000	20,285,000,000	+2,088,000,000	+2,088,000,000	+469,000,000	M
Military Service Credits	91,000,000	91,000,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	---	M
Hospital insurance for uninsured	554,000,000	554,000,000	435,000,000	435,000,000	-119,000,000	-119,000,000	---	M
Federal uninsured payment	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	---	---	---	M
Total, Payment to Trust Funds	18,854,000,000	18,854,000,000	20,357,000,000	20,826,000,000	+1,972,000,000	+1,972,000,000	+469,000,000	
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT								
Research, demonstration, and evaluation:								
Federal funds	15,900,000	15,212,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-5,900,000	-5,212,000	---	D
Trust funds	(14,750,000)	(14,120,000)	(8,500,000)	(18,000,000)	(+3,250,000)	(+3,880,000)	(+9,500,000)	TF
Subtotal, Research and evaluation	30,650,000	29,332,000	18,500,000	28,000,000	-2,650,000	-1,332,000	+9,500,000	
Medicare Contractors (Trust Funds):								
Operating funds	(1,041,500,000)	(1,000,069,000)	(956,800,000)	(1,087,000,000)	(+45,500,000)	(+86,931,000)	(+130,200,000)	TF
Contingency fund	(15,000,000)	(14,355,000)	(50,000,000)	(15,000,000)	---	(+645,000)	(-35,000,000)	TF
Subtotal, Contractors	(1,056,500,000)	(1,014,424,000)	(1,006,800,000)	(1,102,000,000)	(+45,500,000)	(+87,576,000)	(+95,200,000)	
Less P.L. 99-272 funds	(-78,000,000)	(-78,000,000)	---	(-105,000,000)	(-27,000,000)	(-27,000,000)	(-105,000,000)	TF
State Certification:								
Medicare certification, trust funds	(48,434,000)	(46,353,000)	(53,475,000)	(53,475,000)	(+5,041,000)	(+7,122,000)	---	TF
General program support, federal funds	3,250,000	3,108,000	3,525,000	3,525,000	+275,000	+417,000	---	D
End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) Networks (trust funds)	(4,837,000)	(4,629,000)	(1,000,000)	(3,850,000)	(-987,000)	(-779,000)	(+2,850,000)	TF
Federal Administration:								
Federal funds	70,170,000	67,150,000	71,008,000	71,008,000	+838,000	+3,858,000	---	D
Trust funds	(144,898,000)	(138,670,000)	(144,169,000)	(144,169,000)	(-729,000)	(+5,499,000)	---	TF
Subtotal, Federal Administration	215,068,000	205,820,000	215,177,000	215,177,000	+109,000	+9,357,000	---	
Total, Program management	1,280,739,000	1,225,666,000	1,298,477,000	1,301,027,000	+20,288,000	+75,361,000	+2,550,000	
Federal funds	89,320,000	85,470,000	84,533,000	84,533,000	-4,787,000	-937,000	---	
Trust funds	(1,191,419,000)	(1,140,196,000)	(1,213,944,000)	(1,216,494,000)	(+25,075,000)	(+76,298,000)	(+2,550,000)	
Total, Health Care Financing Administration:								
Federal funds:								
Current year	37,403,804,000	37,399,954,000	38,649,655,000	40,290,892,000	+2,887,088,000	+2,890,938,000	+1,641,237,000	
Subsequent year advance	6,500,000,000	6,500,000,000	7,100,000,000	7,100,000,000	+600,000,000	+600,000,000	---	
Trust funds	(1,191,419,000)	(1,140,196,000)	(1,213,944,000)	(1,216,494,000)	(+25,075,000)	(+76,298,000)	(+2,550,000)	
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION								
PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS	497,008,000	497,008,000	500,555,000	500,555,000	+3,547,000	+3,547,000	---	M

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS								
Benefit payments	991,389,000	991,389,000	957,000,000	957,000,000	-34,389,000	-34,389,000	---	M
Administration	6,519,000	6,239,000	6,437,000	6,437,000	-82,000	+198,000	---	M
Subtotal Black Lung. program level	997,908,000	997,628,000	963,437,000	963,437,000	-34,471,000	-34,191,000	---	
Less funds advanced in prior year	-270,000,000	-270,000,000	-270,000,000	-270,000,000	---	---	---	M
Indefinite such sums	12,341,000	12,341,000	---	---	-12,341,000	-12,341,000	---	M
Apprn available in prior year	-11,730,000	-11,730,000	---	---	+11,730,000	+11,730,000	---	M
Total Black Lung. current request	728,519,000	728,239,000	693,437,000	693,437,000	-35,082,000	-34,802,000	---	
Subsequent year advance appropriation	270,000,000	270,000,000	252,450,000	252,450,000	-17,550,000	-17,550,000	---	M
SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME 1/								
Federal benefit payments	9,040,551,000	9,040,551,000	9,589,000,000	9,589,000,000	+548,449,000	+548,449,000	---	M
Beneficiary services	6,800,000	6,800,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	+1,400,000	+1,400,000	---	M
Administration	1,010,507,000	977,838,000	972,118,000	972,118,000	-38,389,000	-5,720,000	---	M
Subtotal Supplemental Security Income. program.	10,057,858,000	10,025,189,000	10,569,318,000	10,569,318,000	+511,460,000	+544,129,000	---	
Less funds advanced in prior year	-2,345,769,000	-2,345,769,000	-2,339,250,000	-2,339,250,000	+6,519,000	+6,519,000	---	M
Indefinite such sums	253,545,000	253,545,000	---	---	-253,545,000	-253,545,000	---	M
Apprn available in prior year	-409,194,000	-409,194,000	---	---	+409,194,000	+409,194,000	---	M
Total SSI. current request	7,556,440,000	7,523,771,000	8,230,068,000	8,230,068,000	+673,628,000	+706,297,000	---	
Subsequent year advance appropriation	2,339,250,000	2,339,250,000	2,765,000,000	2,765,000,000	+425,750,000	+425,750,000	---	M
ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS								
Current Law								
Maintenance assistance:								
AFDC:								
Benefit payments	8,204,153,000	8,204,153,000	8,441,805,000	8,441,805,000	+237,652,000	+237,652,000	---	M
Error rate sanctions	---	---	-777,200,000	---	---	---	+777,200,000	M
Child support enforcement collections	-386,000,000	-386,000,000	-417,000,000	-417,000,000	-31,000,000	-31,000,000	---	M
Subtotal. AFDC.	7,818,153,000	7,818,153,000	7,247,605,000	8,024,805,000	+206,652,000	+206,652,000	+777,200,000	
Adult categories	13,368,000	13,368,000	13,368,000	13,368,000	---	---	---	M
Emergency assistance	80,500,000	80,500,000	81,900,000	81,900,000	+1,400,000	+1,400,000	---	M
State and local administration and training	998,084,000	998,084,000	1,054,584,000	1,054,584,000	+56,500,000	+56,500,000	---	M
Administration and training-jurisdictions	6,616,000	6,616,000	6,616,000	6,616,000	---	---	---	M
Repatriation	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---	M
Subtotal. maintenance assistance	8,917,721,000	8,917,721,000	8,405,073,000	9,182,273,000	+264,552,000	+264,552,000	+777,200,000	
Research & evaluation	2,925,000	2,799,000	2,925,000	2,925,000	---	+126,000	---	M
Federal administration	33,737,000	32,278,000	31,976,000	31,976,000	-1,761,000	-302,000	---	M
Subtotal current law	8,954,383,000	8,952,798,000	8,439,974,000	9,217,174,000	+262,791,000	+264,376,000	+777,200,000	

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
Legislative proposals								
Reform welfare administration	---	---	-15,000,000	---	---	---	+15,000,000	M
Workfare benefits	---	---	-252,000,000	---	---	---	+252,000,000	M
Workfare administration	---	---	200,000,000	---	---	---	-200,000,000	M
End parents' benefit/Essential person limit	---	---	-101,000,000	---	---	---	+101,000,000	M
Limit assist to minor mothers not living w/parents	---	---	-20,000,000	---	---	---	+20,000,000	M
18 mo. all RCA/RMA refugee program	---	---	-48,742,000	---	---	---	+48,742,000	M
Subtotal, Legislative proposals	---	---	-236,742,000	---	---	---	+236,742,000	
Total, net of legislative proposals	8,954,383,000	8,952,798,000	8,203,232,000	9,217,174,000	+262,791,000	+264,376,000	+1,013,942,000	
Less funds advanced in previous years	-2,095,000,000	-2,095,000,000	-2,193,754,000	-2,193,754,000	-98,754,000	-98,754,000	---	M
Indefinite such sums	950,486,000	950,486,000	---	---	-950,486,000	-950,486,000	---	M
Appropriation available in prior year	-908,910,000	-908,910,000	---	---	+908,910,000	+908,910,000	---	M
Total, Assistance payments, current request	6,900,959,000	6,899,374,000	6,009,478,000	7,023,420,000	+122,461,000	+124,046,000	+1,013,942,000	
Subsequent year advance appropriation	2,193,754,000	2,193,754,000	2,293,615,000	2,293,615,000	+99,861,000	+99,861,000	---	M
LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE (Unauthorized, not considered)								
Energy Assistance Block Grant	(2,097,765,000)	(2,007,561,000)	(2,097,642,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Federal Administration	(2,235,000)	(2,139,000)	(2,358,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Subtotal, Energy assistance	(2,100,000,000)	(2,009,700,000)	(2,100,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE (Unauthorized, not considered)								
Cash and medical assistance	(235,440,000)	(225,316,000)	(195,409,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
State administration	(35,316,000)	(33,797,000)	(35,369,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Social services	(71,700,000)	(68,617,000)	(46,803,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Voluntary agency program	(4,000,000)	(3,828,000)	(1,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Education assistance for children	(16,600,000)	(15,886,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Preventive health	(8,400,000)	(8,039,000)	(10,355,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Targeted assistance	(50,000,000)	(47,850,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Federal Administration	(6,305,000)	(6,030,000)	(6,083,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Legislative proposals	---	---	(78,979,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Total, Refugee Resettlement	(427,761,000)	(409,363,000)	(373,998,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES (Trust Funds)	(3,992,220,000)	(3,847,863,000)	(4,011,373,000)	(4,000,373,000)	(+8,153,000)	(+152,510,000)	(-11,000,000)	TF
Total, Social Security Administration:								
Federal funds:								
Current year	15,682,926,000	15,648,392,000	15,433,538,000	16,447,480,000	+764,554,000	+799,088,000	+1,013,942,000	
Subsequent year advance appropriations	4,803,004,000	4,803,004,000	5,311,065,000	5,311,065,000	+508,061,000	+508,061,000	---	
Trust funds	(3,992,220,000)	(3,847,863,000)	(4,011,373,000)	(4,000,373,000)	(+8,153,000)	(+152,510,000)	(-11,000,000)	
CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT								
Program level, current law	592,484,000	559,356,000	770,383,000	770,383,000	+177,899,000	+211,027,000	---	M
Less funds advanced in previous years	-160,000,000	-160,000,000	-170,750,000	-170,750,000	-10,750,000	-10,750,000	---	M
Indefinite such sums	26,729,000	26,729,000	---	---	-26,729,000	-26,729,000	---	M
Current request, Child Support Enforcement 1/	459,213,000	426,085,000	599,633,000	599,633,000	+140,420,000	+173,548,000	---	
Subsequent year advance appropriation	170,750,000	170,750,000	187,000,000	187,000,000	+16,250,000	+16,250,000	---	M

1/ President's budget proposes savings of $41 mil. for later transmittal.

71-059 O-87-15 (Pt. 13)

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES								
SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (TITLE XX)	2,700,000,000	2,583,900,000	2,700,000,000	2,700,000,000	---	+116,100,000	---	M
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES								
Programs for Children, Youth, and Families:								
Head start (unauthorized)	(1,086,842,000)	(1,040,098,000)	(1,075,059,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Child abuse:								
State grants	12,000,000	11,441,000	---	12,000,000	---	+559,000	+12,000,000	D
Discretionary activities	13,898,000	13,339,000	---	13,898,000	---	+559,000	+13,898,000	D
Challenge grants	---	---	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000	D
Runaway youth	23,231,000	22,231,000	23,250,000	23,250,000	+19,000	+1,019,000	---	D
Dependent Care Planning and Development (unauth)	(5,000,000)	(4,785,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Family violence	2,500,000	2,393,000	---	2,500,000	---	+107,000	+2,500,000	D
Family crisis and protective service grants	---	---	30,500,000	---	---	---	-30,500,000	D
Subtotal, CY & Families	51,629,000	49,404,000	53,750,000	56,648,000	+5,019,000	+7,244,000	+2,898,000	
Programs for the Aging:								
Grants to States:								
Supportive Services and Centers	265,000,000	253,605,000	265,000,000	275,000,000	+10,000,000	+21,395,000	+10,000,000	D
Nutrition:								
Congregate meals	335,970,000	321,522,000	336,000,000	350,000,000	+14,030,000	+28,478,000	+14,000,000	D
Home-delivered meals	67,900,000	64,980,000	67,900,000	75,000,000	+7,100,000	+10,020,000	+7,100,000	D
Grants to Indians	7,500,000	7,178,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	---	+322,000	---	D
Research, training, and special projects	25,000,000	23,925,000	12,500,000	25,000,000	---	+1,075,000	+12,500,000	D
Federal Council on Aging	200,000	191,000	200,000	200,000	---	+9,000	---	D
Subtotal, Aging programs	701,570,000	671,401,000	689,100,000	732,700,000	+31,130,000	+61,299,000	+43,600,000	
Developmental disabilities program:								
State grants	53,400,000	51,104,000	50,250,000	50,250,000	-3,150,000	-854,000	---	D
Protection and advocacy	14,600,000	13,972,000	13,750,000	13,750,000	-850,000	-222,000	---	D
Special projects	2,800,000	2,680,000	---	2,500,000	-300,000	-180,000	+2,500,000	D
University affiliated facilities	9,600,000	9,187,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-600,000	-187,000	---	D
Subtotal, Developmental disabilities	80,400,000	76,943,000	73,000,000	75,500,000	-4,900,000	-1,443,000	+2,500,000	
Native American Programs (unauthorized)	(28,989,000)	(27,742,000)	(27,300,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Program direction	61,069,000	58,441,000	60,169,000	60,169,000	-900,000	+1,728,000	---	D
Total, Human Development Services	894,668,000	856,189,000	876,019,000	925,017,000	+30,349,000	+68,828,000	+48,998,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(1,120,831,000)	(1,072,625,000)	(1,102,359,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
FAMILY SOCIAL SERVICES 1/								
Discretionary activities:								
Child welfare assistance	207,000,000	198,099,000	200,000,000	225,000,000	+18,000,000	+26,901,000	+25,000,000	D
Child welfare training	3,823,000	3,658,000	3,823,000	3,823,000	---	+165,000	---	D
Adoption opportunities	5,000,000	4,785,000	1,400,000	5,000,000	---	+215,000	+3,600,000	D
Social services research	---	---	2,400,000	2,400,000	+2,400,000	+2,400,000	---	D
Child welfare research	11,680,000	11,172,000	6,000,000	11,000,000	-680,000	-172,000	+5,000,000	D
Subtotal	227,503,000	217,714,000	213,623,000	247,223,000	+19,720,000	+29,509,000	+33,600,000	
Entitlement activities:								
Foster care	507,641,000	501,580,000	544,310,000	698,096,000	+190,455,000	+196,516,000	+153,786,000	M
Adoption assistance	41,948,000	41,391,000	59,904,000	59,904,000	+17,956,000	+18,513,000	---	M
Subtotal	549,589,000	542,971,000	604,214,000	758,000,000	+208,411,000	+215,029,000	+153,786,000	
Total, Family Social Services	777,092,000	760,685,000	817,837,000	1,005,223,000	+228,131,000	+244,538,000	+187,386,000	

1/ President's budget requests $100,228,000 FY86 supplemental

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
WORK INCENTIVES								
Grants to States	212,000,000	202,884,000	---	193,000,000	-19,000,000	-9,884,000	+193,000,000	D
Program direction and evaluation	8,000,000	7,656,000	---	7,000,000	-1,000,000	-656,000	+7,000,000	D
Total, Work incentives	220,000,000	210,540,000	---	200,000,000	-20,000,000	-10,540,000	+200,000,000	
Total, Asst. Sec. for Human Development	4,591,760,000	4,411,314,000	4,393,856,000	4,830,240,000	+238,480,000	+418,926,000	+436,384,000	
COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (Unauthorized, not considered)								
Grants to States	(335,000,000)	(320,595,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Discretionary funds	(31,000,000)	(31,167,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Program support	(4,300,000)	(4,115,000)	(3,612,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Total, Community Services appropriation	(370,300,000)	(355,877,000)	(3,612,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT								
GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT:								
Federal funds:								
General	123,789,000	118,459,000	108,319,000	108,319,300	-15,470,000	-10,140,000	---	D
Cancer construction transfer	4,500,000	4,307,000	---	---	-4,500,000	-4,307,000	---	D
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)	16,000,000	15,312,000	---	---	-16,000,000	-15,312,000	---	D
Subtotal, federal funds	144,289,000	138,078,000	108,319,000	108,319,000	-35,970,000	-29,759,000	---	
Trust funds	(8,000,000)	(7,656,000)	(27,500,000)	(27,500,000)	(+19,500,000)	(+19,844,000)	---	TF
Total, Departmental management	152,289,000	145,734,000	135,819,000	135,819,000	-16,470,000	-9,915,000	---	
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL:								
Federal activities:								
Federal funds	41,943,000	40,128,000	29,716,000	30,016,000	-11,927,000	-10,112,000	+300,000	D
Trust funds	(30,000,000)	(28,710,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(+11,290,000)	---	TF
Total, Inspector General	71,943,000	68,838,000	69,716,000	70,016,000	-1,927,000	+1,178,000	+300,000	
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS:								
Federal funds	16,000,000	15,312,000	15,285,000	15,285,000	-715,000	-27,000	---	D
Trust funds	(4,000,000)	(3,828,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	---	(+172,000)	---	TF
Total, Civil Rights	20,000,000	19,140,000	19,285,000	19,285,000	-715,000	+145,000	---	
POLICY RESEARCH	6,500,000	6,220,000	5,000,000	8,200,000	+1,700,000	+1 980,000	+3,200,000	D
Total, Departmental management:								
Federal funds	208,732,000	199,738,000	158,320,000	161,820,000	-46,912,000	-37,918,000	+3,500,000	
Trust funds	(42,000,000)	(40,194,000)	(71,500,000)	(71,500,000)	(+29,500,000)	(+31,306,000)	---	
Total, Department of Health and Human Services:								
Federal Funds (all years)	78,149,991,000	77,554,843,000	79,336,916,000	84,001,567,000	+5,851,576,000	+6,446,724,000	+4,664,651,000	
Current year	(66,676,237,000)	(66,081,089,000)	(66,738,851,000)	(71,403,502,000)	(+4,727,265,000)	(+5,322,413,000)	(+4,664,651,000)	
Subsequent year advances	(11,473,754,000)	(11,473,754,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	---	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(4,361,618,000)	(4,175,522,000)	(3,908,210,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust funds	(5,226,689,000)	(5,029,303,000)	(5,297,867,000)	(5,289,417,000)	(+62,728,000)	(+260,114,000)	(-8,450,000)	

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
TITLE III--DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION								
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED								
Grants for the Disadvantaged (Chapter 1):								
Grants to local educational agencies	3,200,000,000	3,062,400,000	3,261,005,000	3,507,000,000	+307,000,000	+444,600,000	+245,995,000	D
State agency programs:								
Migrants	264,524,000	253,149,000	202,519,000	264,524,000	---	+11,375,000	+62,005,000	D
Handicapped	150,170,000	143,713,000	150,170,000	150,170,000	---	+6,457,000	---	D
Neglected and delinquent	32,616,000	31,214,000	32,616,000	32,616,000	---	+1,402,000	---	D
State administration	35,607,000	34,076,000	35,607,000	38,607,000	+3,000,000	+4,531,000	+3,000,000	D
Evaluation and technical assistance	5,246,000	5,020,000	6,246,000	6,246,000	+1,000,000	+1,226,000	---	D
Total, Chapter 1	3,688,163,000	3,529,572,000	3,688,163,000	3,999,163,000	+311,000,000	+469,591,000	+311,000,000	
Migrant education: (unauthorized)								
High school equivalency program	(6,300,000)	(6,029,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
College assistance migrant program	(1,200,000)	(1,148,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Total, Compensatory Education programs	3,688,163,000	3,529,572,000	3,688,163,000	3,999,163,000	+311,000,000	+469,591,000	+311,000,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(7,500,000)	(7,177,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
IMPACT AID								
Maintenance and operations:								
Payments for "a" children	513,000,000	490,941,000	513,000,000	513,000,000	---	+22,059,000	---	D
Payments for "b" children	130,000,000	124,410,000	---	130,000,000	---	+5,590,000	+130,000,000	D
Special provisions (Section 2)	22,000,000	21,054,000	20,000,000	22,000,000	---	+946,000	+2,000,000	D
Subtotal	665,000,000	636,405,000	533,000,000	665,000,000	---	+28,595,000	+132,000,000	
Disaster assistance	10,000,000	29,570,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	---	-19,570,000	---	D
Construction	17,500,000	16,747,000	5,000,000	25,000,000	+7,500,000	+8,253,000	+20,000,000	D
Total	692,500,000	682,722,000	548,000,000	700,000,000	+7,500,000	+17,278,000	+152,000,000	
SPECIAL PROGRAMS								
Improving School Programs (Chapter 2):								
State block grants	500,000,000	478,500,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	---	+21,500,000	---	D
Secretary's discretionary fund:								
Inexpensive book distribution (including RIF)	7,000,000	6,699,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	---	+301,000	---	D
Arts in education	3,157,000	3,021,000	3,157,000	3,157,000	---	+136,000	---	D
Alcohol and drug abuse education	3,000,000	2,871,000	3,000,000	14,000,000	+11,000,000	+11,129,000	+11,000,000	D
Law related education	2,000,000	1,914,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	+1,000,000	+1,086,000	+1,000,000	D
National Diffusion Network	10,700,000	10,240,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	---	+460,000	---	D
Rural math and science	---	---	---	4,000,000	+4,000,000	+4,000,000	+4,000,000	D
Discretionary projects	3,052,000	2,921,000	3,052,000	3,052,000	---	+131,000	---	D
Subtotal, Secretary's discretionary fund	28,909,000	27,666,000	28,909,000	44,909,000	+16,000,000	+17,243,000	+16,000,000	
Total, Chapter 2	528,909,000	506,166,000	528,909,000	544,909,000	+16,000,000	+38,743,000	+16,000,000	
Other Special Programs:								
Teacher training and improvement: (unauthorized)1/								
State grants	---	---	(60,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Secretary's discretionary fund	---	---	(15,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Science and mathematics education	45,000,000	43,066,000	---	43,066,000	-1,934,000	---	+43,066,000	D
Training and advisory services (Civil Rights IVA)	24,000,000	22,968,000	---	24,000,000	---	+1,032,000	+24,000,000	D
Follow through (unauthorized)	(7,500,000)	(7,177,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Territorial teacher training assistance	2,000,000	1,914,000	---	1,914,000	-86,000	---	+1,914,000	D
General assistance for the Virgin Islands	5,000,000	4,785,000	---	4,785,000	-215,000	---	+4,785,000	D
Ellender fellowships	1,700,000	1,627,000	---	1,700,000	---	+73,000	+1,700,000	D
Women's educational equity	6,000,000	5,742,000	---	6,000,000	---	+258,000	+6,000,000	D
Magnet schools	75,000,000	71,775,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	---	+3,225,000	---	D
Excellence in education	2,500,000	2,392,000	---	2,392,000	-108,000	---	+2,392,000	D
LEAD	7,500,000	7,177,000	---	7,177,000	-323,000	---	+7,177,000	D
Subtotal, Other special programs	168,700,000	161,446,000	75,000,000	166,034,000	-2,666,000	+4,588,000	+91,034,000	
Total, Special programs	697,609,000	667,612,000	603,909,000	710,943,000	+13,334,000	+43,331,000	+107,034,000	

1/ Unauthorized. Proposed for later transmittal.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
BILINGUAL EDUCATION								
Bilingual programs	94,951,000	90,862,000	99,285,000	99,161,000	+4,210,000	+8,299,000	-124,000	D
Training grants	33,564,000	32,121,000	33,566,000	36,490,000	+2,926,000	+4,369,000	+2,924,000	D
Support services	10,440,000	9,991,000	10,100,000	10,300,000	-140,000	+309,000	+200,000	D
Vocational training	3,686,000	3,527,000	---	3,686,000	---	+159,000	+3,686,000	D
Emergency immigrant education	30,000,000	28,710,000	---	30,000,000	---	+1,290,000	+30,000,000	D
Total	172,641,000	165,211,000	142,951,000	179,637,000	+6,996,000	+14,426,000	+36,686,000	
EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED								
Education for the handicapped:								
State assistance:								
State grant program	1,215,550,000	1,163,282,000	1,135,145,000	1,300,000,000	+84,450,000	+136,718,000	+164,855,000	D
Preschool incentive grants	30,000,000	28,710,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	+1,000,000	+2,290,000	---	D
Special purpose funds:								
Deaf-blind centers	14,764,000	14,119,000	9,000,000	14,764,000	---	+645,000	+5,764,000	D
Severely handicapped projects	5,000,000	4,785,000	4,300,000	5,000,000	---	+215,000	+700,000	D
Early childhood education	24,000,000	22,968,000	22,500,000	24,000,000	---	+1,032,000	+1,500,000	D
Secondary and transitional services	6,600,000	6,316,000	6,330,000	6,600,000	---	+284,000	+270,000	D
Postsecondary programs	5,500,000	5,264,000	5,300,000	5,500,000	---	+236,000	+200,000	D
Innovation and development	16,811,000	16,080,000	16,000,000	16,811,000	---	+731,000	+811,000	D
Media services and captioned films	17,429,000	16,676,000	16,500,000	17,429,000	---	+753,000	+929,000	D
Regional resource centers	6,300,000	6,029,000	6,000,000	6,300,000	---	+271,000	+300,000	D
Recruitment and information	1,110,000	1,062,000	1,025,000	1,110,000	---	+48,000	+85,000	D
Special education personnel development	63,906,000	61,154,000	48,000,000	63,906,000	---	+2,752,000	+15,906,000	D
Special studies	3,228,000	3,089,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-1,228,000	-1,089,000	---	D
Total, Education for the handicapped	1,410,198,000	1,349,534,000	1,303,100,000	1,494,420,000	+84,222,000	+144,886,000	+191,320,000	
REHABILITATION SERVICES AND HANDICAPPED RESEARCH								
Rehabilitation services:								
Basic State grants	1,190,000,000	1,145,148,000	1,100,000,000	1,148,356,000	-41,644,000	+3,208,000	+48,356,000	M
Helen Keller Center	4,300,000	4,115,000	4,200,000	4,300,000	---	+185,000	+100,000	M
Unauthorized, not considered:								
Service projects:								
Special demonstration programs	(20,200,000)	(19,332,000)	(14,635,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Recreational programs	(2,200,000)	(2,105,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Migratory workers	(1,000,000)	(957,000)	(950,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
American Indians	(1,400,000)	(1,340,000)	(715,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Projects with industry	(15,200,000)	(14,547,000)	(13,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Subtotal, Service projects	(40,000,000)	(38,281,000)	(29,300,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Client assistance	(6,700,000)	(6,412,000)	(6,300,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Independent living:								
Comprehensive services	(11,000,000)	(10,527,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Centers	(23,000,000)	(22,011,000)	(22,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Services for older blind	(5,000,000)	(4,785,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Subtotal, Independent living	(39,000,000)	(37,323,000)	(22,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Training	(27,000,000)	(25,838,000)	(15,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Innovation and expansion	(9,000,000)	(8,613,000)	(9,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Subtotal	(121,700,000)	(116,467,000)	(81,600,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
National Institute of Handicapped Research	(43,875,000)	(41,983,000)	(39,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Evaluation	(1,800,000)	(1,723,000)	(600,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
Total	1,194,300,000	1,149,263,000	1,104,200,000	1,152,656,000	-41,644,000	+3,393,000	+48,456,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(167,375,000)	(160,173,000)	(121,200,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION								
Vocational education:								
Basic grants	782,381,000	748,738,000	387,156,000	848,000,000	+65,619,000	+99,262,000	+460,844,000	D
National research & data programs	10,000,000	9,570,000	6,818,000	12,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,430,000	+5,182,000	D
Consumer and homemaker education	31,633,000	30,273,000	---	31,633,000	---	+1,360,000	+31,633,000	D
State advisory councils	7,300,000	6,986,000	7,000,000	7,300,000	---	+314,000	+300,000	D
Community based organizations	7,500,000	7,178,000	---	7,500,000	---	+322,000	+7,500,000	D
Subtotal, Vocational education	838,814,000	802,745,000	400,974,000	906,433,000	+67,619,000	+103,688,000	+505,459,000	
Adult education	101,963,000	97,579,000	104,000,000	110,000,000	+8,037,000	+12,421,000	+6,000,000	D
Total	940,777,000	900,324,000	504,974,000	1,016,433,000	+75,656,000	+116,109,000	+511,459,000	
STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE 1/ (Unauthorized, not considered)								
Pell Grants:								
Current year	(3,586,546,000)	(3,432,262,000)	(3,000,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Fiscal year 1986 shortfall	---	(146,000,000)	(250,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Supplemental grants	(412,500,000)	(394,762,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Campus-based aid (proposed legislation)	---	---	(400,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Work-study	(592,500,000)	(567,023,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Direct loans:								
Capital	(190,000,000)	(181,830,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Cancellations	(28,000,000)	(26,796,000)	(25,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Income contingent loans (proposed legislation)	---	---	(137,568,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
State student incentive grants	(76,000,000)	(72,732,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Total, Student Financial Assistance	(4,885,546,000)	(4,821,405,000)	(3,812,568,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS								
Guaranteed student loan program 2/	3,294,034,000	3,259,975,000	3,460,250,000	3,394,000,000	+99,966,000	+134,025,000	-66,250,000	M
HIGHER EDUCATION								
Program development:								
Aid for developing institutions	(141,208,000)	(135,136,000)	(141,208,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Minority institutions science improvement	5,000,000	4,785,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	---	+215,000	---	D
International education and foreign language studies:								
Domestic programs	(26,550,000)	(25,408,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Overseas programs	(5,500,000)	(5,263,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Fund for the Improvement of Postsec. Education	(12,710,000)	(12,163,000)	(10,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Cooperative education	(14,400,000)	(13,781,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Subtotal, Program development	5,000,000	4,785,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	---	+215,000	---	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(200,368,000)	(191,751,000)	(151,208,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Student support services:								
Special programs for the disadvantaged	(176,370,000)	(168,786,000)	(82,370,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Veterans' cost of instruction	(3,000,000)	(2,871,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Academic facilities and projects:								
Interest subsidy grants	(23,500,000)	(22,490,000)	(23,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Academic facilities construction grants(Title VII)	(10,000,000)	(9,570,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Special higher education projects	(6,000,000)	(5,742,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Subtotal, Academic facilities and projects	(39,500,000)	(37,802,000)	(23,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	

1/ $3,787,568,000 proposed for later transmittal.

2/ FY86 supplemental of $65,044,000 proposed for later transmittal. FY87 budget proposes legislative savings of $1,115,241,000 and sequestering of $15,423,000 for later transmittal.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
Graduate programs:								
Graduate/professional opportunity fellowships	(11,750,000)	(11,245,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Public service fellowships	(2,500,000)	(2,393,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
National Graduate Fellowships	(2,500,000)	(2,393,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Legal training for disadvantaged	(1,500,000)	(1,435,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Law school clinical experience	1,500,000	1,435,000	---	1,500,000	---	+65,000	+1,500,000	D
Subtotal, Graduate programs	1,500,000	1,435,000	---	1,500,000	---	+65,000	+1,500,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(18,250,000)	(17,466,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Special grants:								
Assistance to Guam	(500,000)	(479,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Robert A. Taft Institute of Government	(750,000)	(718,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Carl Perkins Scholarships	10,000,000	9,570,000	---	21,000,000	+11,000,000	+11,430,000	+21,000,000	D
Talented teachers	---	---	---	2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000	D
Subtotal, Special grants	10,000,000	9,570,000	---	23,000,000	+13,000,000	+13,430,000	+23,000,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(1,250,000)	(1,197,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Total, Higher education 1/	16,500,000	15,790,000	5,000,000	29,500,000	+13,000,000	+13,710,000	+24,500,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(438,738,000)	(419,873,000)	(256,578,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES LOANS AND INSURANCE	(17,896,000)	(17,891,000)	(19,205,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	M
COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS, LOAN LIMITATION (non-add)	(60,000,000)	(57,420,000)	---	(60,000,000)	---	(+2,580,000)	(+60,000,000)	NA
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND STATISTICS								
National Institute of Education (unauthorized)	(50,831,000)	(48,628,000)	(70,231,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
National Center for Education Statistics	8,747,000	8,371,000	---	8,747,000	---	+376,000	+8,747,000	D
Total	8,747,000	8,371,000	---	8,747,000	---	+376,000	+8,747,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(50,831,000)	(48,628,000)	(70,231,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
LIBRARIES								
Public libraries:								
Services	75,000,000	71,774,000	---	80,000,000	+5,000,000	+8,226,000	+80,000,000	D
Interlibrary cooperation	18,000,000	17,226,000	---	20,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,774,000	+20,000,000	D
Training and demonstrations (unauthorized)	(1,000,000)	(957,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Research libraries (unauthorized)	(6,000,000)	(5,742,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Construction	22,500,000	21,533,000	---	25,000,000	+2,500,000	+3,467,000	+25,000,000	D
Literacy Initiative	5,000,000	4,785,000	---	5,000,000	---	+215,000	+5,000,000	D
Total	120,500,000	115,318,000	---	130,000,000	+9,500,000	+14,682,000	+130,000,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(7,000,000)	(6,699,000)	---	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
PAYMENTS TO SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS								
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND	5,500,000	5,263,000	5,510,000	5,510,000	+10,000	+247,000	---	D
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF	32,000,000	30,624,000	31,380,000	32,000,000	---	+1,376,000	+620,000	D
GALLAUDET COLLEGE 2/	62,000,000	59,335,000	60,737,000	60,737,000	-1,263,000	+1,402,000	---	D
HOWARD UNIVERSITY	164,230,000	157,168,000	157,170,000	170,230,000	+6,000,000	+13,062,000	+13,060,000	D
Total, Payments to Special Institutions	263,730,000	252,390,000	254,797,000	268,477,000	+4,747,000	+16,087,000	+13,680,000	
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT								
SALARIES AND EXPENSES	234,652,000	224,939,000	241,192,000	241,692,000	+7,040,000	+16,753,000	+500,000	D
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SALARIES AND EXPENSES	15,312,000	14,654,000	16,378,000	16,378,000	+1,066,000	+1,724,000	---	D
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, SALARIES AND EXPENSES	43,635,000	41,759,000	38,185,000	38,185,000	-5,450,000	-3,574,000	---	D
Total, Departmental management	293,599,000	281,352,000	295,755,000	296,255,000	+2,656,000	+14,903,000	+500,000	
Total, Department of Education:								
Federal funds	12,793,298,000	12,377,434,000	11,911,099,000	13,380,231,000	+586,933,000	+1,002,797,000	+1,469,132,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(5,562,386,000)	(5,489,023,000)	(1,351,782,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	

1/ FY87 request includes $238,578,000 proposed for later transmittal.

2/ $2,000,000 of 1987 request proposed for later transmittal.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES								
Action (Domestic Programs):								
(Unauthorized, not considered)								
Volunteers in Service to America:								
VISTA operations	(19,000,000)	(18,183,000)	(17,890,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Service learning	(1,368,000)	(1,308,000)	(1,368,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Subtotal	(20,368,000)	(19,491,000)	(19,258,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Citizen Participation and Volunteer Demonstration Programs	(1,801,000)	(1,724,000)	(1,801,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Older Americans Volunteer Programs:								
Foster Grandparents Program	(56,100,000)	(53,688,000)	(56,100,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Senior Companion Program	(18,086,000)	(17,308,000)	(18,086,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Retired Senior Volunteer Program	(29,620,000)	(28,346,000)	(29,620,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Subtotal, Older Volunteers	(103,806,000)	(99,342,000)	(103,806,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Program Support	(25,312,000)	(24,224,000)	(25,000,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Total, Action, unauthorized	(151,287,000)	(144,781,000)	(149,865,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting: 1/								
FY 1988 advance (advanced in FY86)	214,000,000	214,000,000	---	---	-214,000,000	-214,000,000	---	M
FY 1989 (current request)	---	---	130,000,000	214,000,000	+214,000,000	+214,000,000	+84,000,000	M
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service 2/	23,394,000	22,388,000	23,220,000	22,656,000	-738,000	+268,000	-564,000	D
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	3,815,000	3,651,000	3,919,000	3,651,000	-164,000	---	-268,000	D
National Center for the Study of Afro-American History and Culture	200,000	191,000	---	---	-200,000	-191,000	---	D
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science	690,000	660,000	690,000	660,000	-30,000	---	-30,000	D
National Council on the Handicapped	765,000	732,000	850,000	732,000	-33,000	---	-118,000	D
National Labor Relations Board	134,854,000	129,055,000	130,865,000	129,055,000	-5,799,000	---	-1,810,000	D
National Mediation Board	6,358,000	6,085,000	6,540,000	6,401,000	+43,000	+316,000	-139,000	D
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	5,901,000	5,647,000	5,750,000	5,647,000	-254,000	---	-103,000	D
Prospective Payment Assessment Commission(trust funds)	(2,893,000)	(2,769,000)	(3,421,000)	(3,421,000)	(+528,000)	(+652,000)	---	TF
Physician Payment Review Commission (trust Funds)	---	---	---	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	TF
Railroad Retirement Board:								
Dual benefits payments account	392,000,000	375,135,000	255,880,000	380,000,000	-12,000,000	+4,865,000	+124,120,000	D
Federal payment to the Railroad Retirement Account	2,200,000	2,200,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	+900,000	+900,000	---	D
(Limitation on administration, retirement)	(55,422,000)	(53,039,000)	(55,614,000)	(56,634,000)	(+1,212,000)	(+3,595,000)	(+1,020,000)	TF
(Limitation on administration, unemployment)	(16,487,000)	(15,778,000)	(13,919,000)	(14,694,000)	(-1,793,000)	(-1,084,000)	(+775,000)	TF
(Inspector General)	---	---	(1,167,000)	(1,167,000)	(+1,167,000)	(+1,167,000)	---	TF
Soldiers' and Airmen's Home (trust fund limitation):								
Operation and maintenance	33,391,000	32,196,000	34,022,000	34,022,000	+631,000	+1,826,000	---	D
Capital outlay	15,000,000	13,114,000	4,485,000	15,000,000	---	+1,886,000	+10,515,000	D
United States Institute of Peace (unauthorized)	---	---	(1,250,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	D
Total, Related Agencies:								
Federal funds (all years)	832,568,000	805,054,000	599,321,000	814,924,000	-17,644,000	+9,870,000	+215,603,000	
Current year	(618,568,000)	(591,054,000)	(469,321,000)	(600,924,000)	(-17,644,000)	(+9,870,000)	(+131,603,000)	
1989 advance	(214,000,000)	(214,000,000)	(130,000,000)	(214,000,000)	---	---	(+84,000,000)	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(151,287,000)	(144,781,000)	(151,115,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust funds	(74,802,000)	(71,586,000)	(74,121,000)	(76,916,000)	(+2,114,000)	(+5,330,000)	(+2,795,000)	

1/ FY 1986 approp. adv. in FY84 is $159.5 million.
FY 1987 approp. adv. in FY85 is $200 million.
FY 1988 approp. adv. in FY86 is $214 million.
2/ President's budget requests $268,000 FY86 supplemental.

H.R. 5233 - FY 1987 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

	FY 1986 Enacted	FY 1986 Post Sequester	FY 1987 President's Budget	House Bill	House Bill compared to FY 86 Enacted	House Bill compared to FY 86 Post Seq.	House Bill compared to FY 87 Budget	Man Dis
SUMMARY								
Title I - Department of Labor:								
Federal Funds	6,541,215,000	6,303,652,000	5,897,429,000	5,524,294,000	-1,016,921,000	-779,358,000	-373,135,000	
Trust Funds	(2,704,717,000)	(2,588,411,000)	(2,747,345,000)	(2,751,696,000)	(+46,979,000)	(+163,285,000)	(+4,351,000)	
Title II - Department of Health and Human Services:								
Federal Funds (all years)	78,149,991,000	77,554,813,000	79,336,916,000	84,001,567,000	+5,851,576,000	+6,446,724,000	+4,664,651,000	
Current year	(66,676,237,000)	(66,081,089,000)	(66,738,851,000)	(71,403,502,000)	(+4,727,265,000)	(+5,322,413,000)	(+4,664,651,000)	
1988 advance	(11,473,754,000)	(11,473,754,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	---	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(4,361,618,000)	(4,175,522,000)	(3,908,210,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust Funds	(5,226,689,000)	(5,029,303,000)	(5,297,867,000)	(5,289,417,000)	(+62,728,000)	(+260,114,000)	(-8,450,000)	
Title III - Department of Education:								
Federal Funds	12,793,298,000	12,377,434,000	11,911,099,000	13,380,231,000	+586,933,000	+1,002,797,000	+1,469,132,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(5,582,386,000)	(5,489,023,000)	(4,354,782,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Title IV - Related Agencies:								
Federal Funds (all years)	832,568,000	805,054,000	599,321,000	814,924,000	-17,644,000	+9,870,000	+215,603,000	
Current year	(618,568,000)	(591,054,000)	(469,321,000)	(600,924,000)	(-17,644,000)	(+9,870,000)	(+131,603,000)	
1989 advance	(214,000,000)	(214,000,000)	(130,000,000)	(214,000,000)	---	---	(+84,000,000)	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(151,287,000)	(144,781,000)	(151,115,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust Funds	(74,802,000)	(71,586,000)	(74,121,000)	(76,916,000)	(+2,114,000)	(+5,330,000)	(+2,795,000)	
Sec. 515 reserves (P.L. 99-190):								
Federal Funds	12,531,000	11,702,000	---	---	-12,531,000	-11,702,000	---	
Trust Funds	(919,000)	(919,000)	---	---	(-919,000)	(-919,000)	---	
Total, all titles:								
Federal Funds (all years)	98,329,603,000	97,052,685,000	97,744,765,000	103,721,016,000	+5,391,413,000	+6,668,331,000	+5,976,251,000	
Current year	(86,641,849,000)	(85,364,931,000)	(85,016,700,000)	(90,908,951,000)	(+4,267,102,000)	(+5,544,020,000)	(+5,892,251,000)	
1988 advance	(11,473,754,000)	(11,473,754,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(12,598,065,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	(+1,124,311,000)	---	
1989 advance	(214,000,000)	(214,000,000)	(130,000,000)	(214,000,000)	---	---	(+84,000,000)	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(10,095,291,000)	(9,809,326,000)	(8,414,107,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Trust Funds	8,007,127,000	7,690,219,000	8,119,333,000	8,118,029,000	+110,902,000	+427,810,000	-1,304,000	
SECTION 302B RECAP								
Federal Funds (all years)	98,329,603,000	97,052,685,000	97,744,765,000	103,721,016,000	+5,391,413,000	+6,668,331,000	+5,976,251,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(10,095,291,000)	(9,809,326,000)	(8,414,107,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Discretionary, current appropriations	23,615,212,000	22,640,154,000	20,798,416,000	24,927,647,000	+1,312,435,000	+2,287,493,000	+4,129,231,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(9,910,020,000)	(9,631,262,000)	(8,273,702,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Mandatory, total in bill	74,714,391,000	74,412,531,000	76,946,349,000	78,793,369,000	+4,078,978,000	+4,380,838,000	+1,847,020,000	
Less advances for subsequent years	-11,687,754,000	-11,687,754,000	-12,728,065,000	-12,812,065,000	-1,124,311,000	-1,124,311,000	-84,000,000	
Plus advances provided in prior years	11,010,269,000	11,010,269,000	11,673,754,000	11,673,754,000	+663,485,000	+663,485,000	---	
Subtotal, Mandatory, current appropriations	74,036,906,000	73,735,046,000	75,892,038,000	77,655,058,000	+3,618,152,000	+3,920,012,000	+1,763,020,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(185,271,000)	(178,064,000)	(140,405,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	
Total, adjusted current year	97,652,118,000	96,375,200,000	96,690,454,000	102,582,705,000	+4,930,587,000	+6,207,505,000	+5,892,251,000	
(Unauthorized, not considered)	(10,095,291,000)	(9,809,326,000)	(8,414,107,000)	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	DEFER	

□ 1505

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MEET DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE ON AUGUST 6 AND AUGUST 12, 1986

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet should there be reading of amendments under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday, August 6 and on Tuesday, August 12, 1986.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW, AUGUST 1, 1986, TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1986

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow, August 1, 1986, to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CERTAIN CORRECTIONS AND INSERTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5233, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1987

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 5233) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and insertions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5234, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1987

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 516 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 516

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5234) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, all points of order against the following provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived: beginning on page 2, lines 3 through 25; beginning on page 4, line 7 through page 6, line 2; beginning on page 7, line 17 through page 8, line 26; beginning on page 13, lines 7 through 25; beginning on page 14, line 9 through page 16, line 23; beginning on page 39, line 16 through page 41, line 12; beginning on page 42, line 5 through page 43, line 12; beginning on page 51, line 1 through page 55, line 12; beginning on page 56, lines 1 through 10; beginning on page 58, line 6 through page 59, line 13; beginning on page 65, lines 7 through 13; beginning on page 72, lines 1 through 18; and beginning on page 80, lines 1 through 22.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BURTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], for the purpose of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 516 waives points of order against provisions of H.R. 5234, the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1987.

Since general appropriation bills are privileged under the rules of the House, the rule does not provide for any special guidelines for the consideration of the bill. Provisions related to time for general debate are not included in the rule. Customarily, Mr. Speaker, general debate time is limited by a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee prior to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 516 waives clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriation bills against certain provisions in the bill. The specified provisions which have been protected by this waiver are detailed in the rule, by reference to page and line of the Interior appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5234 appropriates $8.2 billion, including $4 billion for the land and natural resources management agencies of the Interior Department, $1.4 billion for the Agriculture Department's U.S. Forest Service, $1.2 billion for the fossil fuels and energy conservation programs of the Energy Department and $1.6 billion for other programs.

Mr. YATES, Mr. REGULA, and the entire subcommittee is to be complimented for their fine work to reach agreement on such a wide range of issues affecting the natural heritage of this Nation. Their efforts to enhance our public lands, national parks, forests, and other resources will long be remembered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], for their support of continued funding of projects in my district, the Foothills Parkway road project and the Cumberland Gap Road. I think they are fine projects.

Naturally, I support the rule, but not necessarily just for those reasons, but because it is a broad ranging bill that is beneficial to the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, the rule has been ably explained by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BURTON]. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Like nearly all our appropriation bills, all save two so far, this bill is protected from points of order by the rule in so many places as to make it ridiculous.

About the only thing not protected by this rule is the enacting clause of the bill. I find protections on 34 different pages within an 80-page bill. That really flaunts the rules of the House and continues to make the appropriations process an embarrassment to us and the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote against the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. 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 315, nays 93, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

YEAS—315

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Craig
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hendon
Hertel
Hillis
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Luken
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Watkins
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

NAYS—93

Archer
Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Chappie
Cheney
Cobey
Combest
Courter
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Fiedler
Fields
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall, Ralph
Henry
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Kasich
Kindness
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lott
Lowry (WA)
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McCollum
Meyers
Michel
Miller (WA)
Monson
Oxley
Packard
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Roth
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Solomon
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Swindall
Vander Jagt
Walker
Weber
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Barnes
Bedell
Boner (TN)
Breaux
Campbell
Carney
Clay
Conyers
Coyne
Edgar
Evans (IA)
Fowler
Grotberg
Hartnett
Lundine
Mavroules
Mitchell
Moore
Waldon
Waxman
Whitten
Williams
Zschau

□ 1530

Mr. CRAIG and Mr. HAYES changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5234, which we are about to consider, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1987

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5234) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1534

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. 5234, with Mr. DOWNEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1987 to the Committee. I am particularly pleased because the bill as reported is under the 302(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. CBO scores the Interior bill as $344 million below the discretionary budget allocation and $11 million below the discretionary outlay allocation, a category many of you have asked about. The total for the bill as recommended, $8,247,192,000, is also $210,155,000 under the amount of $8,457,347,000

enacted in fiscal year 1986 for Interior and related agencies. In comparison to the fiscal year 1986 post-Gramm-Rudman amount, the recommendation is $51,255,000, or less than 1 percent, over that level.

In preparing this bill, the committee took testimony from 73 Members of Congress, and received written requests from 183 more, for a total of almost 1,300 individual account requests received from Members of Congress.

The bill reflects our continuing investment in America and the American people. It provides the amounts necessary to support the national heritage of all Americans—the public lands, the national parks, the national forest, and the cultural and historic preservation of the heritage that we want to pass along to our children, our grandchildren, and the generations to come; and to continue the hope and dream that each of us has that what we pass along for our children and the coming generations will be better than what we now enjoy.

The bill includes $4,010,119,000 for programs of the Department of the Interior; $1,424,637,000 for the U.S. Forest Service; $1,236,752,000 for programs of the Department of Energy; and $1,575,684,000 for Indian Health, Indian Education, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, and the other related agencies of the bill, all of which are described in detail in the report accompanying the bill.

The programs represented in this bill in many ways represent an investment in America itself, and those investments provide significant returns. For example, programs funded in this bill will generate estimated revenues of over $9.6 billion in fiscal year 1986 which is $1.3 billion more than the spending authority in the bill.

There are certain areas in this bill where the committee believed it important to exceed the amounts requested in the President's budget. These include vital programs established to meet identified national goals, such as the land acquisition programs in refuges, parks, national forests, and public lands. The committee has included an increase of $158 million for this purpose, including $50 million for the State assistance program. We could not agree with the administration's request for a minimal land acquisition program. Prices would only go higher; critical habitat would be lost; and private landowners would be inconvenienced.

The committee has also recommended increases of $220 million in Indian programs, including construction of hospitals, clinics and schools, irrigation and sanitation facilities, and protection and development of natural resources on reservation lands, in keeping with our trust responsibilities to the Indian people. However, the recommended funding for these programs in fiscal year 1987 is $40 million below the enacted level for fiscal year 1986. The committee has also recommended increases totaling almost $138 million for the U.S. Forest Service, in order to maintain important programs in forest research, State and private forestry, and recreation in the National Forest System.

With respect to the Outer Continental Shelf, the bill contains a compromise agreement, rather than a moratorium, for leasing off California. This agreement provides for review by the Secretary of the Interior of the two proposals developed by the congressional negotiating group as well as the proposal developed by the Governor in accordance with section 18 of the OCS Lands Act amendments. The Secretary is also instructed to provide the congressional group a 30-day period to review and comment on a draft copy of his final program for offshore California prior to its submission to the President and the Congress. In this submission, the Secretary is required to indicate, in detail, why any specific recommendation contained in these proposals has not been incorporated. This agreement provides for prelease activity to continue in the three California planning areas yet affects delays in Sales 95 and 91 in southern and northern California, respectively. A great deal of time and effort has gone into forging this agreement and the committee is pleased to include this proposal in lieu of a moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, when Fiorello H. La Guardia, New York City's famous colorful mayor used to say "When I make a mistake, it's a beaut." The same is true about the Congress. When it makes a mistake, it's a beaut and it made a mistake 12 years ago when it passed the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Act. For 12 years a commission set up by that act has been trying to unscramble Navajo and Hopi people who have been living together for decades—centuries in certain areas—and has succeeded only in making a complex human problem more complicated and distant from solution.

Rectifying wrongs committed against Indian people is always traumatic, a wrenching process which takes years not only in trying to find reasonable answers but in healing wounds in the aftermath. Usually, it's a dispute between Indians and non-Indians, and in land cases where the white people have forcibly driven the Indians from their land, the courts and the Congress have not given their original land possession back to the Indians. Usually, a part of the land is given back together with remuneratory compensation or agreement is reached only for a monetary payment.

That is not true in the Navajo-Hopi dispute. Rather than reaching a monetary satisfaction for the rightful claim of the Hopi to their land which was appropriated by Navajo settlers, the Congress decided to partition the land and relocate Hopis who were on Navajo land—only a few—and Navajo who were on Hopi land—and there were many.

There is no doubt that the Navajo did take over Hopi lands and there is no doubt that the Hopi are entitled to redress. In the 1974 act, the Congress decided that the Navajo, even those who had been living on the land for generations, should pack up and leave. The Congress would provide new homes for them in other communities—and the fiasco began.

What happened was like a huge cost overrun on a defense contract, except that the lives of human beings were at stake here. It was represented to Congress—perhaps misrepresented in retrospect—that only a few families were involved. The relocation would be completed in a short time, would be relatively simple, and would cost the taxpayers about $41 million. Here we are today, 12 years later, years from a termination of the relocation having spent close to $100 million already and faced with spending an estimated $1 to $200 million more.

The court set the moving date for July 7, 1986. July 7, 1986 has come and gone; 1,024 families have been relocated, most of them are now living in slum areas, waiting for the U.S. Government to keep its word to provide them with the decent, comfortable and sanitary housing they were promised if they moved.

And that is what we have emphasized in our bill—we propose to keep faith with the people who moved voluntarily, relying upon the good faith of the Government and who wound up in dire poverty. We have directed the Navajo-Hopi Commission to find housing for these people. The Commission says they can move only 200 to 250 families a year. Our bill says take care of the cooperating families first.

That means that there will be no forced relocations provided for in this bill. No forced relocations until we are able to take care of the Indian relocatees who desperately need housing now.

Reasonable rents are being paid to the Hopi for the land by their Navajo tenants. We are directing BIA to review the rentals to make sure they are adequate.

Finally Mr. Speaker, this relocation dispute is only a piece of the overall land controversy between the Navajo and the Hopi. It was wrong to attack the problem piecemeal as Congress did in 1974. Now, we have a mess on our hands and our committee is trying to make the best of a bad situation. This dispute needs the wisdom of Solomon and I don't see any Solomon in the vi-

cinity of Congress. In his absence we ask the legislative committee to review this dispute again as an urgent matter. It desperately needs their attention.

The bill contains funding for the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission. As you know, in 1974, Congress passed the Relocation Act in an attempt to resolve the centuries-old dispute between the Navajo and Hopi tribes. At the time, this legislation was adopted, it was represented that only 1,100 families needed to be relocated at an estimated cost of $41 million. To date, more than $134 million has been appropriated with about 1,500 certified eligible families still awaiting relocation. There is also a possibility that new information will surface after the completion of a survey being conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In retrospect, 12 years later, it has become obvious that the magnitude of this problem is much greater than originally estimated and that Congress must reexamine this issue in a comprehensive rather than a piecemeal fashion. There is no forced eviction in this relocation program. Only those who have voluntarily applied to the Relocation Commission and are certified eligible for relocation are presently being moved. The funding in this bill enables the Commission to go forward with housing people who have been uprooted and may be living in adverse conditions. An additional step the committee has taken to ensure that the rights of the relocatees are protected is to include the language carried in the fiscal year 1986 continuing resolution which states that none of the funds appropriated in this or any other act may be used for eviction of individuals until a replacement or new relocation home has been provided.

Recognizing the growing importance of the quality of the Nation's water, the committee has recommended a $7 million increase for continuing a pilot scale national water quality assessment to be coordinated by the U.S. Geological Survey. Problems with agricultural runoff such as at the Kesterson Wildlife Refuge in California and with toxic waste burial and contamination led the committee to expand this program which we started in fiscal year 1986.

For energy programs, there are increases of $900 million over the request. The committee has included $147 million to continue construction of capacity for the strategic petroleum reserve and also has placed language in the bill specifying moderate rates of filling the reserve with oil, requiring an additional $331 million. This continues the House's policy of refusing to put a moratorium on the reserve. This policy was established in the fiscal year 1985 supplemental appropriations act. Imports are increasing, and prices are low, making this a proper time to provide these funds for our national security.

In fossil energy and conservation research and development, the committee recommends an increase of $357 million over the request. Despite the magnitude of that increase, both programs are actually less than fiscal year 1986 levels because the administration request basically put them out of business. We believe their long-term value is significant.

We are providing an increase of $55 million to finance administrative costs of a greatly expanded low-income weatherization program using funds provided to the States by the Exxon oil overcharge settlement. These funds would allow a program three times the size of fiscal year 1986.

Finally, in energy, we have recommended a prohibition on studying the sale of the naval petroleum reserves unless Congress passes an authorization to do so. This is not a good time to sell the reserves, with prices as low as $10 a barrel.

The committee has recommended implementing a grazing fee for Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service lands which gradually would bring those fees up to market levels. In 1987, the increase would be 45 cents per animal unit month, a 33⅓-percent increase over 1986, but well below the market level of $4.86 per AUM. If implemented, this fee increase would provide about $8 to $10 million in new revenue, half of which would go toward improving the public lands.

I would also like to point out language contained in the bill, in section 117, which designates the visitor center for the Illinois and Michigan National Heritage Corridor in Lockport, IL, the "George M. O'Brien Visitor Center." This action recognizes the leadership and contributions of our colleague with respect to the creation and establishment of the National Heritage Corridor.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It continues important programs necessary for the protection and enhancement of our unsurpassed natural resources, while maintaining fiscal responsibility and providing a substantial return to the Treasury. I want to commend the subcommittee members for their unselfish efforts and contributions throughout the preparation of this bill. In particular, I want to note the contributions of our ranking minority member, RALPH REGULA.

The report explains the committee actions represented in the bill in considerable detail. For further clarification I am placing a support table into the RECORD to accompany this statement.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	New budget (obligational) authority, adjusted fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	Bill compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	396.175.000	379.139.000	379.085.000	380.370.000	-15.805.000	+1.285.000
Construction and access	1.395.000	1.335.000	1.200.000	1.200.000	-195.000	---
Payments in lieu of taxes	104.370.000	99.882.000	105.000.000	105.000.000	+630.000	---
Land acquisition	2.286.000	2.188.000	---	850.000	-1.436.000	+850.000
Oregon and California grant lands	55.777.000	53.379.000	51.160.000	54.260.000	-1.517.000	+3.100.000
Range improvements	10.000.000	9.570.000	8.506.000	8.506.000	-1.494.000	---
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	4.247.000	4.247.000	5.195.000	5.195.000	+948.000	---
Miscellaneous trust funds	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	---	---
Total, Bureau of Land Management	574.350.000	549.840.000	550.246.000	555.481.000	-18.869.000	+5.235.000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	299.415.000	286.529.000	285.127.000	306.500.000	+7.085.000	+21.373.000
Construction and anadromous fish	21.168.000	20.258.000	3.113.000	21.113.000	-55.000	+18.000.000
Migratory bird conservation account	14.910.000	14.323.000	---	3.000.000	-11.910.000	+3.000.000
Land acquisition	42.799.000	41.061.000	1.500.000	33.225.000	-9.574.000	+31.725.000
National Wildlife Refuge Fund	5.611.000	5.370.000	5.645.000	5.645.000	+34.000	---
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	383.903.000	367.541.000	295.385.000	369.483.000	-14.420.000	+74.098.000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	637.466.000	610.634.000	655.482.000	628.875.000	-8.591.000	-26.607.000
National recreation and preservation	11.029.000	10.555.000	9.547.000	10.904.000	-125.000	+1.357.000
Historic preservation fund	24.795.000	23.729.000	---	24.200.000	-595.000	+24.200.000
Construction	117.286.000	112.408.000	29.114.000	75.989.008	-41.297.000	+46.875.000
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(10.300.000)	(10.300.000)	---	(12.500.000)	(+2.200.000)	(+12.500.000)
Land acquisition and state assistance	97.810.000	93.604.000	15.270.000	101.100.000	+3.290.000	+85.830.000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-28.710.000	-28.710.000	---	---	+28.710.000	---
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	4.771.000	4.566.000	4.771.000	4.771.000	---	---
Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission	248.000	237.000	---	250.000	+2.000	+250.000
Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Commission	75.000	72.000	---	75.000	---	+75.000
Total, National Park Service	864.770.000	827.095.000	714.184.000	846.164.000	-18.606.000	+131.980.000
Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	430.769.000	412.306.000	395.500.000	423.220.000	-7.549.000	+27.720.000
Minerals Management Service						
Leasing and royalty management	167.210.000	160.029.000	160.300.000	162.893.000	-4.317.000	+2.593.000
Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing	---	---	800.000	---	---	-800.000
Total, Minerals Management Service	167.210.000	160.029.000	161.100.000	162.893.000	-4.317.000	+1.793.000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	133.449.000	127.711.000	107.100.000	126.429.000	-7.020.000	+19.329.000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	85.142.000	81.502.000	100.880.000	99.078.000	+13.936.000	-1.802.000
(Rescission)	-210.000	-210.000	---	---	+210.000	---
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	206.141.000	197.277.000	190.520.000	232.720.000	+26.579.000	+42.200.000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	291.073.000	278.569.000	291.400.000	331.798.000	+40.725.000	+40.398.000
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian Programs	921.132.000	882.779.000	862.060.000	892.328.000	-28.804.000	+30.268.000
Construction	102.948.000	98.418.000	59.155.000	86.066.000	-16.882.000	+26.911.000
Road construction	---	---	---	2.500.000	+2.500.000	+2.500.000
Payment to the Alaska Native Escrow account	7.830.000	7.493.000	---	---	-7.830.000	---
Tribal trust funds:						
Definite amount	4.000.000	4.000.000	1.000.000	1.000.000	-3.000.000	---
Revolving fund for loans (limitation on direct loans)	(16.300.000)	(15.599.000)	(16.320.000)	(16.320.000)	(+20.000)	---
Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund	2.197.000	2.103.000	2.485.000	2.652.000	+455.000	+167.000
Indian loan guaranty and insurance fund (limitation on guaranteed loans)	---	---	(30.000.000)	---	---	(-30.000.000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1.038.107.000	994.793.000	924.700.000	984.546.000	-53.561.000	+59.846.000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Administration of territories	79.894.000	76.459.000	71.529.000	78.874.000	-1.020.000	+7.345.000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	19.171.000	76.455.000	13.050.000	14.340.000	-4.831.000	+1.290.000
Compact of Free Association	210.840.000	210.840.000	27.920.000	36.170.000	-174.670.000	+8.250.000
Total, Territorial Affairs	309.905.000	363.754.000	112.499.000	129.384.000	-180.521.000	+16.885.000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	New budget (obligational) authority, adjusted fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	Bill compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987
Departmental Offices						
Office of the Secretary	43.151.000	41.296.000	42.816.000	42.482.000	-669.000	-334.000
Office of the Solicitor	20.256.000	19.385.000	20.800.000	21.255.000	+999.000	+455.000
Office of Inspector General	16.117.000	15.424.000	16.300.000	16.300.000	+183.000	---
Construction Management	775.000	742.000	684.000	684.000	-91.000	---
Office of the Secretary (special foreign currency program)	994.000	951.000	---	---	-994.000	---
Total, Departmental Offices	81.293.000	77.798.000	80.600.000	80.721.000	-572.000	+121.000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority	4.274.829.000	4.159.436.000	3.632.714.000	4.010.119.000	-264.710.000	+377.405.000
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(10.300.000)	(10.300.000)	---	(12.500.000)	(+2.200.000)	(+12.500.000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research	125.525.000	120.127.000	111.481.000	129.183.000	+3.658.000	+17.702.000
State and private forestry	57.799.000	55.321.000	24.871.000	57.671.000	-128.000	+32.800.000
National forest system	1.214.001.000	1.168.924.000	894.488.000	996.687.000	-217.314.000	+102.199.000
Construction	224.222.000	214.654.000	195.197.000	192.409.000	-31.813.000	-2.788.000
Timber receipts transfer to General Fund	(-55.491.000)	(-102.765.000)	(-86.815.000)	(-86.815.000)	(-31.324.000)	---
Timber purchaser credits	---	---	(154.321.000)	---	---	(-154.321.000)
Land acquisition	32.566.000	31.356.000	3.206.000	42.936.000	+10.370.000	+39.730.000
Operation and maintenance of recreation facilities	---	---	52.000.000	---	---	-52.000.000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	777.000	744.000	966.000	966.000	+189.000	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges	20.000	20.000	895.000	895.000	+875.000	---
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	3.798.000	3.798.000	3.800.000	3.800.000	+2.000	---
Miscellaneous trust funds	89.000	85.000	90.000	90.000	+1.000	---
Total, Department of Agriculture	1.658.797.000	1.595.029.000	1.286.994.000	1.424.637.000	-234.160.000	+137.643.000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Energy Security Reserve (rescission) 1/	(-6.900.000.000)	(-6.900.000.000)	---	---	(+6.900.000.000)	---
1/ Rescission not included for comparison purposes.						
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean Coal Technology (by transfer):						
Fiscal year 1986	(99.400.000)	(99.400.000)	---	---	(-99.400.000)	---
Fiscal year 1987	(149.100.000)	(149.100.000)	---	---	(-149.100.000)	---
Fiscal year 1988	(149.100.000)	(149.100.000)	---	---	(-149.100.000)	---
Subtotal, Clean Coal Technology Reserve	(397.600.000)	(397.600.000)	---	---	(-397.600.000)	---
Fossil energy research and development	310.971.000	296.954.000	82.767.000	314.512.000	+3.541.000	+231.745.000
(By transfer)	(13.015.000)	(13.015.000)	(2.511.000)	(2.511.000)	(-10.504.000)	---
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	13.586.000	13.002.000	127.108.000	122.177.000	+108.591.000	-4.931.000
Energy conservation	446.721.000	427.512.000	39.433.000	231.825.000	-214.896.000	+192.392.000
Economic regulation	24.475.000	23.423.000	21.850.000	23.400.000	-1.075.000	+1.550.000
Emergency preparedness	6.008.000	5.750.000	6.044.000	6.044.000	+36.000	---
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	112.365.000	107.533.000	---	147.433.000	+35.068.000	+147.433.000
SPR petroleum account	---	---	---	331.000.000	+331.000.000	+331.000.000
Energy Information Administration	60.318.000	57.724.000	59.651.000	60.361.000	+43.000	+710.000
Alternative fuels production	1.020.360.322	1.020.360.322	---	---	-1.020.360.322	---
Appropriation for debt reduction	-1.020.360.322	-1.020.360.322	---	---	+1.020.360.322	---
Total, Department of Energy	974.444.000	931.898.000	336.853.000	1.236.752.000	+262.308.000	+899.899.000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Health Resources and Services Administration						
Indian health services	831.694.000	821.265.000	722.378.000	836.336.000	+4.642.000	+113.958.000
Indian health facilities	46.665.000	46.198.000	---	54.921.000	+8.256.000	+54.921.000
Total, Department of Health and Human Services	878.359.000	867.463.000	722.378.000	891.257.000	+12.898.000	+166.879.000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education	67.071.000	64.187.000	75.729.000	67.236.000	+165.000	-8.493.000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission						
Salaries and expenses	22.356.000	21.395.000	22.335.000	22.335.000	-21.000	---
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses	176.995.000	169.384.000	190.061.000	189.318.000	+12.323.000	-743.000
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program)	2.485.000	2.378.000	---	---	-2.485.000	---
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	5.518.000	5.281.000	4.851.000	4.851.000	-667.000	---
Restoration and renovation of buildings	11.009.000	10.536.000	12.828.000	12.113.000	+1.104.000	-715.000
Construction	3.976.000	3.805.000	7.500.000	6.095.000	+2.119.000	-1.405.000
Subtotal	199.983.000	191.384.000	215.240.000	212.377.000	+12.394.000	-2.863.000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses	33.587.000	32.108.000	34.607.000	34.607.000	+1.020.000	---
Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings	3.244.000	3.139.000	2.400.000	2.400.000	-844.000	---
Subtotal, National Gallery of Art	36.831.000	35.247.000	37.007.000	37.007.000	+176.000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	New budget (obligational) authority, adjusted fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	Bill compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses	3.372.000	3.227.000	3.266.000	3.383.000	+11.000	+117.000
Payment to the endowment challenge fund	994.000	994.000	---	---	-994.000	---
Subtotal. Woodrow Wilson Center	4.366.000	4.221.000	3.266.000	3.383.000	-983.000	+117.000
Total Smithsonian Institution	241.180.000	230.862.000	255.513.000	252.767.000	+11.587.000	-2.746.000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration	120.948.000	115.148.000	102.000.000	120.761.000	-187.000	+18.761.000
Administrative expenses	15.489.000	15.423.000	15.900.000	15.900.000	+411.000	---
Subtotal	136.437.000	130.571.000	117.900.000	136.661.000	+224.000	+18.761.000
Matching grants	29.224.000	27.967.000	27.000.000	29.000.000	-224.000	+2.000.000
Total. National Endowment for the Arts	165.661.000	158.538.000	144.900.000	165.661.000	---	+20.761.000
Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Fund						
Salaries and expenses	298.000	285.000	---	---	-298.000	---
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration	96.038.000	91.823.000	83.140.000	95.840.000	-198.000	+12.700.000
Administrative expenses	14.115.000	13.508.000	14.300.000	14.301.000	+186.000	+1.000
Subtotal	110.153.000	105.331.000	97.440.000	110.141.000	-12.000	+12.701.000
Matching grants	28.488.000	27.263.000	29.000.000	28.500.000	+12.000	-500.000
Total. National Endowment for the Humanities	138.641.000	132.594.000	126.440.000	138.641.000	---	+12.201.000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants	1.988.000	1.988.000	---	3.500.000	+1.512.000	+3.500.000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration	21.394.000	20.474.000	330.000	21.394.000	---	+21.064.000
Total. National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities	327.982.000	313.879.000	271.670.000	329.196.000	+1.214.000	+57.526.000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses	380.000	364.000	420.000	420.000	+40.000	---
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses	1.575.000	1.507.000	1.417.000	1.533.000	-42.000	+116.000
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	2.696.000	2.580.000	2.684.000	2.684.000	-12.000	---
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	21.000	20.000	---	5.000	-16.000	+5.000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salaries and expenses	2.315.000	2.215.000	2.437.000	2.342.000	+27.000	-95.000
Public development	3.230.000	3.091.000	3.774.000	3.869.000	+639.000	+95.000
Total. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	5.545.000	5.306.000	6.211.000	6.211.000	+666.000	---
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council	2.112.000	2.021.000	2.057.000	2.040.000	-72.000	-17.000
Total. title II. Related Agencies: New budget (obligational) authority	4.182.518.000	4.036.501.000	2.984.261.000	4.237.073.000	+54.555.000	+1.252.812.000
RECAPITULATION						
Total. Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations:						
New budget (obligational) authority	8.457.347.000	8.195.937.000	6.616.975.000	8.247.192.000	-210.155.000	+1.630.217.000
Rescission	(-28.920.000)	(-28.920.000)	---	---	(+28.920.000)	---
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(10.300.000)	(10.300.000)	---	(12.500.000)	(+2.200.000)	(+12.500.000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(16.300.000)	(15.599.000)	(16.320.000)	(16.320.000)	(+20.000)	---
(Timber receipt transfer to general fund)	(-55.491.000)	(-102.765.000)	(-86.815.000)	(-86.815.000)	(-31.324.000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	---	---	(30.000.000)	---	---	(-30.000.000)
(By transfer)	(13.015.000)	(13.015.000)	(2.511.000)	(2.511.000)	(-10.504.000)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	New budget (obligational) authority, adjusted fiscal year 1986	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill	Bill compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1986	Bill compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1987
TITLE I -DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management	574.350.000	549.840.000	550.246.000	555.481.000	-18.869.000	+5.235.000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	383.903.000	367.541.000	295.385.000	369.483.000	-14.420.000	+74.098.000
National Park Service	864.770.000	827.095.000	714.184.000	846.164.000	-18.606.000	+131.980.000
Geological Survey	430.769.000	412.306.000	395.500.000	423.220.000	-7.549.000	+27.720.000
Minerals Management Serivce	167.210.000	160.029.000	161.100.000	162.893.000	-4.317.000	+1.793.000
Bureau of Mines	133.449.000	127.711.000	107.100.000	126.429.000	-7.020.000	+19.329.000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	291.073.000	278.569.000	291.400.000	331.798.000	+40.725.000	+40.398.000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1.038.107.000	994.793.000	924.700.000	984.546.000	-53.561.000	+59.846.000
Territorial and International Affairs	309.905.000	363.754.000	112.499.000	129.384.000	-180.521.000	+16.885.000
Secretarial Offices	81.293.000	77.798.000	80.600.000	80.721.000	-572.000	+121.000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	4.274.829.000	4.159.436.000	3.632.714.000	4.010.119.000	-264.710.000	+377.405.000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	1.658.797.000	1.595.029.000	1.286.994.000	1.424.637.000	-234.160.000	+137.643.000
Department of the Treasury	(-6.900.000.000)	(-6.900.000.000)	---	---	(+6.900.000.000)	---
Department of Energy	974.444.000	931.898.000	336.863.000	1.236.752.000	+262.308.000	+899.889.000
Indian Health	878.359.000	867.463.000	722.378.000	891.257.000	+12.898.000	+168.879.000
Indian Education	67.071.000	64.187.000	75.729.000	67.236.000	+165.000	-8.493.000
Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission	22.356.000	21.395.000	22.335.000	22.335.000	-21.000	---
Smithsonian	199.983.000	191.384.000	215.240.000	212.377.000	+12.394.000	-2.863.000
National Gallery of Art	36.831.000	35.247.000	37.007.000	37.007.000	+176.000	---
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	4.366.000	4.221.000	3.266.000	3.383.000	-983.000	+117.000
National Endowment for the Arts	165.661.000	158.538.000	144.900.000	165.661.000	---	+20.761.000
Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Fund	298.000	285.000	---	---	-298.000	---
National Endowment for the Humanities	138.641.000	132.594.000	126.440.000	138.641.000	---	+12.201.000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	1.988.000	1.988.000	---	3.500.000	+1.512.000	+3.500.000
Institute of Museum Services	21.394.000	20.474.000	330.000	21.394.000	---	+21.064.000
Commission of Fine Arts	380.000	364.000	420.000	420.000	+40.000	---
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	1.575.000	1.507.000	1.417.000	1.533.000	-42.000	+116.000
National Capital Planning Commission	2.696.000	2.580.000	2.684.000	2.684.000	-12.000	---
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	21.000	20.000	---	5.000	-16.000	+5.000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	5.545.000	5.306.000	6.211.000	6.211.000	+666.000	---
Holocaust Memorial Council	2.112.000	2.021.000	2.057.000	2.040.000	-72.000	-17.000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	4.182.518.000	4.036.501.000	2.984.261.000	4.237.073.000	+54.555.000	+1.252.812.000
Grand total	8.457.347.000	8.195.937.000	6.616.975.000	8.247.192.000	-210.155.000	+1.630.217.000

□ 1540

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

Mr. Chairman, my able chairman has described the bill very well. I want to say before I get started that the chairman has been eminently fair. He has provided an opportunity for all members of the subcommittee to participate in the drafting of this bill and in dealing with the issues that are in it, even at times when he may have disagreed with some of the results.

Likewise, the gentleman has been very fair with witnesses. We have had more than 900 witnesses on issues before this subcommittee, and in all instances, the chairman has given them every opportunity to be heard.

I also want to commend the staff of the subcommittee. They, too, have been very open and receptive to all of the members of the committee and work well in serving all of us.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I meant to address a subject that is very close to my heart when I began my remarks and I am sorry that I got lost in the Navajo/Hopi dispute.

What I wanted to tell the members of the committee and the House was the tremendous assistance that was given to our committee by the ranking member on the Republican side. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] participated in all the hearings. He participated in all of the decisions. In all my years in the Congress, I have never encountered any Member who is more able, more cooperative and more willing to work conscientiously. It is a real pleasure for me to pay this tribute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Certainly I think we have worked well together to try to bring to this body a responsible bill.

To those of you who read the letter on the minority side from our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, Mr. LATTA, he points out in his letter that we are $344 million under the budget allocation in BA and we are $11 million under in outlays. As the chairman has said, we will even be under fiscal year 1986, post-Gramm-Rudman following amendments that the chairman will offer.

This is in the face of the fact that in this bill, we provide funding for the management of one-third of the United States. Most people do not realize that one-third of all the land in this Nation is owned by the Federal Government and is fiscally managed by the provisions of this bill.

Also, we did this in the face of the fact that we had over 1,200 requests from 256 of our colleagues for all kinds of projects. There are very few districts in the United States that are not, in some way, touched by what is done in this bill.

I also would point out that this bill is one of the few, if not the only bill, that we will be dealing with in appropriations that actually returns money to the Treasury. The activities that are governed by this bill and expenditures contained therein will generate $1.345 billion more than it costs to manage them.

The revenues from Outer Continental Shelf drilling, the revenues from various other mineral developments on the public lands, the revenues from the sale of the timber are all part of that money that flows into the U.S. Treasury. Much of it goes out in land and water conservation funds to provide local communities assistance in building parks or other recreational facilities to serve the people.

Likewise, some of it has gone to the States to give them a helping hand.

I think this is a bill that is very important to America. It is a very positive bill because we are doing things that are very essential to the future well-being of our country.

Just to touch on a couple of policy issues that are important. One concerns the Forest Service, and maintenance. I think we need to do more in maintenance in the Forest Service. It is a little-known fact that there are 2½ times as many visitor days to our national forests as there are to our national parks. We think of the parks as being the recreational areas when, in fact, the pressure on the Forest Service has grown tremendously over the last several years for the usage as a recreation area, and it is as well the area that produces probably 30 to 40 percent of the lumber that is sold in the United States.

Forty-four percent of all the recreation on Federal lands takes place in our national forests, which brings me to something that I think as a Congress we need to address. That is the issue of fees for entrance to our national parks and for the use of recreational facilities in the national forests.

In the bill, we do not do anything about this, therefore I would share this information with you.

For $3, a carload of people can go into Yosemite for 7 days. For Yellowstone, a carload of people can go in for $2. In 1930, the entrance fee to Yellowstone for a carload was $3. In 1986, it is $2.

Why do I bring these points to you? I might also mention Denali National Park in Alaska, a total of 6 million acres where there is no entrance fee. In fact, we provide a bus service so that people visiting Denali, some 450,000 last year, pay nothing for the bus service.

□ 1550

I think that is wonderful if we can afford it, and I wish we could continue this; but I would point out to the Members that the fees only pay 7 percent of the costs of maintaining our parks.

I am concerned that in the future the pressures to maintain parks and recreation facilities from both a health and safety standpoint, as well as providing campsites, will continue to grow while we do not have adequate funding to take care of them as we should.

I would hope that at some future time in the authorizing committee and in this body, we address the problem of entrance fees to the parks. I would like to see those increased, with the money going back into the park or the Forest Service, wherever it is generated. We should plow it back in to improve the quality of the experience that the camper or the visitor would have.

We cannot do that unless we do change the statutes to allow a greater charge for access to the park system.

In 1986, we collected $21 million in fees at the same time Americans were spending almost $4 billion to go to the movies. So it illustrates, I think, the need to address this as a policy issue.

Second, this bill deals with many of the energy problems of the United States. I want to caution Members, I think something we need to be concerned about is a growing dependence on foreign sources of petroleum.

It is estimated that by 1995, 43 percent of our consumption in the United States will be imported. Now that may not concern us today when gasoline prices are going down, but I think we are beginning to mainline on petroleum imports in the United States, and there will be a day of reckoning.

As Jim Schlesinger, who used to be the Secretary of the Department of Energy said so well: "Our country vascillates between panic and complacency." Today it is complacency; in a few years it could well be panic.

I think that as a policy question we should be focusing on the energy needs of this Nation in the years to come. We have all heard that clicke that an army marches on its stomach. Well, I would say that 1986's army marches on its gasoline tank.

It is vital that we think in terms not only of our own usage and the vital importance of petroleum to our industrial base in this Nation, but also as to the defense needs of our country.

On the question of the Outer Continental Shelf, we have addressed this, particularly the California situation. I would have to say to you that this policy issue will be before us in 1987 because we have in effect said in the bill that the Department of Interior shall bring back a 5-year plan under the OCS Lands Act, and included in there shall be their recommendations for the OCS area off the coast of California.

At that time, this body will have to make a decision as to what we think that policy should be, not only on California but all of our OCS lands. We will have to address the problem of energy security. Also we will have to address the problem of how indebted we choose to be to the OPEC nations, because it has great foreign policy implications.

The decisions as to the energy situation in the United States in 1995 and the year 2000 will be made today and tomorrow, and not at that time. So those are questions that we need to address.

Likewise, we are going to have to address ultimately the issue of Alaskan offshore land as well as to whether or not other areas of Alaska are put in to wilderness designation.

These are some of the things I would mention to you that are part of this bill or part of the policy issues that will confront us in the months ahead.

I am happy to report to you, because it was the subject of substantial debate last year, that progress is being made on the question of clean coal, I am pleased to report to you that just last week the Department of Energy selected 9 out of 51 proposals to develop clean coal technology. This would be technology to be used in steel making, the generation of electric power, industrial processing, and the production of fuel.

I think the interesting thing about this is the fact that in our legislation last year, which was the subject of some discussion on this floor, we adopted a $400-million appropriation for clean coal; but we required that it be matched by another 50 percent, or $400 million in the private sector.

So that any project had to be at least a 50-50 match. The projects that were selected last week by DOE have only 35 percent Federal moneys in them, and 65 percent private money.

That says very clearly that the private sector has confidence in the technology that they are proposing, and they are simply saying, "We need a helping hand from the Federal Government, but we're willing"—that is, the private sector—"to put up 65 percent of the cost, even though the legislation only required 50 percent."

I would hope that we will take some time on the acid rain issue and give clean coal programs an opportunity, to reach fruition, because it seems to me that we cannot spend a lot of money on capital investment mandated by acid rain legislation and then come along with clean coal technology, which would be in the long term a better solution and expect to put that in place also. There is only so much money available in the private sector industrial economy.

I think the fact that we have these projects; that they are going to be on stream, is evidence that there is a strong, strong commitment on the part of the private sector. This is very important for the future of energy, for the future of clean air in this Nation.

I commend this bill to all of my colleagues and ask for your support. We have worked in a very responsible way, in my judgment, as a bipartisan committee to address a lot of tough issues, to respond to the Members and the concerns they have for the development of projects in their district, and we have done it and still stayed under the outlays and the budget authority, post-Gramm-Rudman, or we will be with the chairman's amendment. I think that is a substantial accomplishment given the fact of the nature of the challenges we have in this subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, I support the provision of the bill which provides for a phased increase in grazing fees from the current fee of $1.35 per animal unit month to $4.68 per AUM. If this language is successfully challenged on a point of order, and the administration fails to increase the fee administratively, I encourage my colleagues to adopt legislation to increase the fee. The program is costing taxpayers a lot of money, and the 2 percent of the American livestock producers who feed their livestock on subsidized public rangelands have a competitive advantage relative to all other livestock producers.

As the Committee on Government Operations concluded in a report issued last spring, the current fee of $1.35 per AUM is inconsistent with the fair market value criteria contained in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. The committee also recommended administative action to increase the fee (H. Rept. 99-593). The Departments of the Interior and Agriculture spent $4 million for a recent study of the grazing fee for public rangelands which established that the average 1983 appraised market value was $6.53 per AUM for all Federal grazing land. That is almost 5 times the $1.35 currently charged by Interior and Agriculture and perpetuated by an Executive order issued in February 1986. In fact, the committee found that grazing fees do not even cover the costs of the grazing program, falling short by $78 million for 1982 and 1983, and by almost $33 million for 1984. For 1985, the Office of Management and Budget estimated that the grazing fee covered only "35 percent of Federal costs of range management and improvement."

Currently, less than 2 percent of American livestock producers feed their livestock on public rangelands. If we decided to subsidize all livestock producers equally, it would cost the American taxpayer more than $2 billion annually. In addition, even though it is predominantly Western livestock producers who use public rangelands, only 7 percent of those producers have access to the public rangelands.

Furthermore, according to projections provided by USDA's Economic Research Service, continued use of the formula contained in the Executive order will keep the fee at $1.35 until 1991. The Committee on Government Operations concluded that during a time of burgeoning deficits and painful cuts required by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act, a fee failing to even cover the costs of the program cannot be justified.

One of the more interesting things we learned during the investigation was that permittees who pay $1.35 per AUM include not just traditional family ranchers, but major oil companies, land investment partnerships, agribusinesses and lawyers and doctors who engage in ranching as a weekend avocation.

In addition, the Bureau of Land Management—but not the Forest Service—allows the permittees to "sublease" the use of grazing permits to others. They charge a higher price, and pocket the difference between the $1.35 per AUM that the public Treasury receives and the amount received from the producer who actually grazes livestock on the rangelands.

In October 1984 Congress enacted a provision to try to collect these windfall profits for the public Treasury. But to date BLM has successfully thwarted Congress' efforts. At the time of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources in December 1985, not a single cent has been collected by BLM in accordance with the statute. As of June 30, 1986, the BLM reported it had collected a total of only $8,274.45 in "subleasing" profits on 5 permits, despite the fact that BLM itself had identified 633 leases from which it could collect such profits. In addition, BLM has shielded hundreds of other subleasing types of arrangements from collection efforts through a narrow and highly questionable interpretation of the statute. As a result, somebody other than the American taxpayer is making money off the public's land and, in some cases, damaging it in the process by overgrazing.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCKINNEY].

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted today to rise in support of H.R. 5234, the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987, and call to the attention of the House the fact that for the third consecutive year the House Appropriation Subcommittee on Interior has recommended an appropriation for the Connecticut Coastal National Wildlife Refuge, the refuge that was born of legislation I introduced in 1984.

The difficult task of prioritizing the many worthwhile land acquisition requests that come before the Interior Subcommittee is understood by this Member. Therefore, it is with much appreciation that I applaud Chairman SIDNEY YATES and ranking Republican RALPH REGULA for their efforts on behalf of this significant project in my home State of Connecticut. I also applaud the efforts of full committee Chairman JAMIE WHITTEN and senior committee Republican SILVIO CONTE.

As recommended by the committee, the appropriation level for the Connecticut Coastal National Wildlife Refuge is a modest $600,000. This appropriation will allow the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to purchase the final major site in the refuge—the 10-acre barrier beach at Milford Point, which lies in Connecticut's Third Congressional District represented by my good friend BRUCE MORRISON. The other three areas of the 145-acre refuge—Chimon and Sheffield Islands off Norwalk and Falkner's Island off Guilford—already are owned and managed by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Approximately 11 acres of 62-acre Sheffield Island are privately owned.

The preservation of Milford Point is a tremendous victory for wildlife conservation in Connecticut, in New England, and in our Nation. Some wildlife experts claim that it is the most ecologically significant site in the four-part Federal refuge. The barrier beach certainly is the vital link that holds together the individual parts of the refuge as an ecological whole.

As the only mainland site in the Connecticut refuge, Milford Point is readily accessible to those seeking outdoor recreation, and it will be open to the public during the nonnesting season. This sandy spot is home to the rare piping plover as well as a resting stop for many of the migratory birds that are supported by the refuge.

Including the committee recommendation for 1987, the total price tag for the refuge is approximately $3 million. Given the outrageous amounts of money currently being paid for property on Long Island Sound, the Federal refuge is being purchased at bargain prices—something of which we can be proud in this dark fiscal period of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. Another major accomplishment of the completion of this project is that it is the first Federal wildlife refuge created on the Atlantic coast in more than a decade.

It isn't often that we in Congress can legislate in perpetuity. But creation of national wildlife refuges, parks, monuments, and trails comes the closest. Today, I take great pride in knowing that Congress has moved one step closer to completing the Connecticut Coastal National Wildlife Refuge.

I urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 5234.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman and the ranking member for their leadership and their willingness for the third consecutive year to support the creation and now the completion of the Connecticut Coastal Wildlife Refuge. In particular, the $600,000 that is in this bill will allow for the completion of the purchase of the Milford Point portion of this wildlife refuge.

It is an important, ecologically critical area; we have been lucky enough

to have the Nature Conservancy taking a leadership in the acquisition of this property by the provision of these appropriated funds. They can now transfer this property permanently to the Federal Government; the Connecticut Coastal Wildlife Refuge and all four parcels intended when the program was authorized are now going to be owned by the Federal Government and preserved forever in Connecticut, where only 3 percent of the coastal area is in fact open space.

□ 1600

We now have a critical resource, and it is through the leadership of this committee, and I want to thank the committee for their help in making this very important environmental resource possible in my district and elsewhere in Connecticut.

I thank the Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, it would not be an Interior appropriations bill without a debate over the proper role of the California OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Program in our Nation's energy security. This is, in fact, the sixth consecutive year in which the issue has dominated much of our discussion on this bill. For the first 4 of those years a blanket moratorium on large portions off the California coast was indiscriminately implemented. Last year, the Congress set up a formal consultation group consisting of the Interior Department and designated Members of Congress, of which I was one. This was in lieu of a moratorium.

While the consultation group met 16 times this year, and examined the OCS issue and options for resolving this dispute in great detail, we were unable to reach a final agreement. Opponents of OCS leasing sought and obtained yet another moratorium in the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior. However, the full committee adopted the so-called compromise that is in the bill before us today.

I regret that the committee found it necessary to legislate in this manner on the OCS issue. However, I appreciate the need to act in light of the circumstances as they exist. In some ways, the outcome could be much worse, given the demands made by the opponents of OCS leasing in our negotiations.

My purpose in rising to speak today is simply to set forth the facts so that my colleagues go into this with their eyes open, fully informed of the consequences of the California OCS provisions of this bill.

In February of this year, the Interior Department issued the proposed program to guide OCS leasing for the 5-year period that will run from January 1987 through December 1991. The plan contemplates at least five sales in three California planning areas: sales 91 and 128 in northern California, sales 95 and 138 in southern California and sale 119 in central California. All of these areas are believed to be some of the most promising new energy fields in the entire United States, containing billions of barrels of oil and trillions of cubic feet of natural gas.

The Interior Appropriations bill contains provisions which will result in a substantial delay in holding the scheduled lease sales. Every year of delay postpones the tough decisions and choices we face in balancing orderly energy development with legitimate environmental concerns, such as air quality. Most importantly, delay denies the Nation the access to these sources of energy which we will need when they become available at the end of the decade of the 1990's.

Specifically, the bill affects sales 91, 95, and 119 directly, and might indirectly impact upon the timing of sales 128 and 138. For example, the call for information on sale 91 for northern California went out in February of this year as scheduled. This is the first step in a process that takes almost 2 years from a call to an actual sale of leases. In the interim, there are draft and final environmental impact statements, comments from the State and local governments, area identifications, public hearings and notices of sale.

While the call on sale 91 has gone out, the express terms of the bill prohibit the draft environmental impact statement on this sale from being published until at least 90 days after the draft final 5-year plan is sent to Congress next year. In other words, the draft EIS which under the proposed 5-year plan was to be done in March 1987, will now be put off until the late spring of next year. More importantly, the bill prohibits the final notice of sale on 91 from being issued prior to January 1, 1989, meaning no lease sale until at least February 1989. The proposed 5-year program currently contemplates the holding of sale 91 in April 1988, a full year's delay.

On the surface, the only provision in the bill on southern California lease sale 95 is a prohibition on taking the initial step, the call for information, until March 1987. However, this has the practical effect of bumping all of the steps back in time, thus delaying the sale. My best estimate, based on the time interval between steps in the proposed program, is that the notice on sale 95 would not occur until February 1989 and thus the sale would not take place until March 1989, or later.

As I indicated earlier, I concede that things could be worse. The bill does not rope off areas of the OCS from development by legislation when sales actually do occur. There are no arbitrary buffer zones lasting up to 15 years that would block access to the most promising geological areas. Prelease activities can go forward on all of the sales.

Nonetheless, the House should know that we are doing damage to our long-term ability to meet the energy needs of the country without returning to the dependence on imported oil that we have strived so hard to avoid. Sitting in 1986, with an oil glut and falling prices, the temptation of complacency is powerfully attractive. As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels, where we wrestle with energy policy every day, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not sound the warning to resist the temptation.

The latest data from the Department of Energy shows that oil imports are up fully 25 percent from 1 year ago. We have projections that imports will double in the next decade if we do not find new sources of oil. Even once these sales occur, if they occur on time, there is a great deal of work from lease sale to energy production. It is a process that can take up to 5 to 10 years. We are talking about the energy for the 21st century. To make policy for the year 2000 based on the glut of 1986 is shortsighted in the extreme. We cannot predict the market that will prevail in 12 months, much less what we will face in 12 years. The only safe course is to be prepared. The provisions of this bill run counter to that objective.

While this seems to be the best we can accomplish at this hour, I only hope that in the very near future we can persuade our colleagues from around the country that this is more than a California issue, it is a national issue and should be treated as such. Even within California, we need to awaken the rest of the State to the importance of OCS leasing to our economy so that we might bring some balance to the debate. We want to work with our coastal district colleagues, but not at the expense of our long-term energy security.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to the chairman and the ranking member for the long efforts that they have provided in trying to find a compromise with regard to the issue of off-shore drilling. It is not an easy issue, obviously, to resolve.

Mr. Chairman, included in the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987 is a provision which represents an important step toward reaching a long term, balanced settlement of the dispute over oil and gas development offshore California. This provision is the result of a compromise worked out between members of the California dele-

gation and members of the Appropriations Committee as an alternative to the reinstatement of the leasing moratorium which has been included in four of the last five Interior appropriations bills.

This compromise was crafted after 6 months of negotiations between an 18 member congressional task force and representatives of the Interior Department. When it became clear that these negotiations would not produce an agreement based on a tract-by-tract analysis, the Department proposed a procedural delay, during which time the Secretary would review each of the proposals which had been made during the course of the negotiations. It was the position of the California negotiators that such a delay would be acceptable only if lease sales scheduled for northern and southern California would be held in abeyance during the Secretary's review. Unfortunately, while the Department agreed to delay the southern California sale for 1 year, it refused to negotiate a delay on the northern California sale.

The compromise worked out with members of the Appropriations Committee represents the final position of the Interior Department in the negotiations with the addition of a delay in the northern California sale. I believe that the delay on both lease sales represents fair and equitable treatment for the coast, as well as offering an opportunity for meaningful negotiations with the Department. Up to this point, Interior has had little incentive to talk seriously, and it is my hope that with the enactment of this provision we can move toward a compromise acceptable to all the parties involved in this long and contentious debate.

I would like to pay personal tribute to those Members who have been involved in the months of negotiations with the Department and to those members of the Appropriations Committee who have been instrumental in bringing about this compromise. In particular, I would like to thank Interior Subcommittee Chairman SID YATES for his longstanding commitment to a balanced approach to oil and gas development offshore California. There is no doubt that without the leadership provided by the chairman over the past few years, the ill-advised leasing schemes of former Interior Secretary James Watt would have been carried out. His support for the compromise included in this year's bill is one of the keys to the success of this approach.

I would also like to pay tribute to the ranking minority member of the Interior Subcommittee, Mr. REGULA, who played a key role in reaching this compromise. His willingness to weigh fairly the arguments of all the parties involved, his patience during months of negotiations having no direct impact on his district or his State, and his commitment to reaching a fair and equitable settlement have played a crucial role in this debate.

My sincere thanks and appreciation go also to Mr. FAZIO and Mr. LOWERY, of California, for their longstanding support and assistance on the committee and to the other Members who have worked so long and hard to win a fair settlement for the people of California. While this provision does not represent a settlement, it does offer the hope of a reasonable, balanced policy with respect to the protection and development of a truly national resource.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] a member of the committee.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5234, the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1987. This is an extremely important piece of legislation which makes appropriations not only for the Department of the Interior, but also for programs administered by the U.S. Forest Service, the Department of Energy, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

The Committee on Interior appropriations has reported a bill that represents fiscal restraint at a time when we all are making every effort to tighten our fiscal belts. The legislation comes in under its 302(b) allocation, both in budget authority and outlays for the most recently agreed current resolution on the budget for the fiscal year.

The chairman has already outlined the major provisions of this bill, and so I would like to highlight a few items that are of particular interest to my constituents in the Second Congressional District in New Mexico and my colleagues. First of all, I was extremely pleased that the subcommittee has funded a number of important energy initiatives aimed at providing for a more secure energy future. We are all painfully aware that the current world energy glut masks a potentially dangerous energy future if we do not promote policies that enhance—not diminish—our energy security. To that end, I was pleased that the Appropriations Committee has recommended funding for continued construction of oil storage capacity for the strategic petroleum reserve, and has included $331 million for continued purchases of oil at a rate of 85,000 barrels a day. In the area of fossil energy conservation research and development, the committee has continued its commitment by providing major increases above fiscal year 1987 budget levels, while maintaining levels of support consistent with previous years. For fossil energy research and development the bill recommends $314,512,000, an increase of $231,745,000 above the requested level, and for conservation research and development a level of $159,675,000, an increase of $125,242,000.

Mr Chairman, there are just a few areas that I have concerns about which I feel compelled to discuss at this time. The first item is that provision in the bill which seeks to raise grazing fees on Bureau of Land Management lands by more than 300 percent. This dramatic increase was included in the bill without the benefit of public input, and no hearings were held on this proposal by the authorizing committee. Mr. Chairman, the livestock industry is currently facing its worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Many ranchers have gone bankrupt and many Federal grazing allotments and private grazing lands are going unused. Now is not the time to arbitrarily and perhaps capriciously add another burden to our farmers and ranchers in these difficult times. At the appropriate time, I will offer a point of order against this provision in the bill and remove it from the bill.

Finally Mr. Chairman, and for similar reasons, I am opposed to that section in the report which recommends a decrease of $2,243,000 for wild horse and burro management. If this provision remains, it would mean that no more animals would be removed from Federal rangelands during the coming fiscal year. I believe this would be a big mistake and I would hope that an agreement could be reached in conference on this section of the report.

So except for those two provisions, Mr. Chairman, I do support this critical legislation and urge its adoption.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the chairman for pronouncing the name "Oregon" correctly, and I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for a great number of things in this fine bill but particularly the two pieces of legislation in the bill that deal with buy-America on oil rigs and the log export prohibition on our public lands.

It is essential that we require oil drilling rigs to be bought, to be used in the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States, to be built in the United States. Now, the people of my congressional district, Coos Bay, were doublecrossed.

Last year when they were promised they would get support for it and the fact that the chairman and his committee have put this in their bill is a great advantage to Oregon, and we thank you tremendously.

Our primary industries in this Nation are eroding before our eyes. We are losing our primary industry.

Our economy is falling apart, and we sit and do nothing; at least the administration does nothing; the Congress is beginning to act.

Factory orders this month, down again for 3 months in a row; new home sales, the big building block of the economy supposedly this year, have fallen for the third month in a row, down 10 percent in the last month.

So the only thing they had going for them, housing which feeds our lumber industry, it is falling apart now also. So thank goodness we can still, if this bill becomes law, build some things in the United States and not have the entire manufacturing of this country done overseas by foreign labor and by foreign capital.

If we cannot protect our workers, if we cannot protect our industry, who can?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITTAKER].

Mr. WHITTAKER. Mr. Chairman, these Interior appropriations are extremely important to the Nation as a whole. However, I have taken a special interest in one particular detail in this bill regarding the allocation of abandoned mine land reclamation funds among the States.

In Kansas, our coal production has dropped but the problems left behind have not gone away. That is why we depend on the Secretary's discretionary fund to keep our mine land reclamation programs operating.

Earlier this year, I submitted letters to the Office of Surface Mining from about 20 States and tribes which generally supported the idea of a $2 million minimum based budget. Under such a program, States with less coal production—but no fewer problems left over from the past—would have at least $2 million to address critical reclamation needs in their jurisdiction.

I urge my colleagues from the following States to take note that their AML officials were backing a minimum based budget which is essentially prohibited by this bill: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Lousiana, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming.

I'll repeat that these are States which supported a minimum based budget formula.

It is my understanding that OSM was considering some type of minimum based program which would benefit Kansas and other States. Unfortunately, there is language in this bill which short circuits these efforts. This bill says simply that the Secretary's discretionary fund must be apportioned solely on the basis of inventory. In effect, we take away the Secretary's discretion and that could be bad for many States which could have benefited from a minimum based budget.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to base the future of AML programs in many States on inventory, I hope that the OSM is especially sensitive to Kansas' efforts to update its inventory.

In a letter to me dated July 10, 1986, Jed Christensen, Director of the OSM, told me:

> Allocations for all States for 1986 were based on the original inventory data since this was what was available to OSMRE at the time the 1986 allocations were determined. States and tribes have now been given until July 31, 1986 to submit inventory updates. OSMRE plans to process these updates for use in determining the 1987 allocations. In addition, OSMRE will allow another year to update the inventory to be used for the 1988 allocation and thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, it my understanding that Kansas has submitted roughly $200 million in updates to better reflect its inventory of eligible sites.

I have every confidence that Mr. Christensen will keep his pledge by making certain that Kansas' updates are taken into account when OSM apportions the Secretary's discretionary funds in 1987.

However, if the Director and the Secretary have reason to conclude in the future that some sort of minimum based budget is needed to address the needs of some States, I urge these responsible administrators to return to Congress with such a formula.

□ 1615

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my strong support for H.R. 5234, the fiscal year 1987 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

I want to particularly compliment the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and Mr. REGULA, the ranking minority member, for the outstanding job they have done on this year's bill. At a time of undeniable fiscal constraint, they have fashioned a measure, which discharges some of the most important responsibilities of the Federal Government, in a manner that acknowledges, both the needs of the Nation, and the imperatives of the budget. In addition, I want to take special note of the effort of the staff, whose many significant contributions greatly facilitated the work of the subcommittee.

I know of no appropriations subcommittee, which has a more diverse scope of responsibility, than does the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies. From the operation of the Smithsonian Institution to logging on Federal lands in Oregon, from the acquisition of land for a national park in Florida, to research on magnetohydrodynamics, from Indian health and education programs, to the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, DC. It's all here in this bill. There is no region in the country that is not, in some way, affected by the programs funded in H.R. 5234. Others lay claim to the title "all American bill," but make no mistake, this one is it.

The United States is a nation rich in history and physical beauty. One of the best decisions Congress ever made was to support the creation of the National Park System, through wich irreplaceable treasures of nature, and of our country's past, can be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations. This bill continues a century-old tradition of maintaining our national parks and national historic sites.

It also provides funds for a limited amount of park land acquisition. These funds, and the funds the bill makes available for land acquisition in the National Forest System, are a testament to the subcommittee's belief that we must act where we can to prevent development on land that should properly be reserved for the enjoyment of all Americans. In spite of the very real budget pressures we face, the subcommittee has been able to set aside funds for this important purpose. That is an action that I strongly support.

As I believe most of the Members of the House would agree, the United States has not yet solved the fundamental energy problems that led to gasoline lines in the not-too-distant past. We have made progress, however, in the development of both, alternative fuels and advanced energy conservation techniques. This bill builds on that progress by supporting programs, that I am confident will hasten the day when our current overreliance on petroleum is brought to an end. Efforts to burn coal more efficiently and more cleanly, as well as the continued development of fuel cells, which are among the technologies funded by H.R. 5234, hold out the promise that the United States will enter the next century making far better use of the resources that it has in abundance than we are doing today.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter covered by this bill to which I want to make special reference. For a number of years, because of the leadership of Chairman YATES, the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies has made available funds for the Low-income Weatherization Program. That program, has been able to weatherize about 200,000 households annually with the Federal funds we have provided. This program has made a tremendous difference in the lives of the low-income people it has served. Some States, like my own State of Massachusetts, have supplemented Federal weatherization funds with money of their own. There continues

to be, however, a great need for this type of energy conservation effort, a need which has been estimated at between 15 to 20 million households.

Our decision on weatherization, as modified by Mr. YATES' amendment, reflects the subcommittee's awareness that the States would be receiving far more in funds derived from the settlement of oil overcharge cases than we could make available. We believe that the States have the means, through the oil overcharge funds, to continue weatherization at a level which will at least match the national fiscal year 1986 level of effort. We have provided administrative fees to accomplish that result, and we will closely monitor the performance of the States in this regard. When Federal appropriations are again necessary to sustain this important program, I intend to support them, and I believe that the subcommittee will as well.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5234 is an important bill, which deserves the support of the House. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the legislation. I want to compliment the chairman, the ranking member, and all of the members of the committee for this excellent legislation. I think you clearly have the most interesting and diverse appropriation legislation that comes before the Congress each year. I look forward to working with you next year, with earlier notice, on some efforts for funding through Federal cost-sharing provisions for interpretation centers and signing of some of our historic trails for example, the Lewis and Clark, Morman, and Oregon Trails.

Primarily today, however, I want to talk about the American mustang, the four-legged variety, and about the discussed and cussed and occasionally loved American burro that exist on BLM lands in Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and at other locations.

Two types of facilities are involved in the BLM Wild Horse and Burro Management Program. They are holding facilities, primarily used for conditioning the burro and wild horses and related veterinarian services to prepare these mustangs and burros for adoption. Second, there are the adoption facilities.

I am concerned about the language on the committee report on pages 11 and 12 where the committee recommends decreasing the BLM appropriation by $2,423,000 based upon the expectation that no animals would be removed from BLM lands in fiscal year 1987. The committee goes on to say it "believes no more animals should be removed until it is established the projected vastly increased adoption rates actually can be achieved."

One of the two—or perhaps now three—holding facilities is in my district near Bloomfield, NE. I am concerned about the committee's recommendation because one cannot reasonably just start and stop these holding facility operations at will without great dislocation, cost, and inefficiency. The contractors of these holding facilities are not going to be interested in being contractors in the future if they are shut down after only 1 year and despite making substantial capital investment. I think you have created a very definite and substantial problem for these contractors if you cut back the removal of wild horses and burros from BLM to zero level.

So I am suggesting to the committee that, as a minimum, some accommodation ought to be made in a House-Senate conference for these "holding" facility operators, and I am going to make a couple of recommendations I hope the committee can consider.

It seems to me, that the holding facility in my district, the Bloomfield Wild Horse Ranch, handles their responsibilities very effectively and very humanely, using the best animal husbandry techniques. With that in mind, I would, accordingly, like to suggest three things:

First, sufficient horses should be removed from the BLM lands to replenish the wild horses in the existing "holding" facilities on a "100-horse-out—to adoption center—100-horse-in—to holding facilities—as the horse adoptions take place.

Second, the burro adoption program should be sustained or increased as their adoption is proceeding at a more rapid rate.

Third, as a minimum, the current level of horses in the "holding" facilities should not be reduced below 75 percent of existing capacity of these facilities so as to maintain the viability of these facilities and the amortization of the substantial investment in these facilities.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for considering this public expression of my concerns and my recommendations for accommodating the commitments made to the contractor and the communities in which they are located while meeting the fiscal and pragmatic concerns that we all share with respect to the Bureau of Land Management Program for Wild Horse and Burro Management.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his suggestions, and I would say that we will take these to the conference. I am quite sure the Senate will have some language in on this issue. The gentleman does address a problem.

We have a problem, and that is when it comes to adopting these animals, the burros are easy to get rid of, but the mustangs are not. Consequently, they are accumulating. So the committee thought we should not add to the overload until the Department comes in with a program to keep moving them out after they had been treated.

We will take a good look at that issue.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The essence of one of my suggestions relates to the burro program. With respect to the mustangs I would suggest that they be handled at the "holding" facilities on a hundred-in-hundred-out basis and keep the facility operating on at least 75 percent capacity, then the adoption that does take place can be accommodated.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to congratulate the chairman for his outstanding leadership on the Navajo-Hopi relocation issue, and as well as the committee's strong support for American Indians. I think that without a champion like the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SIDNEY YATES, the Indian population of this country would be hurting very badly.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the subcommittee chairman and his staff for all of their work on the interior appropriations bill. As always, my colleague from Illinois has done an excellent job of looking after the needs of American Indians, an underserved population in this country. I am especially pleased to see that the Appropriations Committee is taking significant steps to address the serious problem of alcoholism which is taking a very real toll on the lives of native Americans. The committee's recommendation of $27,705,000 for alcoholism programs is an increase of $1,300,000 over the President's budget request. This increase is earmarked for nationwide alcoholism prevention programs, also an essential front in the war on alcohol abuse. Alcoholism and alcohol-related problems are of epidemic proportions—an estimated 44 percent of the Navajo people are directly or indirectly affected by alcoholism. The chairman should know that I have been successful in passing an authorization for the Gallup-Navajo alcoholism rehabilitation demonstration project in the Indian health care reauthorization bill, which is pending action on the floor. This

project is a pilot program which would be a first and major positive step toward implementing a scientifically controlled and carefully monitored rehabilitation program among Navajo people. The program could then be used as a model for replication among other tribes elsewhere. This is a priority project for the Navajo people. It is also important to the people in the local communities in my district who are adversely affected by Indian alcoholism. Am I correct in my understanding that the committee feels that this project should be given every serious consideration in the allocation of funding for alcoholism projects?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from New Mexico is correct. Alcoholism is one of the most serious problems facing American Indians. This demonstration project should be given every serious consideration in the allocation of funding for alcoholism projects.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his answer.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio for allowing me to spend a few seconds on the bill.

Before I do that, I want to say to the committee that I had the privilege of serving on the committee as ranking member for quite a while. I enjoyed every second of it and I got to know and appreciate all of the items in the bill. I want to say that if I were able to sit down and craft a person who I would like to see on my side of the aisle manage the bill, it might be somebody who might turn out to be as good a person as my dear friend, the gentleman from Ohio [RALPH REGULA], who does a superb job.

□ 1625

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the leadership that he has provided over a long period of years for all the accounts in this bill, diverse as they are. He has done a superb job and we owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I express my gratitude for a lot of things that occurred in this bill. I guess most specifically the moneys that were added to the bill for the Office of Surface Mining and the important work that they do in rehabilitating the lands of the Nation, and making the people secure in their homes and in their businesses.

I consider it a great privilege to participate in the hearing process of this bill and the writing of it. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be passed with resounding approval.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5234, making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies, and urge its overwhelming approval by the Members of this House.

This is a bill that advances the cause of protection and preservation of our Nation's precious natural resources, our cultural resources and our energy resources—a most unique awesome responsibility.

As always, I commend my good friend and chairman, SID YATES, and the ranking member, RALPH REGULA, for their skill and leadership in guiding this bill through the long and arduous committee process. They have both conducted our deliberations in a fair and courteous manner so that all of us have had the opportunity to help shape the broad outlines of the bill that is before you today.

Specifically, the bill provides $8.2 billion in new budget authority, $300 million below the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation. In addition, this bill is estimated to generate over $10 billion in revenues in fiscal year 1987.

This bill provides our Nation with a responsible energy research program and increases our national security by providing funds to continue construction of storage capacity for the strategic petroleum reserve and increase the SPRO fill rate to 75,000 barrels a day. This is an insurance policy, we believe, against future world oil disruptions.

The Clean Coal Technology Program was funded last year at the rate of $400 million to be spent over a 3-year period of time. In response to this congressional action, the Department of Energy received 51 proposals. The committee, concerned that the proposals do not address the emissions problems associated with existing powerplants, has included language directing DOE to solicit statements of interest from industry aimed specifically at clean coal technology that could be utilized to retrofit, repower, or modernize existing facilities.

This bill responsibly addresses our stewardship commitments to protect and preserve our Nation's precious public lands and waters by providing land acquisition funds for refuges, parks, and national forests, as well as funds for State assistance programs.

We funded programs administered by the Bureau of Land Management responsible for the multiple use of over 300 million acres onshore, 370 million in subsurface mineral rights—the Fish and Wildlife Service which manages over 90 million acres of refuges, fishery research centers, and waterfowl production areas—the National Park Service System covering 80 million acres—visited by nearly 400 million individuals annually and the National Forest Service with 191 million acres of timber production, forestry research programs, grazing, and recreational lands.

I could hardly speak of protecting and preserving our public lands without mentioning an element within Interior called the Office of Surface Mining. This agency is charged with the task of enforcement of the 1977 Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. I was heartened to see an increase in the abandoned mine reclamation fund for State grants which are used to address the most hazardous health and safety problems associated with reckless, irresponsible mining practices. Pennsylvania alone has nearly $15 billion in priority 1 and 2 abandoned mine work remaining to be reclaimed.

For well over 20 years, most particularly since the creation of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, Congress, in a bipartisan spirit, has consistently supported funding for the Endowments as well as the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art and, in recent years, the Institute of Museum Services. This has been a clear declaration that financial assistance for the Arts and Humanities is a proper, if not critical, responsibility of the Federal Government. I am pleased to say that we have continued that strong support for each of these programs.

My friends, this is an excellent bill, responsible to our stewardship commitments to the land and the people who live on it. Gifford Pinchot, the father of conservation and former Governor of Pennsylvania, summarized the importance of preservation by saying:

> The very existence of our nation and all the rest depends solely on conserving our resources which are the very foundation of its life.

I ask my colleagues to adopt this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for the leadership he has provided on this committee and also to the new ranking minority member on the committee, with whom I have worked very closely. I think the leadership both gentlemen have provided has resulted in an excellent work product that we on the Interior Subcommittee bring before the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay particular attention and really give a particular compliment to the chairman, Mr. YATES, for the cooperation he gave to those of us in the Northwest for a significant purchase of highly scenic lands along the Columbia River Gorge. This acquisition, which is folded into this bill, removes a major developmental threat to the gorge, and it plays a crucial role and will play a crucial role in the ultimate passage of a scenic bill providing general scenic protection for this national resource.

With that, I thank the gentleman and I compliment the ranking minority member for the contribution he has made as well.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly address the section of the bill regarding the Department of Energy's Fossil Energy Research and Development Programs. I commend Chairman YATES and the committee for greatly improving on the administration's bare bones request for oil and natural

gas research. However, I question whether the committee bill is really "scratching us where we itch" regarding long-term solutions to the problems of producing States.

Enhanced oil recovery research—which tests innovative methods for extracting hard-to-reach oil in known reservoirs—would be funded at $11.5 million. This is about half of the amount recommended by the authorizing committee, which increased EOR over last year without an increase in the overall fossil budget, and it is a subtle redistribution of funding away from programs that can have a more profound effect on independent producers—the small businessmen of the oil and gas industry.

Also, there is no clear commitment to maintain the Federal Oil R&D Lab and Management Office.

The production and pricing policies of the Saudis have pushed oil prices down to the $8 to $9 range. Low market prices have forced oil companies to drastically cut back on R&D efforts, stop exploring and drilling for new resources, and plug marginal-producing wells.

This means that we will eventually increase our use of imported oil and forfeit more of our energy security. Having to plug marginal wells is especially significant. Plugging a well means that the resource is more than likely lost forever, because the oil, brought to the surface under pressure will be lost in small pockets in the rock formations.

Light and heavy oil EOR would give producers the technical ability to keep marginal wells active. It makes sense to tap as much of a known resoruce as possible. This is especially important since there are 300 billion barrels of discovered, yet untapped, oil in this country.

As much as this bill improves on the administration request, I hope that the other body will see fit to fund EOR at a higher level, and that perhaps in conference this disparity in funding can be addressed.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

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

Mr. Chairman, when the bill was reported from committee it was about $56 million over the 1986 BA. In talking to the chairman, he indicated that he would remove that overage as he indicated again on the floor today. For that reason, I shall make no across-the-board amendments since all of my across-the-board amendments have been calculated to return to the BA of 1986 or to make a freeze.

It does not mean that I am satisfied with the bill. I do notice that the National Capital Arts and Culture Affairs grants are up 76 percent. There are other items that are up. The Pennsylvania Avenue Land Development Corporation, up 17 percent. I would feel a lot better if we had not made these enormous increases, but I congratulate the committee on confining its efforts to amounts no greater than last year.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

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

Mr. Chairman, as someone who has consistently opposed congressional OCS leasing restrictions, I rise to express my profound disappointment at the inclusion of language within this legislation which delays the Federal sale of oil and gas leases off the California coast until 1989.

While I do not question the motives of those who offer this language, I am extremely distressed that we have once again delayed leasing and exploration of these OCS lands which contain some of the best and highest prospects for new oil and gas development.

As the ranking minority member of the Panama Canal/OCS Subcommittee and a member of the so-called California negotiating team, I have spent literally hundreds of hours on the issue of leasing off the California coast.

From these discussions I have learned that there are two truths or axioms about California. These are: first, that there is no willingness or desire on the part of the moratorium proponents to accept an agreement which provides a viable and meaningful leasing program off of California.

And, second, that there is absolutely nothing unique about the California coastline which requires such extraordinary protection.

In fact, the great irony of this entire debate is that by delaying exploration year after year, you end up causing far greater environmental damage by increasing the amount of crude oil carried on foreign tankers which have a safety record far worse than the OCS program.

Since 1970, there has been over 5 billion barrels of oil produced from the OCS with a loss of fewer than 850 barrels as a result of blowouts.

At the same time, out of the 60 largest oil spills that have occurred in the waters of this Nation, only 1 is the result of OCS oil and gas activities; the remainder were caused by tanker spills.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal OCS is our Nation's safest energy extraction program. In order for an oil company to drill an offshore lease, it must comply with 74 sets of Federal regulations and nearly 3 dozen major Federal laws concerned with environmental protection and navigation safety.

In the final analysis, the safety and environment issue is nothing more than a fig leaf or a facade for those who oppose OCS leasing.

The 6,460 tracts that have been the subject of debate for so many years do not belong to the State of California but they belong to the people, all of the people, of the United States. Any oil and gas produced in these areas benefits all Americans.

By delaying these lease sales until at least 1989, we as a nation will lose the tremendous oil and gas resources that the California OCS has to offer.

In fact, it has been estimated that 250,000 jobs, 2.2 billion barrels of oil, 4.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and $8.7 billion of Federal revenues will be lost it these restrictions are continued in the future.

This language will also have a direct and adverse impact on hundreds of other Americans, in nearly every State, who are employed by companies who serve and supply the offshore industry.

Finally Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that for the past 3 years we have paid an average of $1 billion every week to buy foreign oil imports.

One real and positive way to reduce our staggering trade imbalance, of which oil imports represent 40 percent, is to increase our supply of domestic reserves which will reduce the need for foreign imports.

The California OCS region has the energy potential to significantly reduce these record trade deficits and to provide the energy we need to heat our homes, fuel our cars, run our businesses, and satisfy our national defense requirements.

We must not delay to the point where we are facing a return to gasoline lines, factory and school closings, and double digit inflation.

Let us stop this nonsense and instead begin the process of exploring these California OCS lands in a timely, safe, and orderly manner.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong favor of the legislation at hand.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the committee for its diligent work on the Interior appropriations bill. This bill appropriates $8.2 billion and generates $9.2 billion in revenues for fiscal year 1987. One of the areas in which this bill can generate additional revenues is through an increase in grazing fees on our Nation's public lands.

This appropriations bill contains language which will implement the "modified market value formula." This formula was outlined in a report issued in the March 1986 Bureau of Land Management—Forest Service Grazing Fee Report to Congress. The study found the 1983 average fee for comparable western private grazing lands was $6.25 per animal unit

month—the amount of forage needed to feed one cow for 1 month.

President Reagan issued an Executive order on February 14, 1986, freezing the current fee of $1.35 per animal unit month. The $1.35 fee was derived from formulas established in the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 and expired on December 15, 1985.

To correct this discrepancy, and to ensure our public lands are not providing an unfair advantage for 16 percent of all western livestock operators—2 percent of all livestock producers in the United States—I urge my colleagues to support the 1986 Interior appropriations bill.

I understand, however, a point of order may be raised regarding the additional jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Should this point of order be sustained, I request that my colleagues review legislation I introduced on April 30, 1986, H.R. 4713.

H.R. 4713 will add millions of dollars to our revenues, a minimum of $31.2 million over a 3-year period. The cost for maintaining our public lands used for grazing was approximately $70 million in 1984. The amount of grazing fees collected the same year was $18 million. We are losing $52 million annually on this program.

H.R. 4713 will achieve the same goal the Interior appropriations bill we are now considering could attain. It will generate revenues and protect our public lands through an increase in grazing fees.

Due to severe time constraints, it is doubtful Congress will enact this measure before fall adjournment. However, this legislation is needed to eliminate a subsidy provided to western cattlemen, amounting to tens of millions of dollars each year.

The adoption of H.R. 4713 would eliminate the unfair advantage some western ranchers now have over their neighbors and virtually all eastern livestock farmers. The increase in grazing fees will aid in balancing the Federal budget. The higher grazing fees were also recommended 2 years ago by the President's private sector survey on cost control, commonly known as the Grace Commission. As chairman for the natural resources task force of the House Grace Commission caucus, I am seeking to implement one of the panel's recommendations.

In May 1986, the National Wildlife Federation circulated a letter which endorsed H.R. 4713 and the increase in grazing fees. In the letter the federation states that "during the past 7 years, the Government has lost nearly $500 million in revenue foregone as a result of the operation of the current grazing fee formula." The Izaak Walton League of America states that approximately 3 percent of the total ranchers that are issued permits control 40 percent of public grazing in 11 Western States. Also of serious concern is that in the West, 225 million acres are under severe threat of desertification. This acreage represents a land area equal to the size of the Thirteen Original Colonies.

Finally, I would like to reiterate that not only will this provision increase revenues, it will level the playing field for livestock producers in States without public rangelands and, attempt to prevent the continued overgrazing of our public lands. Again, I urge the support of my colleagues on this subject.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] in a colloquy to address the need for Forest Service participation in the construction of a multiagency headquarters facility in the Big Sur area of California's central coast.

As you know, the Big Sur coast is a resource of truly national significance, and an area of unique environmental, biological, and social values which should be preserved for future generations. One of the unique aspects of the Big Sur is the multitude of public agencies which have jurisdiction within the area. In the effort to preserve Big Sur it becomes absolutely essential that the efforts of these different agencies be coordinated.

Currently, the major State and Federal agencies are using facilities which are woefully inadequate to cope with the expanding demands of planning and management in the area. The State Department of Parks and Recreation runs its operations from a cramped 2-bedroom house while the Forest Service manages hundreds of thousands of acres from a literally decaying structure which should have been abandoned years ago.

Working together, these agencies have agreed to construct a facility to house each of their different operations. The hope is that such an arrangement will not only save money and time, but that it will facilitate greater coordination between the separate jurisdictions. The agencies have agreed to share the cost of land acquisition, design, and construction. The State agencies have already allocated their share of the design costs and the State has agreed to provide the land.

It is my understanding that the Forest Service has requested only $50,000 of its $100,000 portion of the design costs in the Forest Service budget for fiscal year 1987. This amount will not be adequate to cover the Federal share and I would respectfully request that the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations make every effort to increase this amount as it completes its consideration of this legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I certainly understand the frustration of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] with regard to the adequacy of the Forest Service request for this much needed project. It is also my understanding that the Forest Service has requested only $50,000 of the required $100,000 for the design of the Big Sur multiagency headquarters facility in its construction account. The gentleman may rest assured that the subcommittee will make every effort as we go to conference to find the additional $50,000 of the Federal share for the design of the facility.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman.

□ 1635

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has the assurance of our committee that we will give his request every consideration when the committee meets.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of language contained in the Interior appropriations bill which would prohibit all offshore oil leasing along the California coast until January 1989. Implementation of this language is very important. Without it, environmentally sensitive areas along the California coastline would face the threat of drilling as early as next year.

Offshore oil drilling would significantly endanger coastal tourism, recreation, fishing and marine life, and worsen an already serious air pollution problem in the Los Angeles basin.

I, along with other members of the California congressional delegation, have been involved in negotiations with the Department of the Interior for nearly 3 years to try to come to an agreement on the issue. Unfortunatel, the intransigence of the Interior negotiators led to a breakdown in the talks. As a result of that intransigency, we were forced to take our case to the members of the House Appropriations Committee, who imposed a delay in the final sale on both lease sales 91 and 95 until 1989.

I am particularly concerned about protecting the Santa Monica Bay. The beaches in this area are among the most heavily used in the country. The economies of the cities in the bay are heavily dependent on tourism and beach traffic. Any significant oil spill could cause significant economic damage and dislocation in the cities along the bay.

The danger of an oil spill is very real. Recent earthquakes in northern and southern California should remind us all of the very real threat posed by seismic activity. The Santa Monica Bay is a seismically active area which has suffered from major and minor earthquakes in the past.

In light of the current abundance of oil, and the depressed price in the international market, now is a particularly inauspicious time to begin drilling in the Santa Monica Bay.

The Interior Department's argument that foregoing exploitation of potential oil reserves in California's Outer Continental Shelf will "jeopardize America's economic well being and national security * * *" does not hold water. By DOI's own estimates, California's total OCS reserves amount to 2.15 billion barrels of oil. Unleased areas offshore California, approximately 1.88 billion barrels, represent

less than 3 percent of total U.S. reserves. At the current rare of consumption, this would provide 125 days of oil, or just 2.4 percent of America's needs until the year 2000.

Complete development of the California's OCS will not have a significant impact on the U.S. dependence on foreign oil. When the 2.15 billion barrels off California's coastline are compared to Saudi Arabia's 168.8 billion barrels in known reserves, it is evident that opening the California coast to oil drilling will not protect the United States from the unpredictable forces of the world oil market.

Protecting our national security from the threat of disrupted foreign oil supplies must be a primary goal. However, there are preferable alternatives to the Reagan administration's attempt to indiscriminately drill for oil along the California coastline. Filling the strategic petroleum reserve, strictly enforcing compliance with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's regulation with fuel economy standards and encouraging the use of alternative sources of energy through tax incentives will provide much better protection against an oil embargo.

I commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their action to protect California's coastal resources. Now is not the time to open up some of the most scenic beaches in the country to offshore oil drilling.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting the fiscal year 1987 Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I want to call to my colleagues' attention what I believe is an inequity in the requirements for the distribution of discretionary funds under the Abandoned Mines Land [AML] Reclamation Program for which funds are appropriated under H.R. 5234.

The inequities in the distribution of these funds was the subject of my testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior earlier this year. The requirements that will be used under this bill to distribute the AML Program discretionary funds fails to take into consideration the actual funding needs of individual AML Programs on a national basis. By taking away all of the Secretary's discretion to distribute the funds on the basis of need, only those States with a very high inventory of high priority AML sites will be able to maintain a viable AML Program. This clearly conflicts with the intention of the original act, which contains well-defined requirements for the expenditure of discretionary funds as authorized under section 402(g) of the act.

Given the obvious inequities and limitations of these apportionment requirements, I have advocated a minimum base budget of $2 million in discretionary funds for those States that meet certain criteria. This would guarantee a viable AML Program for the States that need one while ensuring they have the ability to obligate funds in a timely manner. The basic concept of a minimum base budget has the support of many of the coal-producing States throughout the Nation, and I believe this is a fair approach. I am disappointed to see that the committee dismissed this proposal in favor of the one mandated by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to keep these points in mind as debate on the AML Program continues. It is my hope that we will be able to reach a compromise that will allow the traditional coal-producing States to address their needs while maintaining a viable program for the States that need one.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5234 and commend the committee for bringing to the floor such a responsible fiscal year 1987 appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

I want to particularly note the fine work Interior Subcommittee Chairman YATES and his colleagues such as JACK MURTHA, RALPH REGULA, and JOE MCDADE have done on the budget for the Bureau of Mines. Incorporated in this bill is a policy that I, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources on the authorizing committee, have also adopted which recognizes the need during this period of drastic budgetary constraints to give priority to Bureau activities concerning the health and safety of the Nation's mining work force, increased efficiencies and productivity in coal and mineral extraction and the mitigation of adverse environmental effects of mining.

It is a grim, but nevertheless true fact, that coal mining deaths in West Virginia this year are running double compared to last year even though overall mining employment has declined. There is no doubt that the administration's proposed budget for the Bureau, which represents an abdication of responsibility for adequate mining related research, would fail to address these frightening mine fatality figures.

However, H.R. 5234 provides the Bureau's Health and Safety Technology Program with increased funds for, among other items, research on respirable dust at Pennsylvania State and West Virginia University, the mitigation of mountain bumps which have killed coal miners in southern West Virginia and elsewhere, methane control and drainage and for the development of a new generation of self-contained rescue units which will give our miners a fighting chance of survival in case of disaster. Under the Mining Technology Program, increased funding is being provided to complete testing on a number of prototype mining devices as well as for research addressing the environmental impacts of coal mining in the areas of subsidence and acid mine drainage.

I am also pleased that my proposal to transfer the research activities of the Office of Surface Mining to the Bureau of Mines has been incorporated by this bill. The primary reasons for this proposed transfer, which is also being implemented by the Interior Committee in its budget reconciliation resolution, are twofold. First, OSM is primarily a regulatory agency with little expertise in conducting research and continues to have grave difficulties in meeting its regulatory mandate. In the past, Congress recognized this situation when it transferred the Mineral Institutes Program from OSM to the Bureau of Mines. Second, OSM's research program is duplicative of research areas conducted by the Bureau of Mines, which has a greater research orientation and more expertise in these matters. Research should be consolidated into one entity in order to bring about a more efficient and cost-effective program to address environmental problems associated with coal development.

Where OSM should focus its efforts outside of the title V regulatory program is in abandoned mine land reclamation projects. Under the pending legislation, $186 million is earmarked for State reclamation grants as well as $9.4 million for the RAMP Program.

For the U.S. Geological Survey, H.R. 5234 recommends an increase of $27.7 million over the budget estimate. Included is an increase for mineral surveys on public lands, a program that provides necessary information as a basis to make informed decisions on land management activities and land use. This bill, as has the Mining Subcommittee, also recognizes the importance of the energy geologic surveys, including the coal investigations program which the Survey has been deemphasizing.

With respect to the Minerals Management Service, I note that H.R. 5234 does not include funds for interest on refunds as this is not authorized by current law. The Mining Subcommittee has under consideration the administration proposal in this area, as well as other legislative matters being advanced by MMS relating to mineral receipt management, and will take action at the appropriate time. On a related matter, I commend the Interior Subcommittee for not providing MMS with an indefinite appropriation as it requested relating to late interest payments to the States. While H.R. 5234 does include authority for these payments, a definite appropriation is provided.

Under the budget for BLM, H.R. 5234 contains bill language to require the bonding of mining operations under the mining law of 1872 prior to approval of operations that would create a "significant surface disturbance." The reason this language was inserted into H.R. 5234 appears to be based on a March 1986 GAO report which found that certain lands mined under the 1872 mining law have been abandoned without adequate reclamation. Although BLM has established some regulations for reclaiming public domain lands, GAO believes the agency has done little to enforce them and that requiring bonds on these mining operations would be an effective enforcement tool.

The Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources has been conducting its own examination of hardrock mining reclamation issues. It is my intention to continue investigating this matter especially since I agree that BLM needs some congressional guidance in this area. However, the language in H.R. 5234 is ambiguous and may fall short by not addressing leasable noncoal minerals under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 or disposable materials under the Materials Act of 1947. This matter certainly warrants more in-depth consideration than a single GAO report.

In the area of clean coal technology, our colleague, RALPH REGULA, has inserted in H.R. 5234 a provision of a bill he and I have sponsored to direct the Energy Department to solicit statements of interest from industry for technology proposals that could be used to retrofit existing coal-fired powerplants. The gentleman from Ohio has been a leader in the Clean Coal Technology Program and it is our desire to realize the full commercial benefits of the remaining funds set aside for this effort.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5234 also contains $6 million in Forest Service land acquisition funds

for the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia. I, along with my colleagues in the West Virginia House delegation, are seeking this funding to allow the first-phase purchase of a privately held tract in the forest of great scenic, ecological, and recreational value. I am deeply appreciative to Chairman YATES for including this funding as well as to JACK MURTHA for his recognition of this matter.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this Interior appropriation measure H.R. 5234.

As a chairman of the House Interior Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation I'm pleased that the measure has responded well to the budget oversight hearing recommendation that we had forwarded to the Appropriations Interior Subcommittee.

Chairman YATES and his subcommittee have indeed done their work with care and good consideration of the problems that our public resources confront.

Specifically this measure provides good support for the National Park Service maintaining an active land acquisition program and support for State land acquisition which was slated by the administration budget for elimination. This indeed was important action to maintain these vital programs and permit meeting the commitment made by previous authorizations and designations of various conservation units within the NPS and within our States.

The administration OMB-inspired attack on the land water conservation trust fund is illogical and unfair. This program has a resource base in the billions which is dedicated to support the commitment of land purchases of conservation units which the Congress enacts into law. To renege on these commitments is to break faith with the people and property owners impacted who find themselves without recourse, while they await Federal commitments.

Beyond the land acquisition provisions this bill continues good support for the operation of our national parks for the road system through the portion of the highway trust funds dedicated to that purpose and most important is the operation, maintenance, and construction commitment in the measure before us.

Mr. Chairman too often we may neglect the value of the human resource—the park personnel—who do such outstanding work in the interpretation, planning, maintenance, and a myriad of other jobs which make the visit experience to our national park area such a joy.

The administration attempts to hold adequate funds for this purpose—hostage to dramatically increased entrance fees is indeed inappropriate. Too often the case today is that the required fees are not even collected. Yet the administration proposal, never formally introduced in the House to my knowledge, sought to substantially increase the charge and the number of units to which it would apply.

The administration proposal sought to cream off 20 percent of the fee revenue to the General Treasury and didn't even seek to insure that the questionable increased dollars generated by such a fee would be used to enhance the NRS budget. Indeed their draft proposal indicated that it would substitute for regular operation and maintenance dollars.

I would not object to a reasonable system of user fees for services actually provided with assurances that the dollars flow, to the NPS exclusively and some incentive for the specific park units, but this was not being proposed Mr. Chairman, and should be explored as this topic had hardly been concluded.

In summary I want to offer my thanks to Chairman YATES and the members of his subcommittee for a good job, the dollars appropriated for the Pacific office of the NPS, for the American Samoa Park study and the many other areas of interest that I've received a positive response to regarding the measure before us—it deserves our support and vote.

Mr. MCKERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to repudiate certain provisions of H.R. 5234, the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations measure for fiscal year 1987. In particular, I am referring to that portion of title II pertaining to the Department of Energy's State energy conservation programs.

The Appropriations Committee has not provided program funds for energy conservation policy and conservation grants, the energy extension service, schools, and hospitals grants, and low-income weatherization grants. Instead, the committee has directed the States to utilize the funds made available as a result of the Exxon oil overcharge settlement for these programs. Mr. Speaker, this action is extremely regrettable.

The Exxon funds are intended to be utilized to provide restitution to consumers who suffered as a result of the egregious violation of price controls that were imposed on petroleum products. It would, therefore, be inappropriate to utilize these funds to supplant customary appropriations for State energy programs as proposed by the committee.

The State Energy Conservation Program, Energy Extension Service, Institutional Conservation Program, and the Weatherization Assistance Program have proven extremely beneficial to the States in maintaining their conservation activities. While the committee professes a strong commitment to the low-income weatherization program and pledges to continue the program through direct appropriations when the settlement funds have been depleted, I am concerned that it will prove impossible to restart these appropriations at that time.

For this reason, I have prepared an amendment to title II, which restores funding for these programs to current levels. However, following discussions with a representative of the National Community Action Foundation, an organization which represents those State entities which distribute the conservation grant moneys, I have decided not to offer this amendment.

While the foundation is very supportive of my desire to restore the direct appropriations, it is concerned that the support necessary to sustain my amendment does not exist in the House of Representatives and that an amendment in this regard would be defeated. As such a defeat could undermine the foundation's efforts to gain Senate support for direct appropriations, I was urged to withhold my amendment. I reluctantly concur with the foundation; however I wish to make it clear that I intend to fight this effort to supplant customary funding for important State programs.

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the rule on H.R. 5234—the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. I particularly want to commend the Rules Committee for denying a waiver on points of order against section 314 of the bill which would effectively legislate a new formula for calculating fees charged by the Federal Government for grazing livestock on public lands.

The issue of grazing fees is one of considerable controversy as well as misconception. While I strongly believe that this issue must be addressed by this body at an appropriate time and I supported efforts last year to negotiate a new public rangelands bill, I do not think that this bill—a money bill—is the appropriate vehicle to legislate a new grazing fee formula. If left intact, section 314 would clearly result in an abdication of an important legislative responsibility of the authorizing committee to the appropriations process. In addition, section 314 would drastically increase user fees for a certain segment of the public without providing for direct public input and debate on the potentially adverse effects of this action.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the legislative history on the grazing fee issue will show that it is a very complicated and controversial issue. The grazing fee formula which is still in place today was originally mandated by Congress as part of the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 [PRIA]. This formula was set for a 7-year trial period that ended on December 31, 1985 and was linked to economic conditions in the livestock industry. It was designed so that in years when the industry income increases, so does the fee received by the Government. Conversely, when conditions in the livestock industry are poor, such as they are now, the fee is reduced. At the end of the 7-year trial period, the act also required the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to evaluate the current formula and other grazing fee options and to submit to Congress their recommendations for a grazing fee schedule for 1986 and beyond. This report has been delivered to Congress, but to my knowledge there have been no hearings to discuss the substance of their findings or recommendations.

With PRIA due to expire, major efforts were mounted last year by the key authorizing committees in both the House and the Senate to enact new public rangelands legislation that would also set new fees for grazing livestock on Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service lands in the West. It was my understanding that specific proposals considered last year would have extended the current formula for an additional 5 years. Unfortunately, an agreement was not reached and, by law, the current fee system was allowed to expire on December 31. In the absence of any congressional action, the President issued an Executive order on February 14, 1986, to extend the current PRIA formula with the important addition of a minimum fee level of $1.35 per animal unit month for this year and until such time as Congress can reach an agreement on this and other public rangelands issues.

I don't believe, however, that this appropriations bill—H.R. 5234—is the appropriate legislative vehicle for enacting a new fee system.

This is an appropriations bill and as such has arbitrarily imposed a new grazing fee formula which would increase grazing fees more than 300 percent during the next 4 years. This represents a substantial economic impact on western livestock operators which are just now recovering from drastic oversupplies and plummeting prices that have partially resulted from the Federal dairy programs. And all of this will come about without public hearings to adequately evaluate the merits of this grazing fee proposal or the implications for the industry.

The Rules Committee obviously concurred that this appropriations bill is not the appropriate vehicle to legislate a new grazing fee formula—a formula which is clearly contrary to current practice as well as legislative proposals considered and debated last year by the authorizing committee.

I applaud this rule and strongly support the removal of section 314 from the Interior Appropriations bill before final passage.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill because it preserves critical funding for conservation R&D and Fossil Energy Policy Programs that are critical to a balanced energy program.

I first want to express my disappointment over the severe budget reductions in the Conservation Program which was submitted to Congress by the administration. These reductions, which amount to a 55-percent cut from fiscal year 1986 levels, are just the most recent step in what has amounted to an overall drastic and continual decline in civilian energy R&D budgets since 1982.

Our Conservation Program has paid off handsomely, in fact, better than most of us could have anticipated. This was one area where the Government sponsorship of research and development and the attendant consumer education campaign regarding the potential savings through conservation practices provided us with big payoffs.

Over the years I have had the opportunity to become familiar with Conservation R&D Programs, particularly at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Oak Ridge and other national laboratories have been prominent in conservation research since the early seventies. One of the major Oak Ridge programs is:

The development of nickel aluminide alloys displaying high strength and ductability at high temperature is expected to improve the efficiency of automobile and truck engines and industrial equipment.

This is just one example of a successful program which has been managed by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory but was in great jeopardy at the administration's proposed fund levels. The committee has responded to this challenge by increasing transportation R&D funds on electric and hybrid vehicles, by $8.3 million which includes the Nickel Aluminide Alloy Program.

Next, I would like to mention the exciting prospects for research to be done by the Department of Energy in the area of advanced materials research in the high temperature materials laboratory [HTML] at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The HTML will provide a unique capability for conducting this challenging research through the availability of a broad multidisciplinary professional staff. It provides a common focal point for industrial/university/Government participation while providing access to high-cost research equipment which would otherwise be denied to many researchers.

This project is in the final stages of construction and we expect that it will be operational by February 1987. ORNL has already spent approximately $19.6 million and an additional $1 million which was not requested needs to be appropriated this year to allow completion of the project. Our Science and Technology Subcommittee which has authorized the HTML is recommending that the project be carried within the Office of Conservation and Renewables—where it currently resides—for 1 more year, rather than be transferred to the Office of Energy Research [OER] as the Department has requested. I am pleased to note that the appropriations committee agrees with the wisdom of this operating management decision particularly since OER has not budgeted for HTML through an oversight. I appreciate the subcommittee chairman's concern, and assistance he has provided in the past and I want to commend him for ensuring that the HTML has had such strong support.

It is also important to comment on the funding contained in this bill for the steel initiative which calls for work to be done at the Argonne and Oak Ridge National Laboratories. I need not repeat any description of the troubled fate of the steel industry, but this initiative funds an R&D Program aimed at ensuring work and future production processes in order to preserve a domestic capacity to produce steel. It will improve steel production technology to remain competitive with foreign steel producers and the program is designed to utilize the expertise which is available at our laboratories.

The final portion of my statement concerns ORNL activities within the fossil research and development budget.

Our Science and Technology Subcommittee on Energy Development and Applications, which authorizes the DOE portion of the fossil energy R&D budget, increased the administration request by $9.160 million for materials and components and this bill has $9 million which reaffirms the strong congressional support for this activity.

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory has an active research program in materials research. Their support programs in coal liquefaction and surface coal gasification were drastically reduced in the fiscal year 1987 administration request. Their work in materials and components also suffered a reduction in excess of $1 million in the requested budget but remains a vital element of the ARTD Program.

I expect that ORNL will receive a significant fraction of the $1.6 million increase recommended in this bill.

These additional funds for materials research will provide significant technological and economic benefits to clean coal technology systems for which this committee has provided leadership in the House. As an author of one of the principal clean coal technology bills, I am most pleased about the creation of the $750 million appropriations reserve. Certainly, recent developments on acid rain legislation should further accelerate the demonstration of alternatives to wet scrubbers on coal plants. The announcement this week of nine project awards totalling $360 million is a major step in this thrust, and I was pleased to note that the awards cover a spectrum of new technologies.

Materials research areas for which additional funds will be used at ORNL—and at support laboratories—include iron and nickel aluminides, high-temperature structural alloys, and structural ceramic composites. The Iron and Nickel Aluminides Program offers the promise of sturdy and corrosion-resistant materials applicable to many coal-fired systems. The high-temperature structural alloys being developed will aid the development of high-efficiency steam cycle systems using clean burning coal technology. Structural ceramic composites will provide very high-temperature materials for cleanup of, and heat recovery from, hot coal-gas streams.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks on the DOE portion of the interior appropriations bill. Thank you for your consideration and the committee's support.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to certain changes in funding for energy conservation contained in the fiscal year 1987 Interior appropriations bill. Let me make clear that I do not mean to criticize the chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, who every year is faced with drastic and unconscionable cuts in energy conservation funding, and every year manages to reconstruct some semblance of an energy conservation policy with little help from the administration. When the next energy crisis hits, our ability to handle it wisely will be largely attributable to the consistent support afforded energy efficiency technologies by Chairman YATES.

Nevertheless, I am concerned because the energy conservation research budget continues its downward trend even as our dependence on oil imports has begun to increase dramatically. In June 1985, our net imports of oil were just 4.2 million barrels a day. One year later, our net imports have risen 33 percent, to 5.6 million barrels.

Where are we getting these new imports? Primarily from Saudi Arabia and other OPEC countries. OPEC accounted for only a third of our net imports 1 year ago. Now, OPEC accounts for half.

Five years ago, this would have been a major press headline around the country. Today it is virtually ignored by everyone, including our Government leaders. President Reagan and his energy appointees are preoccupied with saving the nuclear power industry from itself, giving little thought to our dwindling nonnuclear research capabilities.

Under enormous pressure to cut the budget, all of us are succumbing to a "happy days" philosophy which says that spending needed today is more important than spending needed tomorrow. Somehow, the future is expected to take care of itself.

Our government is acting like the man with a hole in his roof. When its sunny, like today, he says he can't fix the roof because there are too many other things to do. And when it starts to rain, he can't fix the roof because its raining.

The trouble is that we're not talking about a small hole in the roof. When we have energy problems, they are not minor. They affect our entire economy. The recession of 1981-82, which most economists agree was driven by several years of energy inflation, was a homewrecker for millions of jobless Americans.

The energy conservation research budget, even with the increases provided by the Appropriations Committee over the President's requests, needs repair.

The research budget on building technologies, down 65 percent since 1981, will be cut another 17 percent under this bill.

The budget for industrial energy conservation research and development, which is down 52 percent since 1981, will be cut another 13 percent under this bill.

And the budget for transportation energy efficiency R&D, already down 60 percent since 1981, will be cut another 9 percent under this bill.

In other words, as the storm clouds build, we are letting our energy house fall down around us. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that we are ripping the shingles off the roof one by one.

Are we wasting money on energy conservation R&D? Absolutely not. In fact, our Federal research dollars have generated dramatic returns in this sector. For example, the buildings R&D budget has supported research on solid-state ballasts for lighting, low-emissivity window films, and residential absorption heat pumps. The total government cost of these three projects was less than $12 million, thanks to the standard DOE cost-sharing arrangements with private industry. Two of the three projects have already produced annual net savings far greater than the Federal investment. Their eventual impact, given full market saturation, is huge. According to estimates of the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, these three technologies will ultimately save U.S. consumers over $10 billion a year.

Even if one assumes that these technologies would have eventually penetrated the market anyway, there is no doubt that the Department of Energy's research has led to the acceleration of that process. If market penetration were accelerated by only 5 years, the net benefit of Federal involvement would total $50 billion in return for an initial investment of only $12 million.

Conservative estimates already credit increased efficiency with saving our economy $150 billion in energy costs since 1973. Additional progress could reduce our current national energy bill from $430 billion to less than $300 billion annually. The benefits to our economy from such savings would be immense. Our trade deficit would be reduced, our oil prices would stabilize, OPEC would remain weak, and capital would flow to more productive sectors of the economy.

To its credit, the staff of the DOE conservation office takes great pains to identify high priority energy conservation research in its multiyear plan. However the actual budget requests do not reflect this planning, and annual appropriations are now falling to such low levels that the entire energy conservation R&D infrastructure is in danger of collapse.

Now that energy conservation has demonstrated its power to put OPEC on the ropes, why are we pulling our punches? Why are we tying our hands just when our oil dependence has started to rise up for another round?

I ask my colleagues to think about these questions now, when we still have time to do something about it. The entire energy research budget is seriously tilted against alternatives to nuclear energy. Oil imports are rising, particularly from unstable OPEC sources. Our automobile fuel economy standards have been weakened, our building standards are inadequate, and we have no appliance efficiency standards at all. In the one area where we should have a political consensus—cost-shared research and development—energy conservation has been crowded out and scientists are losing their jobs.

I don't know when this will all come home to roost, but I know that it will. We are back on the energy yoyo, careening from one extreme to the other. As long as we ignore the extraordinary benefits available from modest investments in energy conservation research, we are surely to stay there.

Finally, I note that the committee has severely curtailed funding for the four States and local grant programs which support energy conservation investment. In the case of two of those programs, the State Energy Conservation Program and the Energy Extension Service, it is not providing any funding at all. For weatherization and schools and hospitals, appropriations are restricted to administrative purposes.

In explaining this action, the report explicitly ties the decision to cut such funding to the distribution of oil overcharge funds to the States pursuant to court order in the Exxon case. Specifically, the report states:

> The Committee is not providing program funds for energy policy and conservation grants (EPCA), the energy extension service, schools and hospitals grants, and low-income weatherization grants. The funds provided to the States as a result of the Exxon oil overcharge case are for use in these programs and are well in excess of amounts normally provided by direct appropriations ($2 billion versus $260 million). It is difficult in current budget circumstances to argue for providing the direct appropriation, even though the Exxon funds are 'supplemental' in nature, because of the sheer magnitude of the Exxon payment.

This paragraph needs to be clarified. First, it suggests that the Exxon funds can be spent solely on the four DOE energy conservation programs. That is not correct. Exxon funds can also be spent on the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] administered through the Department of Health and Human Services. There is no guarantee that in any given State a single dollar will be spent on, for example EES.

Second, it asserts that the Exxon funds vastly exceed direct appropriations for the programs eligible for Exxon funds. That is not correct. The LIHEAP program alone was funded at 2.01 billion in fiscal year 1986. The truth is that the Exxon funds are less than the direct appropriations for all the eligible programs ($2.1 billion versus $2.266 billion).

Third, while it makes a nod toward the "supplemental" feature of Exxon funds, it discounts that feature in light of the Federal budget deficit and the size of the Exxon award. The fact of the matter is that to the extent that the committee is reducing direct appropriations to offset Exxon funds, it is undermining the restitutionary purposes of oil overcharge distributions. The States are not allowed to reduce State expenditures in response to Exxon funds; the same rule should apply to the Federal Government. Instead, we are applying a double standard.

Oil overcharge funds are not Federal tax dollars; they are recovered on behalf of overcharged consumers and distributed to the States on behalf of overcharged consumers. Congress breaks trust with those consumers when it cuts regular appropriations in an attempt to get budget credit at the expense of consumers.

As a practical matter, many States will find it very difficult to respond to the grant cuts contained in this bill. For example, the State of Kentucky has already allocated its Exxon funds, providing less for weatherization than the State normally receives from direct appropriations, and the legislature has adjourned and won't come back into session until January 1988. I understand that an estimated 20 States have already completed their State plans for Exxon funds. All these decisions have been made on the assumption that the regular appropriations would not be reduced because of Exxon. One can argue the wisdom of this assumption, but is worth remembering that both the House and the Senate assumed full funding for all four DOE grant programs in their budget resolutions.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5234) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. REGULA, for their usual thorough and fair way of handling the appropriations bill for Interior and Related Agencies. Over the years, they have been very helpful to me in my role as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and for that I am most appreciative.

I was pleased to see in the committee report that accompanies H.R. 5234 that the committee has expressed concerns over certain expenditures of funds under Section 705 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. I share their concerns about the need to make the best and most efficient use of funds provided for the management of the Tongass National Forest in Alaska.

In May of this year, the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction over issues relating to the Alaska Lands Act, held oversight hearings on the management of the Tongass National Forest.

In followup to those hearings, I have sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Richard E. Lyng, a letter which highlights several serious problems with management of the Tongass, and outlines steps which I urge be taken to remedy those problems. I am inserting a copy

of that letter in the RECORD at this point and hope that it will be of assistance to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee as they carry out ongoing reviews of the use of Federal funds to manage the Tongass National Forest.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 1986.

Hon. RICHARD E. LYNG, *Secretary,*
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As the principal House sponsor of legislation that resulted in the enactment of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and in follow-up to recent Public Lands Subcommittee oversight hearings on the operation of the Tongass National Forest, I am writing to highlight certain problems with management of the Tongass and to outline steps I urge you to direct be taken to correct these problems.

I am particularly troubled by certain Forest Service policies and practices applicable to the Tongass that, if continued unabated, will squander financial and natural resources of the American people. It has been the intent of Congress to honor commitments to Southeast Alaska including reasonable efforts to protect employment and assure a sound permanent natural resources base. It was not the intent of Congress, however, to foster or condone wasteful management practices that would dominate the administration of a national treasure.

Unless there are prompt mid-course corrections in the management of the Tongass National Forest, I can envision a time when the Natural wealth of the nation's largest national forest—its trees, its fisheries, its wildlife, its waters and its land—will be seriously degraded. Then, not only would the forest be unable to sustain a viable timber industry, but the very resource values that make possible a more diversified economy for Southeast Alaska would be greatly impaired.

The Tongass problems certainly are not solely ones created by Forest Service actions. Nonetheless, until more fundamental matters are addressed, it is essential that those problems that are within your Department's authority to correct are addressed.

To focus some of my concerns regarding the Tongass, I will discuss briefly each of the following problem areas, along with recommendations for remedial action:

1. Incorrect Application of Section 705, "Timber Supply"
2. Excessive Road Construction
3. Improper Utility Log Designation
4. Inefficient Log Scaling
5. Data Base for Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP) Revision and Failure to Apply to Section 6(k) of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA)

INCORRECT APPLICATION OF SECTION 705, "TIMBER SUPPLY"

The Forest Service is incorrectly applying the timber supply provision (Section 705) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. At the time of the bill's passage one of the principal sponsors of the Alaska Lands legislation, Senator Tsongas, noted that this section provides ". . . an assurance of funding . . . to maintain a supply of timber from the Tongass of 4.5 billion board feet per decade—that is, 450 mmbf per year."

When I brought the Alaska Lands legislation before the House for final action on November 12, 1980, I did so with a number of reservations and with certain fundamental understandings. Among those understandings was that maintaining "a supply of timber" of 450 mmbf per year assumed that this was the quantity of timber necessary to maintain jobs in the timber industry. It was further assumed that this was the quantity that likely would be purchased by the industry. On the other hand, it was assumed that if industry could not purchase 450 mmbf, the Federal Government would not waste fiscal and natural resources regardless of timber market conditions by continuing to offer timber sales in excess of realistic market demand.

Also at that time, I described some of those understandings when I indicated to the House that: "No more national forest timber should be supplied than can be sold at fair market value . . ." and "No more timber should be offered for sale than the Forest Service can reasonably expect to sell." Congressional intent was not to "force feed" the timber industry regardless of timber market conditions.

Section 705 is being applied by the Forest Service, however, so as to require that 450 mmbf of timber not offered for sale previously must be offered each year regardless of whether the timber industry has purchased all of the timber previously offered, that is, regardless of timber market conditions.

This misapplication of the law is resulting in undue and improper expenditure of Federal funds, excessive construction of roads as well as construction of unneeded administrative facilities. It is also causing serious and long-lasting adverse effects on the forest itself.

What should be occurring is that, if the market conditions do not permit the industry to purchase the entire amount in a particular year, the remainder plus whatever other timber has been previously offered but not sold should be counted in developing the 450 mmbf to be offered in the following year.

For example, assuming the amount of timber prepared and offered in year one is 450 mmbf and only 250 mmbf is sold, the unsold 200 mmbf should be readvertised and counted as part of the 450 mmbf offered in year two. To do otherwise results in timber being prepared for sale in quantities far in excess of that which the market can support and industry can purchase.

Forest Service data shows that over $50 million has been spent during the past 6 years to prepare and administer timber sale offerings which went unsold. The current unsold backlog is estimated to be over 1 billion board feet. The logical extension of the current application of the timber supply provision of ANILCA would result in the continued expenditure of large sums of money for timber sale preparation each year even if *no* timber were ever sold. Such an illogical and wasteful practice was not the intent of section 705.

As I indicated regarding this section upon final House passage of the bill, ". . . this is not a mandate to produce a specific cut level regardless of . . . (the) demand for . . . timber . . . or the cost to the taxpayer." Furthermore, I indicated that "we are not condoning unwarranted or excessive subsidization of . . . the . . . timber companies."

In developing the Alaska Lands legislation, Congress relied, in part, on the advice of the Forest Service that: (1) the historic timber harvest levels could not be sustained without unacceptable harm to other forest resources; (2) the existing timber industry would need to use more special and marginal timber than in the past; and (3) that special and marginal timber could only be made available through greater public investments in certain forest practices.

The purpose of the Tongass Timber Supply Fund is to make available to industry such "special and marginal" timber stands which are lower quality generally and more difficult to access than "normal" stands. The intent was that each year a mix of timber from all three classes would be made available to industry to reach the 450 mmbf if necessary.

At the time of final House passage of ANILCA, I conveyed to the House that "we cannot escape the fact that additional investments are needed to implement TLMP. . . ." What has been occurring, though, is that the Fund has been used to build roads primarily to the better timber stands. It is my understanding that current Forest Service projections for FY 1987 provide for 412 mmbf of "normal" timber to be offered for sale. The resulting timber mix includes a much larger component of "normal" timber than was contemplated by TLMP or ANILCA. This results in high-grading the Tongass—taking densest old-growth trees first—thereby damaging the long-term sustained yield capabilities of the forest, magnifying impacts on wildlife values, and negating the rationale for the Tongass Timber Supply Fund.

The current practice of offering all or nearly all new timber for sale each year should be eliminated. Furthermore, the existing backlog of timber prepared for sale but not sold should be utilized before preparing new timber for sale. The amount of timber prepared and offered for sale each year, including timber offered but not sold in previous years, should be limited to an amount based on realistic timber market demand within the allowable sale quantity (450 mmbf/year).

EXCESSIVE ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Misapplication of the timber supply provision of ANILCA, as discussed previously, has resulted in the construction of many miles of unnecessary roads, damaging the environment and wasting scarce Federal funds in the process.

TLMP calls for an annual average of 46 miles of "pre-roading," based on an annual timber supply of 450 mmbf. During 1982-1984, the Forest Service sold, on average, only 232 mmbf per year. During the same period, the agency pre-roaded an average of 51 miles of roads per year or more than double the amount necessary to meet the timber demand. Under these circumstances, road construction for timber sales should be drastically curtailed until the backlog of timber offered but not sold is appreciably reduced. Furthermore, as this backlog is properly utilized and accounted for as timber supplied to the industry, some of the money being poured into road construction would become available for other purposes.

Regarding a related issue, according to its own Tongass Land Management Plan Evaluation Report, the Forest Service built roads into nearly one-fourth of all the roadless value comparison units (VCU's) in land use designations III and IV between 1979 and 1984. Assuming a 100-year timber rotation, this indicates the Forest Service has been following a timber road construction policy that is neither prudent forestry nor prudent multiple use management.

At the current pace, roads will be built within another 15 years in virtually every roadless area on the Tongass. Under standard practices for harvesting the Tongass on a 100-year rotation, it should be many decades before all management areas would need to be roaded. It appears, therefore, that the Forest Service is constructing new

roads into roadless watersheds at a rate far in excess of that which is necessary.

This is not what was intended when, at the time of the bill's final passage by the House, I expressed that it was ". . . our intent to maximize protection to environmentally sensitive areas, particularly those with high fish and wildlife values." Continuing to utilize the current policy will likely harm both the fishing and tourism industries as well as the long-term sustainability of the Tongass to support a viable timber industry.

The public interest would be served better by a policy that puts road construction funds to more efficient use while retaining options to preserve important fish and wildlife habitat and other values.

I urge you to curtail new road construction for timber sales until such time as most of the backlog of unsold timber offerings is eliminated. Thereafter, road construction should be planned and paced so as to correspond closely to the then-current timber demand.

Additionally, I urge you to defer road construction in prime fish and wildlife habitat areas such as those identified in the draft environmental assessment for TLMP amendments until such road construction is necessary and justified. This is particularly appropriate considering the accelerated pace at which road construction has taken place in sensitive fish and wildlife habitat areas in recent years.

IMPROPER UTILITY LOG DESIGNATION

Another area in need of remedial action is that dealing with the very large amount of timber actually available to the industry but not being counted as part of the annual 450 mmbf timber supply. Such timber also is not counted against the total contract volume under one of the long-term contracts. This timber called "utility volume" is not being counted even though it is, in fact, pulp material.

During congressional consideration of the timber supply needed for the timber industry, it was implicit that utility volume would be counted as an integral part of timber supply since the Tongass industry is not just a lumber economy but is a *pulp*, lumber and cant economy.

The recent Forest Service administrative change on utilization standards, which classifies utility logs as those 10 inches or less in diameter rather than 6 inches or less, exacerbates the situation. Although the new standards may be only temporary, utility volume is being greatly increased as a percentage of total timber, again without being counted as part of the volume "supplied" to industry.

Through these practices, approximately 12 to 27 percent of the total timber offered is being omitted from the calculation of the amount of timber made available to industry. In a year in which 450 mmbf was deemed "supplied" under these Forest Service practices, the amount actually supplied could range from 504 mmbf to 571 mmbf, far above the quantity permitted in the law.

The legislative history is devoid of any suggestion that utility volume would not be included and reported in calculations of timber offered, sold and harvested, or of the timber supply. It was certainly not intended that any class of merchantable wood be excluded from the computations of that supply.

Not to count the utility volume is, in essence, to increase the statutory 450 mmbf supply administratively. Utility volume should be counted in all timber calculations and should be counted against the total timber volume committed under both long-term contracts, not just under one as is now the case.

INEFFICIENT LOG SCALING

As I understand it, some timber purchasers are practicing harvesting techniques that result in quality sawlog timber being scaled as "utility" logs, thereby causing losses to the Federal Treasury and promoting the inefficient handling of wood material from the Tongass National Forest. An unknown amount of money is lost by the Federal government when timber is scaled as utility logs when it is actually of sawlog quality.

Scaling at the mill, as is often the case rather than at the harvesting sites or at log transfer facilities, lessens the incentive for the industry to clear harvesting sites since industry pays only for that timber which actually arrives at the mill. Such scaling also fails to encourage proper care in log transport, including development of alternative transportation methods of logs, since industry is not charged for logs abandoned or lost prior to scaling at the mill.

I urge you to investigate ways to address these problems and to take appropriate remedial action to achieve better administrative control over logs from the stump to the mill, to modify current scaling practices so that the responsibility and costs of losses are placed on the timber contract holder, and to assure that sawlog quality material is scaled as such.

DATA BASE FOR REVISION OF TLMP AND FAILURE TO APPLY SECTION 6(K) OF NFMA

The Forest Service has an opportunity to further improve the management practices and policies of the Tongass through revision of the TLMP. It is of great importance that those who participate in developing the new TLMP use the best available information and data to accurately update and refine the inventory of timber, wildlife, and other natural resources of the Tongass. The new land management plan should provide for managing the Tongass not only for timber sales, but also to provide for many other diverse uses of the Tongass. The best available data will also enable the Forest Service to take advantage of increased yields made possible through investments in precommercial thinning and other silvicultural practices.

I understand that the Forest Service does not intend to designate lands within the Tongass as unsuitable for commercial timber production under Section 6(k) of the NFMA.

It has been argued that Section 6(k) of NFMA does not apply to the Tongass because of Section 705(d) of ANILCA. However, rather than exempting the Tongass from the operation of section 6(k), section 705(d) means exactly what it says: that the ANILCA provisions on timber supply are to be implemented notwithstanding 6(k).

As I indicated in the House at the time of final passage of the Alaska Lands Act, "The Congress fully intends that the Secretary carry out his mandate under Section 6(k) of the National Forest Management Act to identify lands that are not currently suitable as timber producing areas for economic reasons."

The Congressional intent was that the suitability of the Tongass areas for commercial timber production would be analyzed as set out in 6(k), and that this information would help guide sale offering decisions made as the ANILCA provisions are implemented.

In revising the TLMP, I encourage you to see that the latest and best available information and data, including assessments mandated under section 6(k), are utilized.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Secretary, your Department, acting through the Forest Service, has an historic opportunity to resolve problems in Southeast Alaska and improve the management of the Tongass National Forest by exercising leadership and by working with the State of Alaska, its Congressional delegation, the appropriate Committees of the Congress and the public.

As part of the effort to resolve those problems, I respectfully request that you consider the issues I have raised in this letter and take the necessary actions to implement the following recommendations:

1. Eliminate the current practice of offering all or nearly all new timber each year and utilize the existing backlog of timber prepared for sale but not sold before preparing new timber for sale; base the amount of timber prepared and offered for sale each year, including timber offered but not sold in previous years, on realistic timber market demand within the allowable sale quantity (450 mmbf).

2. Curtail new road construction for timber sales until the backlog of timber prepared for sale but not sold is appreciably reduced; defer road construction in prime fish and wildlife habitat areas until necessary and justified; plan and pace future road construction to correspond closely to the then-current timber demand.

3. Begin immediately to include utility volume in all calculations of timber offered, sold, and harvested as part of the allowable timber sale quantity and as timber volume committed under both long-term timber contracts.

4. Investigate ways to improve scaling practices to achieve better administrative control over logs from stump to the mill and to modify scaling practices to place responsibility for losses on timber contract holders and to assure that saw log quality material is scaled as such.

5. Use the best available information and data, including assessments of timber land suitability pursuant to Section 6(k) of the NFMA, in revising the Tongass Land Management Plan.

It should be our goal to see to it that the Tongass National Forest, one of the great natural resource assets of our Nation, is managed in as sound and professional a manner as possible and in the best interests of all the American people to whom it belongs. I look forward to seeing the actions you and the U.S. Department of Agriculture institute in the months ahead to achieve this goal.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL, *Chairman.*

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5234

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

following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau of Land Management, $380,370,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated herein may be expended to approve mining operations conducted under the Mining Law of 1872 (30 U.S.C. 22, et seq.) unless operators are required to post a reclamation bond for all operations involving significant surface disturbance, including all disturbances of more than five acres per year, such bond to be for an amount estimated by the Bureau of Land Management to cover the costs of reclamation: *Provided further,* That evidence of an equivalent bond posted with a State agency may be accepted in lieu of a separate bond.

CONSTRUCTION AND ACCESS

For acquisition of lands and interests therein, and construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, $1,200,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976 (31 U.S.C. 6901-07), $105,000,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94-579 including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, $850,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; $54,260,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation: *Provided further,* That 25 per centum of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 per centum of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315, et seq.), and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further,* That the dollar equivalent of value, in excess of the grazing fee established under law and paid to the United States Government, received by any permittee or lessee as compensation for an assignment of a grazing permit or lease, or any grazing privileges or rights thereunder, and in excess of the installation and maintenance cost of grazing improvements provided for by the permittee in the allotment management plan or amendments or otherwise approved by the Bureau of Land Management, shall be paid to the Bureau of Land Management and disposed of as provided for by section 401(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701): *Provided further,* That if the dollar value prescribed above is not paid to the Bureau of Land Management, the grazing permit or lease shall be canceled.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under sections 209(b), 304(a), 304(b), 305(a), and 504(g) of the Act approved October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and sections 101 and 203 of Public Law 93-153, to be immediately available until expended.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing law, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to $10,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau of Land Management; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed $10,000: *Provided,* That appropriations herein made for Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be reimbursed to the General Fund of the Treasury from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California land grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further,* That appropriations herein made may be expended for surveys of Federal lands of the United States and on a reimbursable basis for surveys of Federal lands of the United States and for protection of lands for the State of Alaska: *Provided further,* That an appeal of any reductions in grazing allotments on public rangelands must be taken within thirty days after receipt of a final grazing allotment decision. Reductions of up to 10 per centum in grazing allotments shall become effective when so designated by the Secretary of the Interior. Upon appeal any proposed reduction in excess of 10 per centum shall be suspended pending final action on the appeal, which shall be completed within two years after the appeal is filed: *Provided further,* That appropriations herein made shall be available for paying costs incidental to the utilization of services contributed by individuals who serve without compensation as volunteers in aid of work of the Bureau.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigations, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; for the general administration of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; and not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by Youth Conservation Corps as if authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended by Public Law 93-408, $306,500,000, of which $4,300,000, to carry out the purposes of 16 U.S.C. 1535, shall remain available until expended; and of which $6,411,000 shall be for operation and maintenance of fishery mitigation facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers under the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan, authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2921), to compensate for loss of fishery resources from water development projects on the Lower Snake River, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of these funds may be used to compensate a quantity of staff greater than existed as of May 1, 1986, in the Office of Legislative Services of the Fish and Wildlife Service or to compensate individual staff members assigned subsequent to May 1, 1986, at grade levels greater than the staff replaced.

CONSTRUCTION AND ANADROMOUS FISH

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigations, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $21,113,000, to

remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be available for expenses to carry out the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 757a-757g).

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1971, as amended (16 U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4-11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, $33,225,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), $5,645,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 72 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only (including 72 for police-type use); purchase of 1 new aircraft for replacement only; not to exceed $300,000 for payment, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general administration of the National Park Service, including not to exceed $408,000 for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission and not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by Youth Conservation Corps as if authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended by Public Law 93-408, $628,875,000, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451) and $15,158,000 to be derived from unappropriated balances in the National Park Service "Planning, development and operation of recreation facilities" account: *Provided*, That the Park Service shall not enter into future concessionaire contracts, including renewals, that do not include a termination for cause clause that provides for possible extinguishment of possessory interests excluding depreciated book value of concessionaire investments without compensation: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be used to compensate a quantity of staff greater than existed as of May 1, 1986, in the Office of Legislative and Congressional Affairs of the National Park Service or to compensate individual staff members assigned subsequent to May 1, 1986, at grade levels greater than the staff replaced.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, environmental compliance and review, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, $10,904,000.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), $24,200,000 to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, established by section 108 of that Act, as amended, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1988: *Provided*, That the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is a State eligible for Historic Preservation Fund matching grant assistance as authorized under 16 U.S.C. 470w(2): *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 105(1) of the Compact of Free Association, Public Law 99-239, the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands shall also be considered States for purposes of this appropriation.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), $75,989,000, to remain available until expended, of which $8,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Park System Visitor Facilities Fund, including $2,700,000 to carry out the provisions of sections 303 and 304 of Public Law 95-290: *Provided*, That for payment of obligations incurred for continued construction of the Cumberland Gap Tunnel, as authorized by section 160 of Public Law 93-87, $10,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended to liquidate contract authority provided under section 104(a)(8) of Public Law 95-599, as amended, such contract authority to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That for payments of obligations incurred for improvements to the George Washington Memorial Parkway, $2,500,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended to liquidate contract authority provided under section 104(a)(8) of Public Law 95-599, as amended, subject to the availability of funds for an additional lane on the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4-11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, $101,100,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended, including $2,270,000 to administer the State Assistance program: *Provided*, That of the amounts previously appropriated to the Secretary's contingency fund for grants to States, $893,000 shall be available in 1987 for administrative expenses of the State grant program: *Provided further*, That $300,000 for Apostle Islands National Lakeshore shall be available subject to authorization.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

For expenses necessary for operating and maintaining the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $4,771,000.

ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR COMMISSION

For operation of the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission, $250,000.

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

For operation of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Commission, $75,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 400 passenger motor vehicles, of which 348 shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed 300 for police-type use and 20 buses; to provide, notwithstanding any other provision of law, at a cost not exceeding $100,000, transportation for children in nearby communities to and from any unit of the National Park System used in connection with organized recreation and interpretive programs of the National Park Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; and for the procurement and delivery of medical services within the jurisdiction of units of the National Park System: *Provided*, That any funds available to the National Park Service may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to maintain law and order in emergency and other unforeseen law enforcement situations and conduct emergency search and rescue operations in the National Park System: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to add industrial facilities to the list of National Historic Landmarks without the consent of the owner: *Provided further*, That the National Park Service may use helicopters and motorized equipment at Death Valley National Monument for removal of feral burros and horses: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Park Service may recover unbudgeted costs of providing necessary services associated with special use permits, such reimbursements to be credited to the appropriation current at that time: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to implement an agreement for the redevelopment of the southern end of Ellis Island until such agreement has been submitted to the Congress and shall not be implemented prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full and comprehensive

report on the development of the southern end of Ellis Island, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall begin processing claims of the licensees of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration within 30 days of enactment of this Act, and that licensees who filed claims with the Department between July, 1984, and January, 1985, or who filed for relief from the Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act on December 31, 1979, or who were mentioned in the December 30, 1985, Opinion of the Comptroller General shall be eligible claimants: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall process such claims in accordance with the facts, methodologies, and criteria employed in the Amerecord, Inc. test case which was settled on August 20, 1983:, and other applicable legal principles: *Provided further,* That these claims will be processed to completion in a judicious and expedient manner not to exceed one year from the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act may be used to issue a request for proposals to lease any or all of Glen Echo Park: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the closure of the Pacific Northwest Regional Office in Seattle, Washington.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (43 U.S.C. 31, 1332 and 1340); classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; $423,220,000: *Provided,* That $52,835,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality: *Provided further,* That in fiscal year 1987 and thereafter the Geological Survey is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further,* That, heretofore and hereafter, in carrying out work involving cooperation with any State, Territory, possession, or political subdivision thereof, the Geological Survey may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, record obligations against accounts receivable from any such entities and shall credit amounts received from such entities to this appropriation.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 14 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for observation wells; expenses of the United States National Committee on Geology; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts: *Provided,* That appropriations herein made shall be available for paying costs incidental to the utilization of services contributed by individuals who serve without compensation as volunteers in aid of work of the Geological Survey, and that within appropriations herein provided, Geological Survey officials may authorize either direct procurement of or reimbursement for expenses incidental to the effective use of volunteers such as, but not limited to, training, transportation, lodging, subsistence, equipment, and supplies: *Provided further,* That provision for such expenses or services is in accord with volunteer or cooperative agreements made with such individuals, private organizations, educational institutions, or State or local government: *Provided further,* That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in Public Law 95-224.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

LEASING AND ROYALTY MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for minerals leasing and environmental studies, regulation of industry operations, and collection of royalties, as authorized by law; for enforcing laws and regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other minerals leases, permits, licenses and operating contracts; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements; including the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $162,893,000, of which not less than $45,354,000 shall be available for royalty management activities including general administration: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this Act shall be available for the payment of interest in accordance with 30 U.S.C. 1721(b) and (d): *Provided further,* That in fiscal year 1987 and thereafter, the Minerals Management Service is authorized to accept land, buildings, equipment and other contributions, from public and private sources, which shall be available for the purposes provided for in this account: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, $125,000,000 shall be deducted from Federal onshore mineral leasing receipts prior to the division and distribution of such receipts between the States and the Treasury and shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

BUREAU OF MINES

MINES AND MINERALS

For expenses necessary for conducting inquiries, technological investigations, and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs; to foster and encourage private enterprise in the development of mineral resources and the prevention of waste in the mining, minerals, metal, and mineral reclamation industries; to inquire into the economic conditions affecting those industries; to promote health and safety in mines and the mineral industry through research; and for other related purposes as authorized by law, $126,429,000, of which $77,505,000 shall remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided,* That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, including the purchase of not to exceed 14 passenger motor vehicles, of which 9 shall be for replacement only; and uniform allowances of not to exceed $400 for each uniformed employee of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement; $99,078,000, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, an additional amount, to remain available until expended, equal to receipts to the General Fund of the Treasury from performance bond forfeitures in fiscal year 1987.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, including the purchase of not more than 21 passenger motor vehicles, of which 15 shall be for replacement only, to remain available until expended, $232,720,000, to be derived from receipts of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund: *Provided,* That pursuant to Public Law 97-365, the Department of the Interior is authorized to utilize up to 20 per centum from the recovery of the delinquent debt owed to the United States Government to pay for contracts to collect these debts: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available to the States to contract for reclamation projects authorized in section 406(a) of Public Law 95-87, administrative expenses may not exceed 15 per centum: *Provided further,* That none of these funds shall be used for a reclamation grant to any State if the State has not agreed to participate in a nationwide data system established by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement through which all permit applications are reviewed and approvals withheld if the applicants (or those who control the applicants) applying for or receiving such permits have outstanding State or Federal air or water quality violations in accordance with section 510(c) of the Act of August 3, 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1260(c)), or failure to abate cessation orders, outstanding civil penalties associated with such failure to abate cessation orders, or uncontested past due Abandoned Mine Land fees: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Interior may deny fifty percent of an Abandoned Mine Reclamation fund grant, available to a State pursuant to title IV of Public Law 95-87, when pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 521 of the Act, the Secretary determines that a State is systematically failing to administer adequately the enforcement provisions of the approved State

regulatory program. Funds will be denied until such time as the State and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement have agreed upon an explicit plan of action for correcting the enforcement deficiency. A State may enter into such agreement without admission of culpability. If a State enters into such agreement, the Secretary shall take no action pursuant to section 521(b) of the Act as long as the State is complying with the terms of the agreement: *Provided further,* That none of the funds shall be used to implement any proposals for a cost-sharing matching fund in making State reclamation grants: *Provided further,* That the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement is to apportion the funding for the Secretary's discretionary fund, as referenced in section 402(g)(3) of Public Law 95-87, on the basis of the Abandoned Mine Lands Inventory: *Provided further,* That expenditure of moneys as authorized in section 402(g)(3) of Public Law 95-87 shall be on a priority basis with the first priority being protection of public health, safety, general welfare, and property from extreme danger of adverse effects of coal mining practices, as stated in section 403 of Public Law 95-87.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For operation of Indian programs by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants including expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order; management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; development of Indian arts and crafts, as authorized by law; for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, $892,328,000, of which not to exceed $56,418,000 for higher education scholarships and assistance to public schools under the Act of April 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 596), as amended (25 U.S.C. 452 et seq.), shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1988, and the funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (88 Stat. 2203; 25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) shall remain available until September 30, 1988: *Provided,* That this carryover authority does not extend to programs directly operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs unless the tribe(s) and the Bureau of Indian Affairs enter into a cooperative agreement for consolidated services; and for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 19(a) of Public Law 93-531 (25 U.S.C. 640d-18(a)), $2,931,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated to the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be expended as matching funds for programs funded under section 103(b)(2) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act: *Provided further,* That no part of any appropriations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available to provide general assistance payments for Alaska Natives in the State of Alaska unless and until otherwise specifically provided for by Congress: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated to the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be used to move the northern California agency office from Hoopa, California, unless a reprograming request has been submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities, including architectural and engineering services by contract; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and construction, repair, and improvement of Indian housing, $86,066,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for use by the Secretary to construct homes and related facilities for the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission in lieu of construction by the Commission under section 15(d)(3) of the Act of December 22, 1974 (88 Stat. 1719; 25 U.S.C. 640d-14(d)(3)), may also be used for counseling and other activities related to the relocation of Navajo families.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

For construction of roads and bridges pursuant to authority contained in 23 U.S.C. 203, the Act of November 2, 1921 (42 Stat. 208; 25 U.S.C. 13), and the Act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750; 25 U.S.C. 318a), $2,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That these funds shall not become available until the balance of funding needed to complete the project is provided from funds available to the State of Oklahoma: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 per centum of contract authority available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Federal Highway Trust Fund may be used to cover roads program management costs and construction supervision costs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

TRIBAL TRUST FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated not to exceed $1,000,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

During fiscal year 1987, and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans pursuant to the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (88 Stat. 77; 25 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), shall not exceed $16,320,000.

INDIAN LOAN GUARANTY AND INSURANCE FUND

For payment of interest subsidies on new and outstanding guaranteed loans and for necessary expenses of management and technical assistance in carrying out the provisions of the Indian Financing Act of 1974, as amended (88 Stat. 77; 25 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), $2,652,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That during fiscal year 1987, total commitments to guarantee loans pursuant to the Indian Financing Act of 1974 may be made only to the extent that the total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, shall not exceed resources and authority available.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans and the Indian loan guarantee and insurance fund) shall be available for expenses of exhibits; and purchase of not to exceed 150 passenger carrying motor vehicles, of which 100 shall be for replacement only.

TERRITORIAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, $78,874,000, of which (1) $76,401,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance; late charges and payments of the annual interest rate differential required by the Federal Financing Bank, under terms of the second refinancing of an existing loan to the Guam Power Authority, as authorized by law (Public Law 98-454; 98 Stat. 1732); grants to the judiciary in American Samoa for compensation and expenses, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)); grants to the Government of American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; construction grants to the Government of the Virgin Islands as authorized by Public Law 97-357 (96 Stat. 1709); construction grants to the Government of Guam, as authorized by law (Public Law 98-454; 98 Stat. 1732); grants to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands as authorized by law (Public Law 94-241; 90 Stat. 272); and (2) $2,473,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Territorial and International Affairs: *Provided,* That the territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further,* That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such governments, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (90 Stat. 299; 91 Stat. 1159; 92 Stat. 495); grants for the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants for the compensation and expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; $14,340,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further,* That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding the proviso under "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" in Public Law 97-257 making funds available for the relocation and resettlement of the Bikini people in the Marshall Islands, such funds shall be available for relocation and resettlement of the Bikini people to any location.

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

For grants and necessary expenses for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands as provided for in sections 177, 122, 221, 223, 103(h)(2), and 103(k) of the Compact of Free Association, $36,170,000, including $7,250,000 for the Enjebi Community Trust Fund, as authorized by Public Law 99-239.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, $42,482,000, of which not to exceed $10,000 may be for official reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $21,255,000, of which not less than $4,062,000 shall be in support of Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement activities.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $16,300,000.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of Construction Management, $684,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from available resources within the Working Capital Fund, 12 additional aircraft, 10 of which shall be for replacement only: *Provided*, That no programs funded with appropriated funds in the "Office of the Secretary", "Office of the Solicitor", and "Office of Inspector General" may be augmented through the Working Capital Fund or the Consolidated Working Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any no year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction; for emergency actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods or volcanoes; for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95-87; and shall transfer, from any no year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such funds as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a primacy State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof: *Provided further*, That all funds used pursuant to this section must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, U.S.C.: *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs and supplies, materials, equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed $300,000; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members: *Provided*, That no funds available to the Department of the Interior are available for any expenses of the Great Hall of Commerce.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902 and D.C. Code 4-204).

SEC. 106. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for obligation in connection with contracts issued by the General Services Administration for services or rentals for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

SEC. 107. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the preparation for, or conduct of, pre-leasing and leasing activities (including but not limited to: calls for information, tract selection, notices of sale, receipt of bids and award of leases) of lands within:

(a) An area of the Outer Continental Shelf, as defined in section 2(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(a)), located in the Atlantic Ocean, bounded by the following line: from the intersection of the seaward limit of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts territorial sea and the 71 degree west longitude line south along that longitude line to its intersection with the line which passes between blocks 598 and 642 on Outer Continental Shelf protraction diagram NK 19-10; then along that line in an easterly direction to its intersection with the line between blocks 600 and 601 of protraction diagram NK 19-11; then in a northerly direction along that line to the intersection with the 60 meter isobath between blocks 204 and 205 of protraction diagram NK 19-11; then along the 60 meter isobath, starting in a roughly southeasterly direction; then turning northeast and north until such isobath intersects the maritime boundary between Canada and the United States of America, then north northeasterly along this boundary until this line intersects the 60 meter isobath at the northern edge of block 851 of protraction diagram NK 19-6; then along a line that lies between blocks 851 and 807 of protraction diagram NK 19-6 in a westerly direction to the first point of intersection with the seaward limit of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts territorial sea; then southwesterly along the seaward limit of the territorial sea to the point of beginning at the intersection of the seaward limit of the territorial sea and the 71 degree west longitude line.

(b) The following blocks are excluded from the described area: In protraction diagram NK 19-10, blocks numbered 474 through 478, 516 through 524, 560 through 568, and 604 through 612; in protraction diagram NK 19-6, blocks numbered 969 through 971; in protraction diagram NK 19-5, blocks numbered 1005 through 1008; and in protraction diagram NK 19-8, blocks numbered 37 through 40, 80 through 84, 124 through 127, and 168 through 169.

(c) The following blocks are included in the described area: In protraction diagram NK 19-11, blocks numbered 633 through 644, 677 through 686, 721 through 724, 765 through 767, 809 through 810, and 853; in protraction diagram NK 19-9, blocks numbered 106, 150, 194, 238, 239, and 283; and in protraction diagram NK 19-6, blocks numbered 854, 899, 929, 943, 944, and 987.

(d) Blocks in and at the head of submarine canyons: An area of the Outer Continental Shelf, as defined in section 2(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (45 U.S.C. 1331(a)), located in the Atlantic Ocean off the coastline of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, lying at the head of, or within the submarine canyons known as Atlantis Canyon, Veatch Canyon, Hydrographer Canyon, Welker Canyon, Oceanographer Canyon, Gilbert Canyon, Lydonia Canyon, Alvin Canyon, Powell Canyon, and Munson Canyon, and consisting of the following blocks, respectively:

(1) On Outer Continental Shelf protraction diagram NJ 19-1; blocks 36, 37, 38, 42-44, 80-82, 86-88, 124, 125, 130-132, 168, 169, 174-176, 212, 213.

(2) On Outer Continental Shelf protraction diagram NJ 19-2; blocks 8, 9, 17-19, 51-52, 53, 54, 61-63, 95-98, 139, 140.

(3) On Outer Continental Shelf protraction diagram NK 19-10; blocks 916, 917, 921, 922, 960, 961, 965, 966, 1003-1005, 1009, 1011.

(4) On Outer Continental Shelf protraction diagram NK 19-11; blocks 521, 522, 565, 566, 609, 610, 653-655, 697-700, 734, 735, 741-744, 769, 778-781, 785-788, 813, 814, 822-826, 829-831, 857, 858, 866-869, 873-875, 901, 902, 910-913, 917, 945-947, 955, 956, 979, 980, 989-991, 999.

(5) On Outer Continental Shelf protraction diagram NK 19-12; blocks 155, 156, 198, 199, 280-282, 324-326, 369-371, 401, 413-416, 442-446, 450, 451, 489-490, 494, 495, 530, 531, 533-540, 574, 575, 577-583, 618, 619, 621-623, 626, 627, 662, 663, 665-667, 671, 672, 706, 707, 710, 711, 750, 751, 754, 755, 794, 795, 798, 799.

(e) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the lease of that portion of any blocks described in subsection (d) above which lies outside the geographical boundaries of the submarine canyons and submarine canyon heads described in subsection (d) above: *Provided*, That for purposes of this subsection, the geographical boundaries of the submarine canyons and submarine canyon heads shall be those recognized by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Adminis-

tration, Department of Commerce, on the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from granting contracts for scientific study, the results of which could be used in making future leasing decisions in the planning area and in preparing environmental impact statements as required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

(g) References made to blocks, protraction diagrams, and isobaths are to such blocks, protraction diagrams, and isobaths as they appear on the map entitled Outer Continental Shelf of the North Atlantic from 39° to 45° North Latitude (Map No. MMS-10), prepared by the United States Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Atlantic OCS Region.

SEC. 108. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance changing the name of the mountain located 63 degrees, 04 minutes, 15 seconds west, presently named and referred to as Mount McKinley.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations in this title shall be available to provide insurance on official motor vehicles, aircraft, and boats operated by the Department of the Interior in Canada and Mexico.

SEC. 110. No funds provided in this title may be used to detail any employee to an organization unless such detail is in accordance with Office of Personnel Management regulations.

SEC. 111. (a) The Secretary of the Interior may consider and accept, as part of the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program for 1987 to 1992, any recommendation included in any proposal submitted to him with respect to lease sales on the California Outer Continental Shelf by the co-chairmen of the Congressional panel established pursuant to Public Law 99-190 or by the Governor of California on May 7, 1986. The major components of those proposals shall be examined in the final environmental impact statement for the program. Consideration or acceptance of any such recommendation shall not require the preparation of a revised or supplemental draft environmental impact statement.

(b) The Secretary shall submit a copy of the draft proposed final leasing program for offshore California to the cochairmen of the negotiating group referred to in subsection (a) who shall have a period of 30 days in which to review such program and provide their comments and the comments of the negotiating group on it to the Secretary prior to its submission to the President and the Congress. When submitting the proposed final leasing program to the President and the Congress in accordance with section 18(d) (43 U.S.C. section 1344 (d)) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, such submission shall indicate in detail why any specific portion of the proposals referred to in subsection (a) of this section was not accepted.

(c) Prior to the approval of the Final Program, referenced in subsection (a), the Secretary may conduct prelease activities for proposed California OCS Lease Sales 95, 91, and 119 and may make changes in those sales on the basis of comments submitted by the Congressional negotiating group or others, except that the Secretary may not issue a: (1) call for information and nominations for Sale 95 prior to March 1, 1987, and no draft environmental impact statement shall be published for Sale 91 sooner than 90 days after the Secretary's submission of the draft of the proposed Final Five Year Program to the members of the Congressional panel, and (2) final notice of lease sale for Lease Sale 91 prior to January 1, 1989.

(d) The members of Congress designated under Sec. 111 of Public Law 99-190 (99 Stat. 1243) are hereby authorized to continue as the Congressional negotiating group and to negotiate with the Department of the Interior, to provide the Secretary of the Interior with the appropriate range of advice, including proposals, and to review and comment on proposals by the Department of the Interior with respect to future oil and gas leasing and protection of lands on the California Outer Continental Shelf.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey without reimbursement to the State of Montana no later than December 31, 1986, all of the right, including all water rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the fish hatchery property located south of Miles City, Montana, and known as the Miles City National Fish Hatchery, consisting of 168.22 acres, more or less, of land, together with any improvements and related personal property thereon.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to designate the Laurel Highlands National Recreational Trail, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 4 of the National Trails System Act, as part of the Potomac Heritage Trail, as requested by the State of Pennsylvania in its April 1984 application, subject to the provisions of paragraph (11) of section 5(a) of the National Trail System Act, as amended.

SEC. 114. Section 5 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1334) is amended (without regard to the limitation contained in section 102) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) Any vessel, rig, platform, or other structure used for the purpose of exploration or production of oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf south of 49 degrees North latitude shall be built—

"(A) in the United States; and

"(B) from articles, materials, or supplies at least 50 percent of which, by cost, shall have been mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States.

"(2) The requirements of paragraph (1) shall not apply to any vessel, rig, platform, or other structure which was built, which is being built, or for which a building contract has been executed, on or before October 1, 1986.

"(3) The Secretary may waive—

"(A) the requirement in paragraph (1)(B) whenever the Secretary determines that 50 percent of the articles, materials, or supplies for a vessel, rig, platform, or other structure cannot be mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States; and

"(B) the requirement in paragraph (1)(A) upon application, with respect to any classification of vessels, rigs, platforms, or other structures on a specific lease, when the Secretary determines that at least 50 percent of such classification, as calculated by number and by weight, which are to be built for exploration or production activities under such lease will be built in the United States in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1)(A).".

SEC. 115. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act for fiscal year 1987 to the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, shall be expended to submit to the United States District Court for Eastern California any settlement with respect to Westlands v. the United States, et al. (CV-F-81-245-EDP) until the Congress has received from the Secretary and reviewed for a period of thirty legislative days a copy of the proposed settlement agreement which has been approved and signed by the Secretary.

SEC. 116. The Secretary of the Interior shall designate the visitor center to be associated with the headquarters of the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor as the "George M. O'Brien Visitor Center" in recognition of the leadership and contributions of Representative George M. O'Brien with respect to the creation and establishment of this national heritage corridor.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, Public Law 88-578, as amended, or other law, Land and Water Conservation Fund assisted land in Berkeley, Illinois, assisted under project No. 17-00180, may be exchanged for existing public lands if Land and Water Conservation Fund conversion criteria regarding equal fair market value and reasonably equivalent use and location are met.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest research as authorized by law, $129,183,000, of which $3,400,000 shall remain available until expended for competitive research grants, as authorized by section 5 of Public Law 95-307.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with, and providing technical and financial assistance to States, Territories, possessions, and others; and for forest pest management activities, $57,671,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out activities authorized in Public Law 95-313: *Provided*, That a grant of $3,000,000 shall be made to the State of Minnesota for the purposes authorized by section 6 of Public Law 95-495.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, and for repayment of advances made in the preceding fiscal year pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 556d for forest fire protection and emergency rehabilitation of National Forest System lands, and including administrative expenses associated with the management of funds provided under the heads "Forest Research", "State and Private Forestry", "National Forest System", "Construction", and "Land Acquisition", $996,687,000, of which $144,767,000 for reforestation and timber stand improvement, cooperative law enforcement, and maintenance of forest development roads and trails shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1988.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for construction, $192,409,000, to remain available until expended, of which $36,736,000 is for construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities; and $155,673,000 is for construction of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C.

532-538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided*, That funds becoming available in fiscal year 1987 under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury of the United States.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-4-11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, $39,936,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and $3,000,000 for acquisition of land and interests therein in the Columbia River Gorge, Oregon and Washington, as depicted on a map entitled "Columbia Gorge Acquisitions—1986" on file with the Forest Service, pursuant to the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428(a)), to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of land within the exterior boundaries of the Cache and Uinta National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, $966,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 per centum of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the sixteen Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94-579, as amended, to remain available until expended.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $90,000 to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed 245 passenger motor vehicles of which eight will be used primarily for law enforcement purposes and of which 235 shall be for replacement only, of which acquisition of 148 passenger motor vehicles shall be from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft, the purchase of not to exceed two for replacement only, and acquisition of 58 aircraft from excess sources; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (b) services pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (c) uniform allowances for each uniformed employee of the Forest Service, not in excess of $400 annually; (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (e) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein, pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); (f) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, 558a note); and (g) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

None of the funds made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended to change the boundaries of any region, to abolish any region, to move or close any regional office for research, State and private forestry, or National Forest System administration of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in the United States Senate and the Committee on Agriculture in the United States House of Representatives.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be advanced to the National Forest System appropriation for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction.

Appropriations and funds available to the Forest Service shall be available to comply with the requirements of section 313(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1323(a)).

The appropriation structure for the Forest Service may not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development and the Office of International Cooperation and Development in connection with forest and rangeland research, and technical information and assistance in foreign countries.

Funds previously appropriated for timber salvage sales may be recovered from receipts deposited for use by the applicable national forest and credited to the Forest Service Permanent Appropriations to be expended for timber salvage sales from any national forest: *Provided*, That no less than $26,781,000 shall be made available to the Forest Service for obligation in fiscal year 1987 from the Timber Salvage Sales Fund appropriation.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or 7 U.S.C. 147b unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprograming procedures contained in House Report 97-942.

No funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture without the approval of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be available to conduct a program of not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by Youth Conservation Corps as if authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended by Public Law 93-408.

The Forest Service is authorized and directed to negotiate, within 90 days after the enactment of this Act, settlement of claims against the United States resulting from a forest fire in the Black Hills National Forest.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

The Secretary of Energy pursuant to the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-577), shall—

(1) no later than thirty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a notice soliciting statements of interest in, and informational proposals for, projects meeting the cost-sharing criteria contained under this head in Public Law 99-190 and employing emerging clean coal technologies which are capable of retrofitting, repowering, or modernizing existing facilities, which statements and informational proposals are to be submitted to the Secretary within sixty days after the publication of such notice; and

(2) no later than one hundred and twenty days after the receipt of statements of interest and informational proposals, submit to Congress a report that analyzes the information contained in such statements of interest and informational proposals and assesses the potential usefulness and commercial viability of each emerging clean coal technology for which a statement of interest or informational proposal has been received.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, $314,512,000, to remain available until expended, of which $221,000 is for the functions of the Office of the Federal Inspector for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System established pursuant to the authority of Public Law 94-586 (90 Stat. 2908-2909), and $2,074,000 to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in the "Fossil energy construction" account, and in addition, $437,000 to be derived by transfer from amounts derived from fees for guarantees of obligations collected pursuant to section 19 of the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5919), and deposited in the "Energy security reserve" established by Public Law 96-126: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas.

Of the funds herein provided, $30,000,000 is for implementation of the June, 1984 multiyear, cost-shared magnetohydrodynamics program targeted on proof-of-concept testing: *Provided further*, That 20 per centum private sector cash or in-kind contributions shall be required for obligations in fiscal year 1987, and for each subsequent fiscal year's obligations private sector contributions shall increase by 5 per centum over the life of the proof-of-concept plan: *Provided further*, That existing facilities, equipment, and supplies, or previously expended research or development funds are not cost-sharing for the purposes of this appropriation, except as amortized, depreciated, or expensed in normal business practice: *Provided further*, That cost-sharing shall not be required for the costs of constructing or operating government-owned facilities or for the costs of Government organizations, National Laboratories, or universities and such

costs shall not be used in calculating the required percentage for private sector contributions: *Provided further,* That private sector contribution percentages need not be met on each contract but must be met in total for each fiscal year.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For necessary expenses in carrying out naval petroleum and oil shale reserves activities, including the purchase of not to exceed 1 passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only, $122,177,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out energy conservation activities, $231,825,000, to remain available until expended, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for a grant for an energy research facility at Tufts University when specifically authorized by an Act of Congress: *Provided,* That award of such grant may be made only upon approval of an appropriate peer review panel convened by the Department of Energy for the specific purpose of reviewing such grant application and subject to conditions, if any, contained, in legislation specifically authorizing such project: *Provided further,* That $2,500,000 of the amount provided under this heading shall be available for continuing a research and development initiative with the National Laboratories for new technologies up to proof-of-concept testing to increase significantly the energy efficiency of processes that produce steel: *Provided further,* That obligation of funds for these activities shall be contingent on an agreement to provide cash or in-kind contributions to the initiative or to other collaborative research and development activities related to the purpose of the initiative equal to 30 percent of the amount of Federal Government obligations: *Provided further,* That existing facilities, equipment, and supplies, or previously expended research or development funds are not acceptable as contributions for the purposes of this appropriation, except as amortized, depreciated, or expensed in normal business practice: *Provided further,* That the total Federal expenditure under this proviso shall be repaid up to one and one-half times from the proceeds of the commercial sale, lease, manufacture, or use of technologies developed under this proviso, at a rate of one-fourth of all net proceeds: *Provided further,* That none of the funds included in this appropriation may be used to carry out the requirements of Part E of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6341-6346).

ECONOMIC REGULATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Economic Regulatory Administration and the Office of Hearings and Appeals, $23,400,000.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

For necessary expenses in carrying out emergency preparedness activities, $6,044,000.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 151 through 166 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-163), $147,433,000, to remain available until expended.

SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT

For expenses necessary for the acquisition, transportation, and injection of petroleum into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and for other necessary expenses as provided in 42 U.S.C. 6247, $331,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the minimum required rate of fill is 85,000 barrels a day until all funds in this account are expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, $60,361,000: *Provided,* That hereafter the information survey entitled "Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (EIA-846F)" shall contain a section III entitled "Fuel Switching Capability To and From Oil" in essentially the form submitted to the Office of Management and Budget on March 14, 1986, and shall be issued to survey energy consumption in 1985 and every three years thereafter.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Appropriations under this Act for the current fiscal year shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; and reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services.

From appropriations under this Act, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

None of the funds made available to the Department of Energy under this Act shall be used to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriations Act.

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, private, or foreign: *Provided,* That revenues and other moneys received by or for the account of the Department of Energy or otherwise generated by sale of products in connection with projects of the Department appropriated under this Act may be retained by the Secretary of Energy, to be available until expended, and used only for plant construction, operation, costs, and payments to cost-sharing entities as provided in appropriate cost-sharing contracts or agreements: *Provided further,* That the remainder of revenues after the making of such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further,* That any contract, agreement, or provision thereof entered into by the Secretary pursuant to this authority shall not be executed prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full and comprehensive report on such project, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

The Secretary of Energy may transfer to the Emergency Preparedness appropriation such funds as are necessary to meet any unforeseen emergency needs from any funds available to the Department of Energy from this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles III and XXI and section 338G of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; purchase and erection of portable buildings; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; $836,336,000: *Provided,* That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through grants and contracts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (88 Stat. 2203; 25 U.S.C. 450), shall remain available until September 30, 1988. Funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts and grants which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total obligation is recorded in the year for which the funds are appropriated: *Provided further,* That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be available until September 30, 1988, for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act (exclusive of planning, design, construction of new facilities, or major renovation of existing Indian Health Service facilities): *Provided further,* That funding contained herein, and in any earlier appropriations Acts for scholarship programs under section 103 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act and section 338G of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service shall remain available for expenditure until September 30, 1988.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of portable buildings, purchases of trailers and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, $54,921,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations in this Act to the Indian Health Service, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the rate for GS-18, and for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (35 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated under this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for the initial lease of permanent structures without advance provi-

sion therefor in appropriations Acts: *Provided further,* That non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all Indian Health Service facilities, if such care can be extended without impairing the ability of the Indian Health Service to fulfill its responsibility to provide health care to Indians served by such facilities and subject to such reasonable charges as the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prescribe, the proceeds of which, together with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651-53), shall be deposited in the fund established by sections 401 and 402 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation: *Provided further,* That with the exception of service units which currently have a billing policy, the Indian Health Service shall not initiate any further action to bill Indians in order to collect from third-party payers nor to charge those Indians who may have the economic means to pay unless and until such time as Congress has agreed upon a specific policy to do so and has directed the Indian Health Service to implement such a policy: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Health and Human Services may authorize special retention pay under paragraph (4) of 37 U.S.C. 302(a) to any regular or reserve officer for the period during which the officer is obligated under section 338B of the Public Health Service Act and assigned and providing direct health services or serving the officer's obligation as a specialist: *Provided further,* That hereafter the Indian Health Service may seek subrogation of claims including but not limited to auto accident claims, including no-fault claims, personal injury, disease, or disability claims, and worker's compensation claims, the proceeds of which shall be credited to the funds established by sections 401 and 402 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be used to implement additional changes in resource allocation methodology until the proposed changes in detail for fiscal year 1987 and the long-range plans for such changes have been submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

INDIAN EDUCATION

For necessary expenses to carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Indian Education Act, $67,236,000 of which $50,021,000 shall be for part A and $14,749,000 shall be for parts B and C: *Provided,* That the amounts available pursuant to section 423 of the Act shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1988.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission as authorized by Public Law 93-531, $22,335,000, to remain available until expended, for operating expenses of the Commission: *Provided,* That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe until such time as a new or replacement home is available for such household: *Provided further,* That of the funds provided under this head, not to exceed $65,000 shall be used to contract for legal services: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated may be used to contract for the services of anyone who has been registered as a lobbyist for the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission: *Provided further,* That the Commission shall relocate those certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation, and to the maximum extent practicable, shall relocate them in the chronological order in which they became certified.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease (for terms not to exceed ten years), and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; up to 5 replacement passenger vehicles; purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees; $189,318,000, including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers: *Provided,* That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, by contract or otherwise, $4,851,000, to remain available until expended.

RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of restoration and renovation of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $12,113,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the Smithsonian Institution may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to expend and/or transfer to the State of Arizona, the counties of Santa Cruz and/or Pima, a sum not to exceed $100,000 within available funds for the purpose of assisting in the construction or maintenance of an access to the Whipple Observatory.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to construct, equip, and furnish the Center for African, Near Eastern, and Asian Cultures in the area south of the original Smithsonian Institution Building, and a research laboratory and conference facility at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama, $6,095,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); purchase, or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, $34,607,000, of which not to exceed $2,420,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds, and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, as authorized, $2,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price: *Provided further,* That unexpended balances of amounts previously appropriated for this purpose under the heading "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art" may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation and accounted for as one appropriation for the same time period as originally enacted.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356), including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $3,383,000.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $136,661,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts

through assistance to groups and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to propose a reprograming of funds for an increase in administration unless a sequestration order under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is implemented for fiscal year 1987.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $29,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988, to the National Endowment for the Arts, of which $20,580,000 shall be available for purposes of section 5(1): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the Chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2), subsections 11(a)(2)(A) and 11(a)(3)(A) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $110,141,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to propose a reprograming of funds for an increase in administration unless a sequestration order under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is implemented for fiscal year 1987.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $28,500,000 to remain available until September 30, 1988, of which $16,500,000 shall be available to National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(h): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the Chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisons of subsections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99-190 (99 Stat. 1261; 20 U.S.C. 956a), $3,500,000, for the following eligible organizations: Shakespeare Theater at the Folger, Corcoran Gallery of Art, Phillips Gallery, Arena Stage, the National Building Museum, the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera Society, Ford's Theater, and the Washington Ballet: *Provided*, That none of the funds may be used to implement paragraphs three and four contained under this head in Public Law 99-190 (99 Stat. 1261; 20 U.S.C. 956a).

INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out title II of the Arts, Humanities, and Cultural Affairs Act of 1976, as amended, $21,394,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the compensation of Executive Level V or higher positions.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), $420,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Public Law 89-665, as amended, $1,533,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the compensation of Executive Level V or higher positions.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,684,000.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, established by the Act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694), as amended by Public Law 92-332 (86 Stat. 401), $5,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by section 17(a) of Public Law 92-578, as amended, $2,342,000 for operating and administrative expenses of the Corporation.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT

For public development activities and projects in accordance with the development plan as authorized by section 17(b) of Public Law 92-578, as amended, $3,869,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Council, as authorized by Public Law 96-388, $2,040,000: *Provided*, That persons other than members of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council may be designated as members of committees associated with the United States Holocaust Memorial Council subject to appointment by the Chairman of the Council: *Provided further*, That any persons so designated shall serve without cost to the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available for the compensation of Executive Level V or higher positions: *Provided further*, That reimbursement for travel expenses for Council employees is available only when approved by the Chairman of the Council: *Provided further*, That the Chairman of the Council may waive any Council bylaw when the Chairman determines such waiver will be in the best interest of the Council.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive Order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture for use for any sale hereafter made of unprocessed timber from Federal lands west of the 100th meridian in the contiguous 48 States which will be exported from the United States, or which will be used as a substitute for timber from private lands which is exported by the purchaser: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to specific quantities of grades and species of timber which said Secretaries determine are surplus to domestic lumber and plywood manufacturing needs.

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for the leasing of oil and natural gas by noncompetitive bidding on publicly owned lands within the boundaries of the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois: *Provided*, That nothing herein is intended to inhibit or otherwise affect the sale, lease, or right to access to minerals owned by private individuals.

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which congressional action is not complete.

SEC. 305. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 306. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 307. Except for lands described by sections 105 and 106 of Public Law 96-560, section 103 of Public Law 96-550, section 5(d)(1) of Public Law 96-312, and except for land in the States of Alaska, and lands in the national forest system released to management for any use the Secretary of Agriculture deems appropriate through the land management planning process by any statement or other Act of Congress designating components of the National Wilderness Preservation System now in effect or hereinafter enacted, and except to carry out the obligations and responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior under section 17(k)(1)(A) and (B) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 226), none of the funds provided in this Act shall be obligated for any aspect of the processing or issuance of permits or leases pertaining to exploration for or development of coal, oil, gas, oil shale, phosphate, potassium, sulphur, gilsonite, or geothermal resources on Federal lands within any component of the National Wilderness Preservation System or within any Forest Service RARE II areas recommended

for wilderness designation or allocated to further planning in Executive Communication 1504, Ninety-sixth Congress (House Document numbered 96-119); or within any lands designated by Congress as wilderness study areas or within Bureau of Land Management wilderness study areas: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prohibit the expenditure of funds for any aspect of the processing or issuance of permits pertaining to exploration for or development of the mineral resources described in this section, within any component of the National Wilderness Preservation System now in effect or hereinafter enacted, any Forest Service RARE II areas recommended for wilderness designation or allocated to further planning, within any lands designated by Congress as wilderness study areas, or Bureau of Land Management wilderness study areas, under valid existing rights, or leases validly issued in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws or valid mineral rights in existence prior to October 1, 1982: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in any area of National Forest lands or the Secretary of the Interior to issue under their existing authority in any area of National Forest or public lands withdrawn pursuant to this Act such permits as may be necessary to conduct prospecting, seismic surveys, and core sampling conducted by helicopter or other means not requiring construction of roads or improvement of existing roads or ways, for the purpose of gathering information about and inventorying energy, mineral, and other resource values of such area, if such activity is carried out in a manner compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment: *Provided further*, That seismic activities involving the use of explosives shall not be permitted in designated wilderness areas: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to augment recurring surveys of the mineral values of wilderness areas pursuant to section 4(d)(2) of the Wilderness Act and acquire information on other national forest and public land areas withdrawn pursuant to this Act, by conducting in conjunction with the Secretary of Energy, the National Laboratories, or other Federal agencies, as appropriate, such mineral inventories of areas withdrawn pursuant to this Act as he deems appropriate. These inventories shall be conducted in a manner compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment through the use of methods including core sampling conducted by helicopter; geophysical techniques such as induced polarization, synthetic aperture radar, magnetic and gravity surveys; geochemical techniques including stream sediment reconnaissance and x-ray diffraction analysis; land satellites; or any other methods he deems appropriate. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to conduct inventories or segments of inventories, such as data analysis activities, by contract with private entities deemed by him to be qualified to engage in such activities whenever he has determined that such contracts would decrease Federal expenditures and would produce comparable or superior results: *Provided further*, That in carrying out any such inventory or surveys, where National Forest System lands are involved, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Secretary of Agriculture concerning any activities affecting surface resources: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to issue oil and gas leases for the subsurface of any lands designated by Congress as wilderness study areas, that are immediately adjacent to producing oil and gas fields or areas that are prospectively valuable. Such leases shall allow no surface occupancy and may be entered only by directional drilling from outside the wilderness study area or other nonsurface disturbing methods.

SEC. 308. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to evaluate, consider, process, or award oil, gas, or geothermal leases on Federal lands in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, State of Washington, within the hydrographic boundaries of the Cedar River municipal watershed upstream of river mile 21.6, the Green River municipal watershed upstream of river mile 61.0, the North Fork of the Tolt River proposed municipal watershed upstream of river mile 11.7, and the South Fork Tolt River municipal watershed upstream of river mile 8.4.

SEC. 309. No assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by this Act unless such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such committees.

SEC. 310. Employment funded by this Act shall not be subject to any personnel ceiling or other personnel restriction for permanent or other than permanent employment except as provided by law.

SEC. 311. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution are authorized to enter into contracts with State and local governmental entities, including local fire districts, for procurement of services in the presuppression, detection, and suppression of fires on any units within their jurisdiction.

SEC. 312. None of the funds provided by this Act to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service may be obligated or expended to plan for, conduct, or supervise deer hunting on the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge.

SEC. 313. None of the funds made available to the Department of the Interior or the Forest Service during fiscal year 1987 by this or any other Act may be used to implement the proposed jurisdictional interchange program until enactment of legislation which authorizes the jurisdictional interchange.

SEC. 314. Notwithstanding any other provision of law and Executive Order 12548 of February 14, 1986, the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior shall hereafter establish annual fees for domestic livestock grazing on the public rangelands as defined in the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-514), beginning with the grazing season which commences on March 1, 1987: *Provided*, That such fees shall annually equal a $4.68 base per animal unit month for mature cattle established by the joint Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service appraisal of 1982-1983 multiplied by the result of a Forage Value Index computed annually from data supplied by the Statistical Reporting Service and weighted by public land animal unit months per State for each of the 16 Western States, such index for data years 1980 through 1984 equaling 100, and divided by 100: *Provided further*, That the annual increase in such fee for any given year shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the previous year's fee: *Provided further*, That such fee shall not be less than $1.35 per animal unit month.

SEC. 315. No funds appropriated or made available under this or any other Act shall be used by the executive branch for soliciting proposals, preparing or reviewing studies or drafting proposals designed to aid in or achieve the transfer out of Federal ownership, management or control in whole or in part the facilities and functions of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (Elk Hills), located in Kern County, California, established by Executive order of the President, dated September 2, 1912, and Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3 (Teapot Dome), located in Wyoming, established by Executive order of the President, dated April 30, 1915, until such activities have been specifically authorized by an Act of Congress hereafter enacted and unless specific provision is made for such activities in an appropriations Act: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to the authority of the Administrator of the General Services Administration pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, as amended, and the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to sell or otherwise dispose of surplus property.

SEC. 316. Section 1013 of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act (2 U.S.C. 684) shall not apply to funds herein appropriated.

Mr. YATES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the entire bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that section 314 is legislation in a general appropriation bill, and violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The section affirmatively directs the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to establish grazing fees, and sets forth terms and conditions for those fees.

The section is clearly legislation, and should be ruled out of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOWNEY of New York). The point of order is conceded and sustained and the section is stricken from the bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the remainder of the bill be limited to a period to terminate at a quarter to 6, with half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire of the subcommittee chairman, does that include all amendments thereto?

Mr. YATES. It includes all amendments thereto, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will have an amendment. Will the chairman of the subcommittee guarantee me 5 minutes on my amendment?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the committee guarantees the gentleman 5 minutes on his amendment.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. YATES: On page 53, line 25, strike "$231,825,000" and insert "$285,825,000". On page 55, line 22, strike "$331,000,000" and insert "$220,000,000".

And on page 55, line 24, strike "85,000" and insert "75,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the amendments I am offering do several things:

First, and foremost, they make an additional amount of $54 million available for program grants for low-income weatherization. The total amount for weatherization will now be $110,200,000, consisting of $55 million for administrative costs associated with up to $550 million of oil overcharge funds from Exxon, $1,200,000 for Indian tribes, and $54 million for direct program grants. Although this is not the full fiscal year 1986 federally funded level of $182 million, it moves much closer to that level than the reported bill, and would allow a total program of about $600 million counting Exxon funds.

Second, it reduces overall budget authority in the bill by $57 million, which would make the total lower than the post Gramm-Rudman fiscal year 1986 level, even after providing an increase for low-income weatherization: $54 million offset weatherization; $57 million reduce bill by 0.7 percent to bring below fiscal year 1986.

The reduction in the strategic petroleum reserve budget authority of $111 million will have no programmatic effect in fiscal year 1987 and only affects preordering of oil for fiscal year 1988.

Third, by reducing the mandatory fill rate for the strategic petroleum reserve from 85,000 to 75,000 barrels per day, outlays scored against the bill will be reduced by about $54 million to offset the low-income weatherization increase and keep the bill below the outlay ceiling of the 302(b) allocation, even if all weatherization funds are spent in fiscal year 1987.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to add $54 million to the bill for low-income weatherization grants.

As recommended by the committee, this bill provides $55 million in grants to the States for the administration of Exxon overcharge moneys allocated to the Weatherization Program. In committee, I supported an increase in the administrative funding because the Court did not allow the States to spend the settlement money on administrative costs. If leveraged correctly and funded adequately, it may encourage the States to put more overcharge money into the low-income programs. The funding level in this bill will allow the States to spend three times more in the Weatherization Program than was provided by Federal funds last year.

In addition to this funding, I welcome the Chairman's amendment to provide another $54 million for the Weatherization Grant Program. I know that the Exxon settlement generated a lot of money for the States, but I'm concerned that this shortlived windfall may result in a decreased Federal commitment later down the road.

After all, oil overcharge funds are consumer dollars which are to be used for restitution purposes only. As the Court emphasized when releasing the Exxon funds, the money should be used as a supplement to, not a replacement for, the existing programs. The Budget Resolution conference committee recognized this principle and recommended full funding for these grant programs in fiscal year 1987.

And believe me, the system is prepared to spend the additional funds. Many, if not most, States spend out all funds before the end of their program year. In Massachusetts, for example, the vast majority of local agencies usually request additional funding and present plans for spending it before 9 months of the year has elapsed. Of course, supplementals are scarce, and overcharge moneys are unpredictable.

The overcharge money can be used to make substantial inroads into existing program backlogs while a full Federal appropriation would guarantee a stable Weatherization Program overtime.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my good friend from Illinois for offering this amendment. No money will be added to the total in the bill, and an important low-income program will receive an extra boost.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment reminds me a little bit of the story of President Truman when he wanted to hire an economist. He said, "Get me an economist with one arm."

They asked, "Why?" And he said, "Well, my present economists always say, well, on one hand, this is the way it is, and on the other hand, this is the way it is, and I want one position."

I feel a little bit that way about this amendment. On one hand I like it and I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I think there is an issue here that at least ought to be brought out. On the one hand I like the amendment because it reduces the budget authority below the post-Gramm-Rudman amounts. It makes the bill acceptable to most of our colleagues.

On the other hand, I have a concern about putting more in weatherization, and I would point out to my colleagues that the States will be getting about $2 billion from the oil overcharge funds paid by Exxon, and there will be additional funds in the future. The States will have an opportunity to use that money for certain categories of energy conservation, the main one being weatherization. I think probably they can do the job with that amount of funding, plus we do already have, I believe, $55 million in here for administration because the Court did limit the amount of that funding that could be spent on administration.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the concern of the subcommittee chairman and those from the Northeast for the needs for weatherization, and I will not oppose the amendment. However, I thought that this is information that ought to be brought to the attention of our colleagues in the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5234, the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987.

At the outset, I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the hard work and leadership of SID YATES and RALPH REGULA. Besides successfully tackling many difficult issues within their jurisdiction, each year the Interior Subcommittee is deluged with Member requests for millions of dollars to fund projects and programs all over the country.

This bill is responsive to most of these requests and to the requirements of the environmental management, cultural, and energy programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

H.R. 5234 is fiscally responsible and should be supported by this House. As the chairman pointed out, this bill is about $344 million below the 302(b) allocation for discretionary budget authority, and outlays in this bill are es-

timated to be $11 million less than the amount assumed in the budget resolution.

Unfortunately, the administration doesn't have the same, positive view about the funding levels in the bill. OMB claims that "the bill is $1.9 billion over the President's budget for discretionary authority," and their intentions are clear. The administration's statement promises that "the Director of the Office of Management and Budget will recommend a veto of the bill in its present form." I think the situation is more positive than this statement suggests.

I generally agree with the recommendations contained in this bill, but like all complicated pieces of legislation, there are a few provisions that make this bill less than perfect.

The bill includes language prohibiting the "executive branch" from "preparing or reviewing studies or drafting proposals" concerning the sale of the naval petroleum reserves. The administration is strongly opposed to this provision and, frankly, I can understand their position.

I agree with the subcommittee chairman on the issue involved here. It doesn't make sense to sell the reserves now when the price of oil is so low, but the President or any agency of the executive branch should be able to propose and justify such a plan.

After all, the administration has no authority to sell the reserves without the expressed approval of the Congress. And I'm sure that the Congress wants all of the facts supporting or rejecting a sale when and if one is considered.

In light of the budget resolution conference agreement, this provision and the recommended report language seem out of place. The report comments that no "funds should be expended for studies until Congress affirms that there is interest in proceeding to investigate the sale of these assets." I thought such interest was expressed before the recess when the Congress voted to approve the congressional budget resolution. The conference report clearly assumes "the sale of the naval petroleum reserves and that it will be completed by the close of fiscal year 1988."

In fact, the agreement recommends that the relevant committees "study the means and cost and benefits of achieving such a sale."

I hope that this amendment and the power marketing amendment do not start a trend designed to stifle budget proposals before we even have the facts. The OMB policy statement on this bill makes a good point on this issue: "the prohibition on studies is in effect a 'gag rule' that would prohibit the Congress from having any useful information regarding the possibility of a transfer of ownership." At this point, every option should be on the table.

In this policy paper, the administration also highlights several other legislative provisions that they view as limiting "executive authority" and overstepping "legislative functions." For the RECORD, I will submit the "statement of administration policy" on H.R. 5234.

Mr. Chairman, despite a few small reservations, I support this Interior appropriations bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote for final passage.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5234, INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1987—SPONSOR: YATES (D), ILLINOIS, JULY 29, 1986

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget will recommend a veto of the bill in its present form.

The bill is $1.9 billion over the President's Budget for discretionary programs. The major increases over the levels included in the President's Budget are for items that can be easily delayed (such as the Strategic Petroleum Reserve facilities construction and fill, and land acquisition) or are of a purely local, rather than national, interest (a variety of increases throughout the bill). The national importance of achieving the deficit reduction targets of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings vastly outweighs the marginal value of these increases.

Of particular concern to the Administration are:

The substantial increase of $478 million for the development and fill of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, along with a mandatory 85,000 barrel per day fill rate that would result in outlays of $820 million in FY 1987 and would negate the savings achieved by Congress in the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985.

Increases of 280 percent in Fossil energy research and development and 488 percent in Energy conservation, which would finance programs that are more properly the responsibility of the private sector and/or State governments.

Federal land acquisition—which should be limited to deficiency court awards and hardship cases given the current fiscal situation and the amount of land the Federal government already owns. Recreation land acquisition and development by States should be based on the States' priorities rather than the availability of Federal grants.

Moreover, the bill contains a number of provisions that would limit executive authority. The Administration strongly opposes section 316. This language is designed to repeal the President's authority to defer budget authority under section 1013 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended. The Administration is also strongly opposed to the requirement that structures on the OCS contain at least 50 percent U.S. materials. This protectionist provision would threaten a trade war with our allies and would drive up the cost of drilling on the OCS.

Other provisions in the bill overstep legislative functions (particularly those enunciated by the Supreme Court in *INS* v. *Chadha*) by requiring Congressional Committee approval of Executive Branch actions and impede the ability of the Executive Branch to manage properly and effectively its responsibilities. The most objectional provisions involve micromanagement instructions, exemptions from personnel ceilings, and prohibitions on studies and proposals for the sale of the Naval Petroleum Reserves. While we remain open to the discussion of specific issues and items of concern to Members and Committees of the Congress, we strongly oppose efforts to infringe upon the constitutional authority and legitimate policy and managerial functions of the Executive Branch.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1987
OBJECTIONABLE PROVISIONS

JULY 24, 1986.

I. FUNDING LEVELS

Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR). The Administration strongly opposes the Subcommittee action providing a total of $478 million—$147 million for the construction of additional SPR storage facilities and $331 million for crude oil acquisition—as well as language mandating a minimum average fill rate of 85,000 barrels per day until all funds are expended. This budget-busting action will result in outlays of about $820 million in 1987, negating the 3-year budget savings achieved by Congress in the Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985, which reduced the minimum fill rate requirement to 35,000 barrels per day.

The current SPR inventory of 503 million barrels is the equivalent of 118 days of protection against a complete cutoff of all oil imports, greater protection than the 90-day level envisioned when the SPR was created. In light of this situation, an acceleration of SPR fill is not only unwarranted, but it also could be more costly to the taxpayers in the long run, since the interest costs on Federal funds borrowed to finance near term SPR purchases will more than likely exceed future increases in oil prices.

Fossil Energy Research and Development. The Administration strongly objects to the appropriation of $314.5 million, an increase of 280 percent over the President's request. In light of current fiscal constraints, such increases are unwarranted, particularly the establishment of a separate new $400 million program for clean coal technology.

The Administration objects to bill language earmarking funds for Magnetohydrodynamics. The Administration also objects to report language earmarking $50.1 million for continuation of Waltz Mill, Wilsonville and LaPorte projects that have outlived their usefulness, and to the $19 million for phosphoric acid fuel cells, which are at a stage of development where the private sector is capable of supporting the final development stages itself.

The Administration believes that an adequate national fossil research and development program can be achieved at much lower cost to the taxpayers through greater private sector cost-sharing and cooperative research and development venture arrangements.

Energy Conservation. The Administration objects to the appropriation of $231.8 million for energy conservation, an increase of 488 percent over the President's request. The $61.5 million provided for State administrative costs associated with energy conservation grant programs is unwarranted in light of the $2 billion allocated to the states from the Exxon Case as well as the $750 million expected to become available from the Stripper Well settlement. The states should pay for their own administrative expenses, or use the Stripper Well funds for this purpose if they so choose.

The Administration also objects to bill language earmarking $10 million for an un-

defined new research facility at Tufts University and $2.5 million for steel research not limited to energy conservation. The Administration believes that much of research and development funding is for projects that should be a private sector responsibility entirely or should otherwise be subject to greater cost sharing or collaborative arrangements.

Indian Health. The Administration strongly opposes the appropriation of $836 million for Indian Health Services (IHS), an increase of $114 million over the President's 1987 budget request of $722 million. The Committee's mark ignores completely the cost savings that will result from on-going management improvements, such as changing the way the IHS pays for contract health service and more efficient collections from third parties.

The Administration strongly objects to attempts to micromanage IHS's congressionally and legally sanctioned efforts to allocate its resources fairly and efficiently. The requirement to submit a detailed report to Congress before implementing IHS's new allocation methodology in 1987 will only delay efforts to tie resource allocations to Indian health care needs.

The Administration objects to new construction funding for Indian Health Facilities (IHF) in 1987. The Congress has already deferred $14 million from the 1986 appropriations for IHF which, when added to the Committee's mark of $55 million, would make $69 million available for 1987.

In particular, the Administration opposes the $25 million proposed for sanitation hook-ups to individual Indian houses. These funds, if necessary, should be included with appropriations that fund Indian housing construction.

The Administration objects to incremental funding of construction projects. The Subcommittee's partial funding of the facilities excludes $77 million in additional cost to the taxpayer of completing these facilities over the next several years.

Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund. An increase of $42 million over the President's Budget request of $191 million is unwarranted. Large balances remain from prior year appropriations (over $500 million) to fund the same activities recommended to receive the increase.

Land Acquisition. The President's Budget proposed a total of $20.0 million for deficiency court awards and hardship acquisitions and further proposed that discretionary land acquisition be deferred through 1989. The increase of $113.4 million for discretionary land acquisition can be and should be deferred, given the current fiscal situation.

The Subcommittee has provided $47.7 million to continue making grants to States for recreation land acquisition and development. This should be left to the States to decide based on their own priorities.

National Park Service. The proposed increase of $47.6 million for park management conflicts with the important principle of funding enhanced National Park operations with increased recreation fees and thereby adds unnecessarily to the national deficit. The recommendations understates the actual appropriation by transferring $15.2 million of funds that were not otherwise intended to be expended.

The Administration opposes the appropriation of an additional $24.2 million for funding State Historic Preservation Offices and subsidizing the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Both the states and the National Trust should rely on their own funding and priorities.

The Committee has added $62.9 million to the proposed budget for park and fish and wildlife projects that can be easily deferred during this time of fiscal restraint.

Fish and Wildlife Service. The Administration opposes the unnecessary discretionary program increases of $21 million for Resource management. Included are additions for refuge maintenance ($9 million), refuge contaminants ($4.5 million), continued funding for fish hatcheries that are not fulfilling a Federal responsibility ($1 million), and endangered species ($6 million).

Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Administration opposes the net addition of $18.3 million to the request for Bureau of Indian Affairs operations, primarily for non-critical natural resources programs.

The Administration opposes the addition of $29.4 million for the Construction and Road construction accounts. The projects proposed for additional funding could be postponed without serious consequences. In particular, the $8.3 million increases for continued construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project should be withheld pending a showing of sustained profitability by the Navajo Agricultural Products Industry.

Forest Service. The Administration opposes the $33 million increase to restore State Forestry to the 1986 level. States are fully capable of assuming more program responsibility and funding.

The Administration also opposes major increases of $82 million for timber sales, road maintenance, and recreation management. Such major investments are not supportable given current, relatively low timber stumpage values and low recreation user fees.

National Endowment on the Arts and the Humanities. The Administration strongly opposes the appropriation of $329 million, $58 million above the President's Budget. Both the Institute of Museum Services and the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs program are continued despite the Administration's request for termination. The President's Budget contains adequate funding to support excellence in the arts and humanities; additional funding is unwarranted. The $3.5 million appropriated for 10 specific District of Columbia arts organizations is particularly inappropriate, since there are many sources of competitive grants available to fund their activities.

II. LANGUAGE PROVISIONS

Moratorium on Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Leasing. Section 107 excludes broad and specific areas of the OCS from the offshore leasing progam. Such a moratorium contradicts the statutory mandate of the OCS Lands Act to expedite exploration and production consistent with proper balancing of environmental and other concerns, and overrides the process of scientific studies and balancing analysis required by Sections 18 and 19 of the OCS Lands Act.

Buy American Provision. Section 115 would require that structures on the OCS contain at least 50 percent U.S. materials. The Administration is strongly opposed to this provision. It would seriously delay and increase the cost of oil production in the OCS; it also conflicts with the Administration policy of encouraging reliance on indigenous energy sources, and it is contrary to U.S. obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Sale of Naval Petroleum Reserves. The Administration strongly opposes Section 315, which prohibits the Executive Branch from preparing studies or drafting proposals for the sale of the Naval Petroleum Reserves (NPR's). This provision would undermine the Congress' ability to achieve the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction targets since the Congressional Budget Resolution assumes sale of the NPR's in 1988. Accomplishment of this goal requires studies to be conducted to assess the value of the Reserves, identify legal problems, prepare draft legislative proposals for consideration by Congress, etc. The prohibition on studies is in effect a "gag rule" that would prohibit the Congress from having any useful information regarding the possibility of a transfer of ownership.

Clean Coal Technology. The Administration objects to bill language requiring the Department of Energy to solicit statements of interest and information proposals from industry on retrofit clean coal technologies. This requirement is premature in light of ongoing Administration efforts in implementing a 3-year, $400 million Clean Coal Technology program. The Department is currently reviewing 51 clean coal project proposals, and will announce its selections for final negotiations on August 1. Final awards may not be completed until next year. It will be several years before the results of this initiative can be evaluated to determine what further Federal involvement in this area would be appropriate and effective.

Energy Information Administration. The Administration supports the conduct of a triennial manufacturing energy consumption survey, but opposes bill language mandating specific requirements for such a survey. The language would result in additional unnecessary and burdensome data collection requirements to industry that serve no useful public policy objective.

Employment Ceilings. Section 310 appears to exempt programs funded by this bill from employment ceilings. The Administration opposes this provision because it prevents effective and efficient management of Agency programs and promotes wasteful spending.

Navajo-Hopi Relocation Commission. The Administration objects to provisions limiting the ability of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission to contract for legal services. This unnecessarily restricts the commission's leeway in matching administrative resources to requirements.

General and administrative provisions in violation of Chadha. The Supreme Court ruled in 1983 (in *INS. v. Chadha*) that legislative vetoes of executive Branch actions taken pursuant to law are not permitted under the Constitution. Such vetoes include not only actions by one House, but also actions by Committees. Since 1983, we have identified many legislative vetoes included in appropriations acts and have proposed their deletion in the President's Budget. The Committee has not only failed to delete legislative vetoes proposed for deletion in the President's Budget, but has added the following new ones:

Legislative vetoes proposed for deletion:

Forest Service, Administrative provisions: The Committee prohibits the changing of regional boundaries and offices "without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in the United States Senate and the Committee on Agriculture in the United States House of Representatives."

The Committee prohibits the alteration of the Forest Service appropriation structure

"without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations."

The Committee prohibits the transfer of funds as authorized by "the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or 7 U.S.C. 147b unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report 97-942."

Section 309. The Committee restricts assessments to those "presented to the Committees on Appropriations and . . . approved by such committees."

New legislative vetoes:

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Operation of Indian programs: The Committee prohibits the use of appropriated funds to move the "Northern California agency office from Hoopa, California, unless a reprogramming request has been submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees."

Health Resources and Services Administration, Administrative provisions: The Committee prohibits the use of funds "to implement additional changes in resource allocation methodology until the proposed changes in detail for fiscal year 1987 and the long-range plans for such changes have been submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations."

Finally, the Committee's Reprogramming Procedures detailed in the accompanying report include several references to "approval" and "consent" by the Committee. While these procedures can be interpreted to be a "report and wait for time to elapse" procedure than a requirement for affirmative action by the Congress before proceeding with the reprogramming, the ambiguity should be removed by deleting such approval language.

Deferral provisions: The Administration strongly opposes section 316. This language is designed to repeal the president's authority to defer budget authority under section 1013 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the hard work and the leadership of that great American, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SID YATES, and of my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. RALPH REGULA.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I do want to acknowledge the good work of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that he, perhaps more than any other Member of the House, has been responsible for cleaning up the Connecticut River so that the people of New England may now see the rock; they are swimming from one end of the stream to the other.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for all his assistance, I would like to inform him that the first Atlantic salmon has gone through all the fish ladders on the Connecticut River and was spotted in Vermont this week. That annual migration goes back to the time of the Indians. That is the first salmon since the time of the Indians that has entered the waters of the Connecticut in Vermont, and I cannot tell you how thrilled I was; it was just like when my wife had her first child.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts because he has been one of the great leaders in conservation of wildlife. And we, in the Pacific Northwest, are glad that finally there are going to be real runs of salmon that the gentleman can pursue in the Atlantic and Eastern States, because he is known in the West for his great talent as a fisherman in the State of Washington and the State of Alaska.

□ 1645

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, because of the gentleman's talents as a fisherman, I was surprised he let that fish swim the distance he just described.

Mr. CONTE. Well, because the salmon are going to spawn upstream and it will bring hundreds and maybe thousands of Atlantic salmon up that stream in another 4 or 5 years.

I would recommend that everybody read the RECORD tomorrow, because there are some sterling words in my prepared statement.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we do not want to leave the Midwest out, and the Coho salmon has returned to Lake Erie, and I invite the gentleman to come and wet a line.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman very much. I will do that.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDSON: Page 62, line 20, strike out "$22,335,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,289,000".

Page 63, after line 3, insert the following: *Provided further,* That of the funds provided under this head, not less than $492,000 shall be used for pre- and post-move counselling:".

Page 63, strike out the period on line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided further,* That of the funds provided under this head, not to exceed $410,000 shall be used for personnel compensation and benefits of the Office of Policy and Direction of the Commission.".

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, I am offering this amendment to H.R. 5234, the Interior appropriations bill because I am very concerned about the Navajo-Hopi relocation. My amendment would decrease the appropriation for the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Commission by $46,000. The amendment also caps the amount of funds for personnel compensation and benefits of the Relocation Commission's Office of Policy and Direction—as defined on page 18 of the fiscal year 1987 congressional budget submission—at $410,000. This ceiling amounts to a cut of 10 percent and equals $46,000. This provision ensures that the cut in the budget of the Relocation Commission will be taken out of the fat at the top which the Relocation Commission has been abusing. It will not have an adverse impact on the relocates themselves. This amendment has the support of Peterson Zah, chairman of the Navajo Nation.

My amendment also earmarks $492,000 of the Commission's budget for pre- and post-relocation counselling. A frequent complaint is that the relocates have not been adequately counseled as to what to expect from relocation, and how to adjust to it. Relocation is a serious and dramatic life-changing event. The Commission should fulfill its obligation to ensure that relocation should be carried out as humanely as possible.

As those who have followed the saga of the Navajo-Hopi relocation are aware, there are some very serious problems and questions surrounding the entire relocation endeavor. This relocation issue has devastated the lives of many people—both Navajos and Hopis. It has also spawned a strata of bureaucrats and consultants who are feeding off the Federal funds which Congress appropriates to provide the essential and vital provision of services to the relocates.

My amendment would deduct $46,000 from the total appropriation of $22,335,000 for the Relocation Commission. The inspector general recently completed an audit, dated July 17, 1986, on the program and administrative activities of the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Commission. The audit found, among other things, that the Commission had not consistently followed procurement regulations when acquiring goods and services. I quote from the IG's report, (page 21) "contracts were

awarded without proper price competition or adherence to statutory profit limitations. In two instances, contracts were awarded for unallowable services or with unspecific work statements. In another instance a contract was awarded with an illegal payment provision. In addition, the Commission had not always: First, monitored billings to assure that vendor payments were appropriate; or second, followed the procedures prescribed for the sale or trade of automatic data processing equipment."

In the case of at least one vendor, competitive procurement procedures were not followed, but rather the vendor was selected on the basis of a prior professional relationship with the Commission's former Executive Director. Neither party to this contract complied with contract provisions requiring all work to be based on written instructions from the Executive Director. Consequently, there was no official record of the actual and specfic services required of the vendor. This case is just one example of the flagrant abuses the inspector general found. There are many more.

This audit also found that internal controls over personal property were almost nonexistent, as the Commission had not established a system and procedures for managing its Government-owned personal property. As a result of this failure, there has been misuse and loss of Government property. Because of the lack of inventory records and documentation, the IG was unable to determine the full effect of the deficiencies. They did find, however, that office equipment was in the possession of former contractors and the former Executive Director.

The audit found, too, that the Commission had essentially no control over the fleet of 16 leased vehicles, resulting in unauthorized use of these vehicles, and apparent vehicles misuse and higher costs to the Government. I could go on and on listing abuses and irregularities found by the inspector general.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the Interior Committee held an oversight hearing on the Navajo-Hopi relocation. Testifying at this hearing were Ross Swimmer, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs and the three Relocation Commissioners. When questioned about the reported expenditure of close to $400,000 by the Commission for lobbying, Mr. Watkins, the head of the Commission told me that the money was not spent for lobbying, but for legal advice, public information and public education. Technically, this is not lobbying, but it sure sounds like it to me—What on Earth are we doing spending Federal dollars on being lobbied for more money? I understand that the inspector general is also looking into the use or misuse of funds.

I have grave misgivings about the consequences of the entire relocation process—I believe, however, that the Congress must continue to provide benefits to those people who have voluntarily relocated. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard and capable work of you and your staff on this interior appropriations bill—you have done a notable job of addressing the complexities of this particular situation. You have, for example, provided that no Relocation Commisson funds can be used to contract for the services of anyone who is a registered lobbyist. You have also clearly stated that no Federal money can be used to forcibly evict any Navajos still resident on the Hopi-partitioned lands. These provisions are important.

I feel strongly, however, that more should be done. We have a very real responsibility to the relocatees, the unfortunate people who got stuck in the middle of this tragedy. My amendment is carefully constructed to have no adverse effect on them. We also have a very real responsibility to the Federal taxpayer to ensure that Federal entities work with maximum efficiency, no mismanagement and no suspicious use of funds. That is why I am offering this amendment today. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, we have had a chance to observe and review the gentleman's amendment. We have no objection to the amendment on this side.

I would just like to make clear for purposes of the record and legislative intent that the Office of Policy and Direction that the gentleman refers to appears upon page 18 of the Justification filed by the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission with the Committee on Appropriations when it presented its case for its 1987 appropriations.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to contest or oppose the amendment. I go along with it, but I think we ought to be pretty clear that this is not going to resolve all our problems.

The Commission has had some difficulties. What we really need now is a massive housing program so we can get these people relocated. I do not think they can necessarily do it with less money, less expertise and less staff, but I am not going to contest it. I think the Commission has at times acted inefficiently and maybe this will alert them and save some money and effort in the long haul.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. It is the understanding of the Committee that the Commission will not be hurt unduly by this reduction and that certainly the housing program will not be hurt in any respect.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Illinois is correct. The amendment simply removes some of the fat from some of the top administrative staff and the Commissioners. It does not deal with funds for relocation and housing.

The amendment also earmarks $492,000 for postrelocation counseling.

I think as Chairman UDALL has pointed out, there have been some abuses by the Commission staff. It has not performed efficiently.

I will submit for the RECORD a summary of the report of the inspector general.

I think it is a message to the Commission that they have got to clean up their act; but once again, I think Chairman UDALL is correct. This is a solution that needs a tremendous amount of thinking. It may be an unresolvable problem, but if there are two people who have contributed positively to trying to reach a solution, it is the chairman of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: On page 43, beginning on line 13, delete the phrase "or any other" and on page 43, line 18, after the phrase "(CV-F-81-245-EDP)" insert a period (".") and delete the remainder of the section.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is necessary to stop a grievous wrong from being committed against America's farmers and America's taxpayers—a wrong which will cost the taxpayers and the power consumers of this Nation hundreds of millions of dollars, and make a mockery of the Federal reclamation law.

The Westlands Water District in California—the largest and perhaps

wealthiest Federal irrigation district in the country—has been engaged in lawsuits with three Secretaries of the Interior under two different administrations.

Westlands is demanding more land than allowed by Congress; more water than permitted by its contract; at subsidies which flagrantly violate the reclamation law.

And they want to pass the bill to the power users and the taxpayers of this country.

Last year, we learned of secret negotiations by the Secretary of the Interior to settle this suit by abandoning positions held by the Government for many years. Congress prohibited the Secretary from finalizing any settlement with Westlands until we had 30 days to review it.

Last week, the Secretary announced his settlement, or should I say, his "capitulation," as it was so accurately characterized by the San Francisco Chronicle.

This settlement would:

Expand the size of the Westlands District by 160,000 acres—nearly one-third more acreage than authorized by Congress in 1960;

Grant Westlands an additional 350,000 acre-feet of high-quality irrigation water, without addressing the existing contamination crisis in the Central Valley resulting from current levels of drainage from Westlands;

Circumvent Federal reclamation law, which requires that existing subsides be eliminated whenever a district receives additional benefits—a concession that will cost taxpayers nearly $200 million; and

Shift repayment obligations for the future drainage system—which could cost $1 billion—from the Westlands beneficiaries to public power users and taxpayers.

These project expansions, these waivers of reclamation law, these shifting of repayment obligations, all would be achieved with no action by the Congress whatever.

Let me be very clear: Westlands is not composed of "family farmers." Westlands farmers are not small, are not families, and are not marginal operations.

Figures just released by the Department of Agriculture show that millions of dollars in crop support benefits are flowing to Westlands. In fact, the top recipient of subsidies under the new farm law, according to USDA, is J.G. Boswell, a Westlands grower who will receive $20 million in subsidies alone.

It is also worth noting that according to a soon-to-be-released report by the Institute for Rural Studies, the average size Westlands farm is in excess of 1,700 acres—four times the size of the average farm operation in California.

At a time when millions of impoverished family farmers in the South and Midwest are watching their best land dry up and blow away, Mr. Hodel's capitulation lavishes hundreds of millions of dollars on some of the most heavily subsidized corporate farmers in the United States.

At a time when millions of poor and middle-income Americans are being told that we must reduce Government programs—no matter how painful—Mr. Hodel's capitulation grants still more subsidies to wealthy Westlands growers and waives the reclamation law, which Congress enacted to get back some of those unjustified benefits.

At a time when irrigation drainage water, contaminated with toxic selenium from Westlands' farms, is jeopardizing the future of agriculture and wildlife in the Central Valley, Mr. Hodel's capitulation signs over another 350,000 acre-feet of subsidized water to Westlands—and shifts the billion-dollar cleanup bill to others.

Mr. Chairman, we don't need 30 days to review this proposal. It is no settlement. Westlands' own attorneys could hardly have been more generous to this special interest district.

It is a raid on the treasury, an inside job, negotiated and approved by men whose long lines of influence stretch between Westlands and the White House—and back again.

Section 115 of this legislation was drafted prior to the submission of the settlement to Congress. It would extend the oversight we included in last year's continuing resolution by granting us another 30 legislative days of oversight.

But now, oversight is not what is needed. Disapproval is.

My amendment, therefore, would modify section 115 so as to prohibit the Secretary from submitting his sell-out agreement to the court.

Let me stress that there are alternatives to this settlement available. In fact, I have already introduced legislation that will resolve many of the issues involved in this litigation—but without capitulating to Westlands, without foisting hundreds of millions of dollars in costs on power users and the taxpayers, and without allowing unelected bureaucrats to rewrite laws of the United States in the backroom.

Let the House send a forceful message to Secretary Hodel today. By passing this amendment, we will disavow his capitulation to Westlands, and express in the strongest possible terms our opposition to his proceeding further with it.

At the same time, let me assure my colleagues that, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, I am fully prepared to move forward with a legislative solution that will address each of the issues in the Westlands dispute in a manner which is fair and responsible to the taxpayers of this county.

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 28, 1986]

A SETTLEMENT THAT'S ALL WET

For two decades the 650,000-acre Westlands Water District in the San Joaquin Valley has battled to maintain its envied and lucrative position as one of the most heavily subsidized agencies ever organized under federal reclamation law. Today it appears that Westlands has won just about everything that it fought for. In the end the U.S. Interior Department, representing the people of the United States, gave in with hardly a whimper.

Thus for 22 more years Westlands will receive an assured annual supply of 900,000 acre-feet of irrigation water from the federal Central Valley Project (more than the City of Los Angeles uses in a year) at the bargain rate of $8 an acre-foot—about 4% of urban water costs in Southern California. The Fresno-based district will receive 250,000 to 350,000 more acre-feet at a higher price, $16.40 an acre-foot, but still far below cost.

Westlands can use its water on 156,000 acres of land that Interior contended in the past was never made a legal part of the water district and therefore was not entitled to receive water from the federal project.

The water will continue to irrigate massive acreages of surplus crops for which there are no markets and that are propped up by the runaway federal price-support program. And the used irrigation water that runs off the fields will add to the long-range San Joaquin Valley pollution problem that no one knows how to solve.

By agreeing to an out-of-court settlement of Westlands' lawsuit against the Interior Department, Interior has let slip by an opportunity to advance the long struggle to reform the 1902 Reclamation Act and to enforce the spirit of modest reclamation reforms achieved by Congress in 1982. At all costs, Westlands wanted to avoid having to negotiate a new contract for all its water and therefore face more realistic prices demanded by the 1982 reform. This fact alone makes Westlands the big winner.

The Interior Department contends that the government does better, economically, by nearly $50 million over the life of the contract than it would have done under the most adverse possible ruling of the court. If that is so, why would Westlands settle rather than pursue its case?

The suit was initiated by Westlands in 1981, when then-Secretary of Interior James G. Watt threatened to cut off Westlands' water unless the district agreed to pay the full cost of its federal water and to finance the entire burden of its waste-water drainage system. The key to Watt's argument was a 1978 opinion by the Interior Department's top lawyer, Leo Krulitz. It challenged the legality of many features of the Westlands project, including the use of water on land never formally made a part of the district. How did Interior get around this legal bottleneck in reaching Thursday's settlement? Easy. The current solicitor, Ralph Tarr of Fresno, merely ruled that key parts of the Krulitz opinion were wrong.

Congress has 30 days to review the settlement, but cannot veto it. But there is ample time for protests to be lodged with the federal court in Fresno, which can. Rejection of the settlement clearly is in the public interest.

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1986]

CARRYING WATER

Interior Secretary Donald Hodel has now reversed a position that not even James Watt would disturb. He has agreed to settle a longstanding dispute with one of the largest federal water users in the West—Westlands, a reclamation district that includes some of the leading corporate farmers in central California. Westlands was long ago given the right to buy 900,000 acre-feet of federal water a year at a low price to irrigate some 500,000 acres. It then expanded, and claimed the right to buy at the same price about a third more water for a third more land. The department resisted, and in the 1982 Reclamation Reform Act, which Westlands helped inspire, Congress said that in all future water contracts and all future renegotiations of old contracts, prices should be higher. Meanwhile, Westlands had taken the department to court.

Essentially Mr. Hodel has agreed to let Westlands have all the water it wants, paying the old price for three-fourths and a higher price only for the rest. He has also left open a second point of contention with the district: how to dispose of the excess water that comes off the fields, and who should pay for that. The department had earlier insisted that Westlands pay for a drain. One had been built to take water to a nearby wildlife refuge; now it turns out that the water involved, because of chemicals picked up in the irrigation process, is poison. Any new solution will be costly; some estimates are over half a billion dollars. Westlands for now is required only to put $5 million a year in a trust fund toward its share.

The thrust of the 1982 law was to ensure that in the future users of federal water would pay more, in part for reasons of fairness, in part to help conserve a scarce resource. A lot of federal water goes to large commercial users who do not need or deserve the subsidy they get. Among agricultural users particularly, a lot of water is also wasted: The theory was that a higher price would bring them to economize. In the Westlands case, there is now the added drainage problem.

Mr. Hodel, in the settlement to which he has agreed in this heavily lobbied affair, says he has advanced the public interest; that he has saved years of litigation while upholding the 1982 law; that he has won a higher price for part of the water and moved closer to a settlement of the drainage issue. He points out as well that the Westlands growers had come with some cause to rely on the federal water. But our sense is that he has not aggressively championed the federal interests in this case. Westlands has cause to be happy; it will get its water, and still at a favorable price. The complex lawsuit will be settled; the secretary gives great thanks for that. But the underlying issues of waste and poison and fairness will remain.

[From the Oakland Tribune, July 29, 1986]

TURNING ON THE TAP FOR WESTLANDS

Where is James Watt now that we need him?

Hardly anyone today misses the former Interior Secretary, whose mission in office consisted of trying to drive a bulldozer through the nation's environment.

But in retrospect he had one bright spot on his record: a willingness to challenge the validity of low-priced contracts for subsidized federal water held by the Westlands Water District in the San Joaquin Valley.

Where Watt charged forward in court, his successor Donald Hodel has surrendered abjectly. Unless some Federal judge blocks his settlement with Westlands, the district will continue receiving cheap water until its original, disputed contract runs out in 2007.

What makes Westlands such a *cause celebre* is the pattern of enormous land holdings by such giant corporate interests as Southern Pacific Co., owner of 80,000 acres in the district. Like other beneficiaries of the federal Central Valley Project, Westlands farmers pay only a small fraction of what their water costs the government.

Most of the large owners in Westlands must eventually sell the bulk of their land. But under the new settlement with Interior announced Thursday, they can continue buying dirt-cheap water to irrigate holdings of any size they lease for farming.

The source of the legal dispute goes back to the mid-1960's when Westlands merged with a neighboring district and, in agreement with the Interior Department, added 156,000 acres to its irrigated area that Congress never explicitly authorized.

At least that was the conclusion reached by a special task force authorized by Congress in 1977, backed up by a 1978 opinion of Interior's solicitor, Leo Krlitz, and accepted by his successor under Watt. Watt threatened to dry up the disputed acreage unless Westlands renegotiated its contract.

That demand was vigorously challenged by farmers who brought suit. The "whole purpose" of the task force was "political," charges Westlands' spokesman Don Upton. "It was loaded by the critics. It came up with the recommendations you would expect."

Now Hodel has accepted Westlands' case nearly in full.

His deal to reinstate the old contract terms and irrigate all the disputed lands particularly galls Rep. George Miller. Martinez, who sponsored the 1982 Reclamation Reform Act to correct some of the distortions in federal irrigation policy.

Miller's act required farmers in districts that revised their contracts or acquired new benefits to pay at least the full operations and maintenance cost of their facilities.

Surely that provision should apply to Westlands, which will receive 250,000 acre-feet in water it arguably was never entitled to, and which is slated to receive another 100,000 acre-feet that everyone agrees will be a new benefit. Instead Interior intends to apply the 1982 act only to that portion of Westlands which directly reaps new benefits a clear end-run around the law.

At $7.50 an acre-foot, the contract price of most Westlands water doesn't even cover the government's operating cost ($9 an acre-foot), much less the full cost of building the project in the first place ($97 an acre-foot, counting capital, interest and power).

The 1982 act, a careful compromise with farm groups, recognized that old contracts, however imprudent, couldn't be tossed aside even for the best of reasons. But the Westlands case supplied a perfect chance to bring the act's reforms to bear. By settling for so little, Interior submerged those reforms and plowed under the clear mandate of Congress.

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 31, 1986]

CARRYING WATER FOR WESTLANDS

Interior Secretary Donald Hodel could have done a lot better by the American public. In the settlement he's proposed of his department's 10-year-long dispute with the Westlands Water District, Hodel did come out with some money for the public treasury, and he did finally put an end to a nasty piece of litigation that the government wasn't certain of winning. But he should have done more.

Westlands is not just another irrigation district. It serves some of the wealthiest landowners in the nation, whose access to cheap, publicly subsidized water helped convince Congress to pass the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982, which should eventually reduce water subsidies for large landowners. Westlands is also the district whose drainage poisoned the Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge—creating not only a huge cleanup bill there, but also a need for new drainage facilities, at a price tag of perhaps half a billion dollars.

Under the circumstances, Hodel should have won more. He guaranteed a water supply for the disputed part of the district, for which Westlands will pay full cost-of-service prices. But for the bulk of Westlands' water, Hodel agreed to continue charging the old contract price of $7.50 per acre-foot from now until the year 2007. That's less than half the cost of serving the district (currently $16.40) and nowhere near the full cost of the water (last estimated at $42).

And Hodel should have held out for more insurance that Westlands itself would pay for its new drainage and old cleanup problems, rather than settling for the $100 million fund Westlands agreed to create over 20 years as a down payment on new facilities.

In fact, Hodel ended up with even less than he thinks he bargained for. Although no one knows how much the solution to Westlands' drainage problems will cost, Hodel made no provision for most Westlands water users to start paying before 2007 for any extra expenses their current low rates won't cover. He simply assumed the bills would get paid, because he expects that next year 70 percent of Westlands landowners will be brought under the umbrella of the Reclamation Reform Act—forcing them to pay $16.40 an acre-foot with annual adjustments to cover any additional service expenses. But that is far from certain. The part of the Reform Act that forces that changeover is currently under litigation, which could mean years of delay, if indeed it ever happens. And even if there were no such complication, Hodel's department hasn't even begun the lengthy studies necessary before that part of the Reform Act can be implemented. Counting on the changeover to pay the bills is a gamble, not an assurance.

Meanwhile, Hodel conceded on the key—if seemingly legalistic—point of defining any new drainage system that's built for Westlands as a "main project feature." Main project features, by law, are the responsibility of everyone who buys federal water or power in California. In fact, if at some point Westlands is found by the Interior secretary to be unable to fully pay for its new drain, power users (like SMUD customers) would be required by law to pay the costs Westlands can't handle.

Interior officials say that would never happen. They say Westlands has the ability to pay, and besides, when Congress authorizes the money to build new drainage facilities, it can write in whatever protections it chooses against other water and power users having to foot the bill. Perhaps. But not knowing either the cost of the new facilities or how much Westlands land might be forced out of production in the meantime because of drainage problems, the district's

ability to pay can hardly be guaranteed. Nor will Congress necessarily be able to save the day. Once there's a court-approved settlement calling the new facilities a "main project features," it would be extremely difficult for Congress to do anything to change that definition.

Perhaps there was no way for Hodel to finally settle all the outstanding drainage issues in this proposed agreement; but if so, it was a serious mistake for him to permit loopholes in the settlement, like the "main project" definition, which create the potential to stick SMUD and other federal power users with a large part of Westlands' bills. Nor was it necessary to issue a department solicitor's opinion that essentially conceded every point in the Westlands litigation before the proposed settlement has even been judicially approved. That left the Interior Department with no leg to stand on should the settlement have to be renegotiated or should it fall through. Nor was it necessary to concede to Westlands both the means to evade future price increases and a current contract price so low that it already doesn't come near to covering the public's cost of serving Westlands. It's not a good deal.

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

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

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

I would particularly like to congratulate the gentleman on initiating this battle last year. I was pleased to join with the gentleman from California last year. The gentleman was successful at that time and I was happy to join with him in providing that this settlement would be required to come back before the Congress before it became law.

The gentleman's concerns were well taken at that time. The evidence is clear that the fears that we had at that time that additional costs could easily be shifted to other water and power users in California have been borne out.

I want to share in the anguish that I know the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] feels at this time.

It is very possible that the 400,000 acres of Westlands land that will need drainage as a result of the selenium problem will not be drainable within the financial resources of the farmers and the growers in that area. That means that under this agreement that those costs can easily be shifted to other water users, other irrigators, other reclamation districts, and certainly to other power users who benefit from Central Valley Power.

My constituents are particularly vulnerable to those additional costs.

This is not an antireclamation law effort. This is an effort for fairness and equal treatment among all the beneficiaries of the Central Valley project and reclamation law across the board.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in strong support of this effort by the gentleman from California. I thank him very much for his help and for his remarks.

This proposed settlement between Westlands and the Department of the Interior deals with extremely complicated issues in their own right. The settlement is made even more dificult by being linked with other existing laws which are obscure even if not disputed, existing law which is either disputed or subject to future interpretations, and estimations of what Congress might not do in the future to implement the agreement.

However, even if one accepts all the premises and hypotheses the Bureau of Reclamation uses, the agreement leaves distinct possibilities that other water users in California's Central Valley project, or the power customers of that project, or Federal power customers in general, or the U.S. taxpayers will fall heir to hundreds of millions of dollars worth of debt in order to finance facilities that will benefit Westlands alone.

The main problems with the Westlands settlement are three:

First, other water users in California, or power customers in California, or U.S. taxpayers in general, could end up paying hundreds of millions of dollars to construct facilities to solve the selenium drainage problem for up to 400,000 Westlands acres in the San Joaquin Valley. This is because the agreement unnecessarily redefines the drainage facilities, making them no longer the exclusive responsibility of the benefiting district, which drainage costs usually are, and instead calls them general features of the Central Valley project. This new status makes the facilities subject to subsidy by electrical ratepayers and to the extent that payment falls short, the general Federal indebtedness.

The reasons the Bureau of Reclamation offers for agreeing to the transfer of repayment obligation are legal concessions the Bureau did not have to make. Not only are the concessions harmful in this context, they will harm the Bureau's and the Congress' position in the future when we try to avoid having excess drainage costs sloughed off onto nonbeneficiaries.

Second, the agreement does bless additional water consumption, 100,000 acre-feet, by certain areas within the Westlands Water District even though other water users in California must still wait in line to establish their needs and plead their case for a priority.

Third, it appears to give Westlands special treatment under the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982, by allowing creation of special districts to sign side-contracts for additional water without requiring that the main Westlands contract be reopened to recover a greater share of the Federal contribution.

The key issue for our colleagues not from California's Central Valley is the first, the change in status of Westland's drainage facilities. I will focus on it in this statement.

Salenium and general drainage in the San Joaquin Valley could add up to a problem costing many hundreds of millions of dollars. For example, the agreement establishes that drainage plans for Westlands should contemplate waste flows as high as 100,000 acre-feet per year. The current celebrated problem at the Kesterson Reservoir involves flows of only 8,000 acre-feet.

Previous interpretations of law, rendered by then Interior Solicitor Krulitz in 1978, would assign all these costs to Westlands. Presumably, if Westlands does not think the facilities worth the cost the facilities would not be built and would never be a burden to anyone else.

However, this agreement makes legal concessions which turn this sensible situation on its head. It adopts as one of its main premises—and asks the judge to bless, incidentally—a reversal of the Krulitz opinion by current Solicitor Tarr, who has issued a new opinion stating that Westlands' drainage facilities are a responsibility of the entire Central Valley project.

The Bureau maintains that it has no choice but to accept reversal of Krulitz, an opinion which former Secretary James Watt did not share. It says Krulitz was simply wrong, and that Tarr is right. Other critics disagree; they do not feel Tarr is particularly pursuasive. In any event, the implications of the Tarr opinion are so strongly unfavorable to the taxpayer and CVP position that the Bureau should never have simply conceded the matter. The advantages of a settlement with Westlands are simply not worth it. The issue should have been litigated to the end. Certainly, the agreement with Westlands should not have been allowed to specifically ratify the findings that Tarr makes. This ratification means that in the future not only will Westlands be able to point to Tarr itself, but also to the court which blesses Tarr.

The only utility for including the Tarr findings in this settlement, and for dwelling on them so heavily, is to serve what must be Westland's prime objective in this settlement: The eventual passing of the financial responsibility for the selenium problem on to others, however much it might cost.

The Bureau seeks to reassure us for the "loss" of our Krulitz position by asserting that other barriers remain between the general project with its backers, the taxpayers, on the one hand, and the costs for Westlands drainage problem on the other.

First, it argues that traditional repayment policy has been that in this particular case, costs for drainage are assignable to Westlands and the two other, lesser districts, which would benefit from this drainage service. But this is only a policy, subject to reversal without congressional approval by the Secretary and thus nowhere near as firm a protection as we thought we had before the statutes were so thoroughly reinterpreted. Further, by saying that the drainage facilities should be "project facilities," has the Bureau not conceded one of the bulwarks of the beneficiaries-shall-pay-in-this-case policy?

Second, the Bureau maintains that if it does not like the eventual cost and benefits of resolving the Westlands' drainage problem, it need not proceed to construct the facilities. However, Westlands contends—has always contended—just the opposite. It reiterates that claim in this settlement, thereby refreshing it. The court, by accepting the agreement, at least would be validating the notion that Westlands' position is arguable.

It is true that this agreement gets Westlands to pay something for the drainage facilities. But that would have been a condition in any event and can hardly be called a satisfactory counterconcession on Westlands' part. Further, Westlands would have to pay for nothing more than what might be defined as its "ability to pay." Therefore, it will argue that given the overriding Federal responsibility to provide drainage, the Federal Government must pick up the balance above ability to pay, regardless of how large that balance is.

The issue of ultimate responsibility will be decided by a future court. The decision might go against the Federal interest. If it does, we would have had Krulitz as an additional protection. Now, if this settlement goes through without Tarr versus Krulitz being litigated, we will have lost an important alternative protection.

The Bureau will assure us there is still a third barrier between the taxpayer and the eventual cost for these facilities: the Congress itself. It maintains that any new drainage facilities would have to come back to Congress for authorization first.

This may not be the case. Assume it is. However, Congress' position is compromised by this settlement. Once the Bureau has conceded that the Westlands drainage costs are general features of the Central Valley project, when Congress considers the authorization several years from now will it not be much harder for Congress to assign all the costs for what is designated a general project feature to one water district?

Yes, it will be harder. We will have an additional argument to make: treat these project facilities differently. Whereas project facilities are usually general obligations, make this set of facilities specifically repayable by the immediate beneficiaries. One can hear Westland's argument now: don't discriminate against us. Treat us like normal projectwide facilities.

The Bureau has given a major political concession to Westlands by changing the definitions. It is redefining normalcy. Normally, drainage is a district-specific obligation, throughout the 17 Bureau of Reclamation States. Water service is provided by general project contracts; drainage is provided by district specific contracts.

But, because the Bureau has turned normalcy around, when Westlands argues in future years that is heavy drainage expenses should "remain" general project costs, it will have the "treat us normally" argument on its side. We will be the ones working against the established definition of who should get what.

The Bureau is thus setting the ground for any future debate in Congress to make it harder for those who believe that Westlands should pay entirely for its own drainage problems.

In return for the major concession of the Krulitz position, the Bureau got only a promise from Westlands that it will pay 35 percent of its capital costs upfront and will make ability to pay contributions thereafter. This is a minor concession: the $100 million to be paid upfront would merely amount to the contemporary value of the debt it would otherwise have had to exclusively repay. The ability to pay limit leaves unattributed excess costs which Westland maintains are the CVP's and the project's responsibilities.

The amendment before us would give the Congress an opportunity to examine this settlement more closely, and perhaps to legislate a fair solution. It is important that the Congress require modifications in it, to preserve its own position and to protect the Treasury.

[From the Sacramento Bee, July 31, 1986]

CARRYING WATER FOR WESTLANDS

Interior Secretary Donald Hodel could have done a lot better by the American public. In the settlement he's proposed of his department's 10-year-long dispute with the Westlands Water District, Hodel did come out with some money for the public treasury, and he did finally put an end to a nasty piece of litigation that the government wasn't certain of winning. But he should have done more.

Westlands is not just another irrigation district. It serves some of the wealthiest landowners in the nation, whose access to cheap, publicly subsidized water helped convince Congress to pass the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982, which should eventually reduce water subsidies for large landowners. Westlands is also the district whose drainage poisoned the Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge—creating not only a huge cleanup bill there, but also a need for new drainage facilities, at a price tag of perhaps half a billion dollars.

Under the circumstances, Hodel should have won more. He guaranteed a water supply for the disputed part of the district, for which Westlands will pay full cost-of-service prices. But for the bulk of Westlands' water, Hodel agreed to continue charging the old contract price of $7.50 per acre-foot from now until the year 2007. That's less than half the cost of serving the district (currently $16.40) and nowhere near the full cost of the water (last estimated at $42).

And Hodel should have held out for more insurance that Westlands itself would pay for its new drainage and old cleanup problems, rather than settling for the $100 million fund Westlands agreed to create over 20 years as a down payment on new facilities.

In fact, Hodel ended up with even less than he thinks he bargained for. Although no one knows how much the solution to Westlands' drainage problems will cost, Hodel made no provision for most Westlands water users to start paying before 2007 for any extra expenses their current low rates won't cover. He simply assumed the bills would get paid, because he expects that next year 70 percent of Westlands landowners will be brought under the umbrella of the Reclamation Reform Act—forcing them to pay $16.40 an acre-foot with annual adjustments to cover any additional service expenses. But that is far from certain. The part of the Reform Act that forces that changeover is currently under litigation, which could mean years of delay, if indeed it ever happens. And even if there were no such complication, Hodel's department hasn't even begun the lengthy studies necessary before that part of the Reform Act can be implemented. Counting on the change over to pay the bills is a gamble, not an assurance.

Meanwhile, Hodel conceded on the key—if seemingly legalistic—point of defining any new drainage system that's built for Westlands as a "main project feature." Main project features, by law, are the responsibility of everyone who buys federal water or power in California. In fact, if at some point Westlands is found by the Interior secretary to be unable to fully pay for its new drain, power users (like SMUD customers) would be required by law to pay the costs Westlands can't handle.

Interior officials say that would never happen. They say Westlands has the ability to pay, and besides, when Congress authorizes the money to build new drainage facilities, it can write in whatever protections it chooses against other water and power users having to foot the bill. Perhaps. But not knowing either the cost of the new facilities or how much Westlands land might be forced out of production in the meantime because of drainage problems, the district's ability to pay can hardly be guaranteed. Nor will Congress necessarily be able to save the day. Once there's a court-approved settlement calling the new facilities a "main project feature," it would be extremely difficult for Congress to do anything to change that definition.

Perhaps there was no way for Hodel to finally settle all the outstanding drainage issues in this proposed agreement; but if so, it was a serious mistake for him to permit loopholes in the settlement, like the "main project" definition, which create the potential to stick SMUD and other federal power users with a large part of Westlands' bills. Nor was it necessary to issue a department solicitor's opinion that essentially conceded every point in the Westlands litigation

before the proposed settlement has even been judicially approved. That left the Interior Department with no leg to stand on should the settlement have to be renegotiated or should it fall through. Nor was it necessary to concede to Westlands both the means to evade future increases and a current contract price so low that it already doesn't come near to covering the public's cost of serving Westlands. It's not a good deal.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California. I rise in support of his amendment.

There is no reason that Westlands should not have to renegotiate its water contract as required by law, now that its district has been expanded.

Mr. Chairman, we are facing a deficit deadline. We have the August 15 snapshot. We must pass a reconciliation bill or there will be enormously painful across-the-board cuts.

Our job is to pick and choose between programs that are worthy and those that are less worthy. It seems to me that this program is at the bottom of the list.

Why should we hand over $1 billion worth of subsidies to the Westlands Water District?

There is no reason that Westlands should not have to pay market rates for the water it receives, as do the urban users. There is no reason that wealthy growers, like the Southern Pacific Corp., should receive this kind of subsidy to grow additional crops when we are facing surpluses in all kinds of commodities.

There is every reason that we should support the amendment and ensure a better deal for the taxpayers, other water users, and the environment.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PASHAYAN].

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Chairman, let me take issue with some of the remarks made by my colleague and good friend from the northern part of the State.

The area the gentleman talks about is indeed populated with family farmers. Some of them, like many farmers across the country, have incorporated under State laws, but the farms are operated and run by families, and the gentleman fully well knows that.

Second, I should like to say that the Secretary of the Interior did not "capitulate" and certainly did not "capitulate" with the flavor and the shading that the gentleman implies by the tone of his voice and by his remarks.

This has been a longstanding and bitter legal dispute. There are legal issues on both sides. The parties came together, as they do in many situations. They made an arm's length settlement and I do not think that it is necessarily at all a good precedent for this body to step in, exercising the power of the purse in a reverse way, and take away funds for the resolution, after many years of a legitimate legal dispute with issues on both sides, and to cut the money off and bar a legitimate settlement under a Federal court. I think that is a very poor policy.

I wonder if the gentleman would appreciate if other Members got up at other times to undo court settlements in the areas of civil rights, et cetera, et cetera. I do not think it is good precedent.

Lastly, I just want again to reaffirm the fact that the Secretary of the Interior acted in a straightforward way upon legal advice.

The gentleman knows the issues in the legal sense are difficult. They are complicated, and if one will look evenly at both sides, I think one will find that the settlement is a reasonable solution to a long-going and bitter problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1700

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

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my dear and distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot commend the gentleman enough, but I do have one complaint. He does not pronounce the name of Oregon exactly the way we pronounce the name of Oregon in Oregon. It is Oregon. I would like my chairman to pronounce that lovely and beautiful name, Oregon.

Mr. YATES. Is that the State where it rains all the time?

Mr. WEAVER. But then, you see, in the summertime, why the scorpions and rattlesnakes come out.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I should like to advise the House that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER] has an amendment, and we are now waiting for the amendment. That is the reason for this interplay at the moment.

I thought the gentleman from Oregon—and that was the reason I yielded to him—was going to tell the House what the nature of the amendment was.

Mr. WEAVER. I am going to, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would love to hear the gentleman's explanation, and I think that we are favorably disposed to this amendment if it has been drafted as the gentleman has suggested.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, there is presently language in the Interior appropriations bill—and I commend the chairman for this language, I commend the ranking minority member for his language, and I commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN] for placing this absolutely essential language into the bill.

What the language does is to prohibit the export of raw logs from our public Federal forests. Right not one of the great banes on the economy of the Northwest is the massive export of our most precious resource, our raw logs. But the logs are not coming from the national forests because of the good work of the Interior Appropriations Committee and Members such as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN], who have made sure that the provision is in this bill each year to prohibit the export of logs from our national forests.

What my amendment will do is to make sure that the Bureau of Land Management, which has 2 million acres of priceless timber in Oregon, has regulations that are consistent with the regulations that the Forest Service has long ago promulgated to maintain the law that has been in the appropriations bill so many times.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM].

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to commend the chairman and the ranking minority member for their excellent work on this bill, trying to bring together the various factions that have to do with Outer Continental Shelf Oil leasing.

Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the provision in the Interior appropriations bill pertaining to the California outer continental shelf oil leasing program.

Initially, during consideration of the Interior appropriations bill by the committee, I did support a 1-year moratorium because I thought that additional time was needed to work out the outstanding conflicts concerning the impact that oil leasing activities will have on the environment, air quality, and local infrastructure which are not capable of accommodating the heavy

industrial activity that accompanies offshore development.

However, while this proposal does not do all that a moratorium would do, it is acceptable in that it will delay preleasing activities to provide the Secretary of the Interior adequate time to analyze the various proposals presented by California's Governor Deukmejian, Congressman REGULA, and the California delegation. At the same time, the delay will allow negotiations to continue on a fair and level playing field in order to decide where to permit offshore oil and gas exploration and production and where to provide long-term protection to those areas along the California coasts that are environmentally and economically sensitive.

This delay is especially important to the 40th District I represent which includes 25 miles of the California coast that the Interior Department judged to be one of the top six coastal resources in the Nation because of its scenic beauty and pristine conditions. Orange County has built a strong vibrant tourist-based economy that generates thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in annual revenues. I believe the costs of developing oil on the outer continental shelf offshore Orange County would far outweigh the benefits derived from the thriving economic base that already exists. Also, many questions still exist concerning the impact that additional emissions from offshore and onshore support facilities would have on the existing air pollution problem in the area. With these questions still remaining, it is necessary for consultation to continue so that these legitimate concerns can be thoroughly addressed before the lease sale process can proceed.

The process incorporated in the Interior appropriations bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to fully review the various proposals submitted during the lengthy negotiating meetings and is consistent with the need to arrive at an acceptable long-term oil leasing program for California. It ensures that the California Members will have the opportunity to continue playing an integral role in developing a balanced oil and gas leasing program—one which adds to our energy resources without threatening the economic base and valuable national coastal resource which is ultimately utilized to the benefit of countless Americans.

Finally, I'd like to point out that this compromise amendment is acceptable to all parties, including the Department of the Interior, who have been actively involved in the negotiating process. Thus, I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Chairman, last week during the consideration of the Energy and Water appropriation bill for fiscal year 1987, we had a rather lengthy debate about eight university facilities that were provided with $69.7 million. These facilities had neither been authorized nor had received a scientific merit review of any sort. Unfortunately the House voted against two amendments that I offered which would have prevented funds from being used for these projects until they had been authorized.

The bill before us today provides a conditional increase of $10 million for an energy research facility at Tufts University. Mr. Chairman, if this earmarking of funds for an energy research facility at Tufts University had been done in the manner that the projects were in the energy and water appropriations bill, I would have offered an amendment to strike the funding.

However, I will not do so, for I believe that the approach taken in the bill which we are considering here today answers many of the objections of those of us who have been critical of the wholesale pork-barrel approach.

The provision of the $10 million for the facility is conditional in that the funding is contingent upon specific authorization legislation being enacted, and upon approval of an appropriate peer-review panel convened by the Department of Energy for the specific purpose of reviewing a grant application for the facility, and subject to conditions, if any, contained in the legislation specifically authorizing such.

I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, for the approach taken in this bill to answer the two main objections many of us have had about the university facility funding as it has been conducted in the recent past. Namely, he has put in this bill that the project must be authorized, and it must be peer-reviewed by the Department of Energy.

I wholeheartedly support this approach, and I hope that we see similar provisions in any other appropriation bills where moneys are earmarked for university facilities.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement, because I think that the gentleman is correct on this issue. I think that it is something that both bodies must take very seriously, this idea of earmarking funds for specific universities.

I think that the approach that this bill demands, that it be a meritorious grant, that there be peer review, and it be authorized, is the appropriate way.

I, too, want to commend the chairman and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], who is on our subcommittee, who was the leader in trying to craft an approach to projects such as this.

Mr. Chairman, I just think that Congress runs a grave risk when we start deciding which universities are going to do research. I do think that peer review makes sense. I think that that is why it has stood the test of time. Again, I want to tell the gentleman that I concur in his approach.

□ 1710

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, and it is my understanding, too, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] was very instrumental in this and he certainly deserves our congratulations, as does the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for bringing this bill to the floor that does it the right way.

They deserve, I think, the commendation of the House for so doing.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEIBERLING: On page 44, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 118. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act to the Department of the Interior shall be expended: (a) to submit to the United States District Court for Colorado any settlement with respect to Tosco Corp., et al. v. Hodel (611 F. Supp. 1130) or, (b) to issue any patent on any lands involved in this lawsuit, until the Congress has received from the Secretary and reviewed for a period of fifteen legislative days a copy of the proposed settlement agreement which has been approved and signed by the Secretary or until all judicial remedies, including all appeals in the judicial process, have been fully exhausted by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Interior is contemplating settling a lawsuit which may involve a virtual giveaway of as much as 360,000 acres of public lands. This deal has been negotiated in secret between the Department and an oil company, as a settlement to a lawsuit

which the Department's own field personnel strongly urged their superiors to appeal rather than settle.

The Interior Committee, on which I serve, has not been briefed by the Department on this deal, despite its important public policy implications. This amendment would make sure that Congress is informed and has a chance to review these public policy implications before the Department acts.

Mr. Chairman, when James Watt was Secretary of the Interior, he proposed "privatizing" the public lands—selling off as much of them to private parties as they would take. Privatization became one of the most publically denounced policy proposals of this administration. Throughout the West, the public denounced the idea of selling off the public lands, and it seemed that the administration got the message.

The deal this amendment concerns would be worse then the selling of public lands—it would amount to giving those land away.

The particular lands the Department is proposing to settle away are oil shale lands. The lawsuit with which this amendment is concerned involves the validity of speculative mining claims made for those lands more than 60 years ago.

These lands represent an important element of our energy future. The oil shale is not worth much now, but in distant years when oil has become scarce and expensive, this will have become a key resource for America.

This amendment does not require congressional approval of a settlement of this lawsuit. It only requires giving us a chance to look at this complicated issue and its important public policy implications.

Mr. Chairman, the litigation the Department is proposing to settle in this way has been under way for decades. All my amendment asks is that the Congress be assured of an additional 15 days to review the merits of any settlement the Secretary proposes prior to exhausting all his rights of appeal through the judicial process.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I am happy to yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. SEIBERLING.

I know of no issue more troublesome, more controversial, or of greater significance than the resolution of the oil shale mining claim problem.

Thousands of oil shale mining claims were located before 1920 on the assumption that oil shale was a valuable mineral, and that the claim could be brought into commercial production. After 1920, shale oil became a leasable mineral but thousands of these old claims still exist. Since that time, well over 60 years, we are still awaiting the first barrel of shale oil to be produced at commercially accepted prices. Literally billions of dollars have been expended without success.

Shale oil is not a present day reserve. It may be a resource valuable at some distant future date, but as of today, it is not commercially valuable for shale oil production.

Mr. SEIBERLING's amendment would not preclude patenting of these claims by the Secretary of the Interior, but it would give Congress an opportunity to review any agreement entered into by the Secretary and the mining claimant.

The lands here at issue include 525 claims covering about 84,000 acres in Colorado. They could be patented at $2.50 per acre. The value of the surface resources alone would exceed that by at least 50 to 100 times. In addition, the precedent set by this case could involve numerous other claims covering up to 300,000 acres in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming.

Mr. Chairman, the extraction of shale oil from oil shale is not totally unlike the extraction of gold from the oceans. The gold is there; it is valuable; the process of extration is fairly well known, but the cost of extraction exceeds the value of the gold by at least a thousand times. The spread on extracting the shale oil from oil shale is not quite of that magnitude. But, so far, the cost of producing shale oil has exceeded the cost of producing conventional crude oil by 5 to 6 times.

I probably, more than anyone, would like to see the resolution of the endless litigation that has surrounded oil shale for more than 60 years. But I am not convinced that the proposed negotiated settlement is the way to go. At a minimum, I feel Congress should have an opportunity to know what is proposed and what the results would be. That is all the Seiberling amendment would do.

I support that effort and urge its favorable consideration.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the amendment, and as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to accept it.

I think that it is the kind of agreement that the Congress ought to be in a position to review before it is finally consummated. I should point out, however, to my good friend from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] that there is a point of order pending against the amendment by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG].

Mr. UDALL. I understand.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to answer any questions if the gentleman from Colorado or anyone else has them as to the lawsuit to the extent we know something about it or to the amendment itself.

I am prepared to defend the point of order if the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] insists upon his point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] insist on his point of order?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Chairman, I insist on a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] on the gounds that it violates rule XXI. Specifically, the Seiberling amendment proposes to change existing law in a nongermane manner by purporting to limit funds under this or any other act, and I emphasize the words "or any other act."

No other acts are before the committee. Therefore, the amendment violates rule XXI, clause 2(b).

Further, Mr. Chairman, the amendment violates House rule XXI, clause 2(c) since it changes existing law insofar as the amendment would prohibit the engaging in a settlement of pending litigation that would impose additional duties on the agency by requiring submittal of the settlement to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to strike the reference to "any other act" so that it just refers to this act and offer a substitute amendment to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOWNEY of New York). The Chair is prepared to rule first on this point of order and address subsequent amendments at that time.

For the reason stated by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG], the Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Colorado against the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is the same as the amendment I just offered with the words, "or any other," stricken in the first and second lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEIBERLING: On page 44, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 118. None of the funds made available by this Act to the Department of the Interior shall be expended: (a) to submit to the United States District Court for Colorado any settlement with respect to Tosco Corp., et al. v. Hodel (611 F. Supp. 1130) or, (b) to issue any patent on any lands involved in this lawsuit, until the Congress has received from the Secretary and reviewed for a period of 15 legislative days a copy of the

proposed settlement agreement which has been approved and signed by the Secretary or until all judicial remedies, including all appeals in the judicial process, have been fully exhausted by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado insist on his point of order?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this Seiberling amendment on the grounds that it violates House rule XXI, clause 2(c) since it changes existing law insofar as the amendment would prohibit the engaging in a settlement of pending litigation and would impose additional duties on the agency by requiring submittal of the settlement to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this does not change existing law. It merely says that prior to preparing a settlement agreement which, of course, the Secretary has the right to do or not to do, before it becomes final, it must be submitted to Congress and lay over for 15 legislative days.

There is no discretion involved and no additional duties involved.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOWNEY of New York). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair rules that for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] the amendment is out of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEAVER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEAVER: Amendment to title III, section 302:

On page 73, line 11, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish regulations under this Section that are consistent with the existing regulations that have been promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER].

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

Mr. WEAVER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I want to thank the gentleman for the generous comments that he made about the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN] and myself, regarding our efforts to limit the export of logs off Federal lands.

I must say that we had great help from our chairman and our distinguished ranking Republican, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] over the years.

We held hearings on this subject, and out of those hearings, we got the Department of Agriculture, which has control over the Forest Service, to adopt new tightening regulations that made the practice of third-party substitution much more difficult through regulations and controls.

□ 1720

What the gentleman here is attempting to do is to see that those same regulations are implemented by the Department of Interior as it relates to the Bureau of Land Management lands.

I think this is a very good amendment; I think that the tightening effect of the new regulations from the Forest Service have reduced dramatically the potential for third party substitution, and I think that this is something that I know my colleague from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER] and I both can support strongly. I urge the committee to accept the Weaver amendment, and I compliment the gentleman from Oregon because he, too, has been at the forefront of the effort to limit exports of logs from Federal lands, and deserves great credit for this enlightened amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] who has explained the amendment perfectly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have read the language that is included on page 44 of House Report 99-714, accompanying H.R. 5234, which relates to the administration's proposed reduction in minerals and materials research in the Bureau of Mines.

As I understand the committee's action, it has disapproved of the administration's request. It further requires that, before any action is taken to consolidate or close any of the research centers, that the Bureau of Mines must conduct a full assessment of any such action and that such a report will be due as part of the Bureau's fiscal year 1988 budget request.

Is my understanding correct?

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield. Yes; it is correct?

Mr. HOYER. It is also my understanding that the Bureau of Mines will adhere to this report language, obviating the need for bill language.

Is this your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. YATES. Yes; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional amendments to the bill?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SEIBERLING] having assumed the chair, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, 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. 5234) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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. FRENZEL. 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 359, nays 51, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—359

Ackerman	Andrews	Archer
Akaka	Annunzio	Aspin
Alexander	Anthony	Atkins
Anderson	Applegate	AuCoin

Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Biaggi
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldon
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—51

Armey
Bartlett
Bilirakis
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Chappie
Cheney
Crane
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Eckert (NY)
Evans (IA)
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Frenzel
Gekas
Gregg
Hansen
Hunter
Ireland
Jacobs
Lagomarsino
Lightfoot
Lott
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Martin (IL)
McCollum
Monson
Moorhead
Petri
Ritter
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Solomon
Strang
Stump
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Walker
Weber

NOT VOTING—21

Badham
Barnes
Bedell
Bevill
Boner (TN)
Breaux
Brown (CA)
Campbell
Carney
Clay
Conyers
Edgar
English
Fowler
Grotberg
Hartnett
Lundine
Mitchell
Moore
Rudd
Skelton

□ 1730

Mr. COMBEST changed his vote 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.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5234, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1987

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 5234, the Clerk shall be authorized to make any necessary technical corrections.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my intention at this time to object, I do so to inquire as to what we can anticipate on the schedule for the next few minutes or the rest of the night. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who are anxiously inquiring as to what we are going to be doing, what bills might be coming up or will we bring up the Postal, Civil Service Treasury rule as had been anticipated?

I would be pleased to yield, under my reservation of objection, to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the acting Republican leader would yield, we are trying to perfect the most productive use of our time. We think it would be very helpful if we were able to get unanimous consent at this point to have until midnight tonight, that the Rules Committee might have until midnight tonight to file a rule on the Department of Defense authorization bill. And I ask that unanimous consent.

Mr. LOTT. Now further reserving the right to object, let me make sure I understand what the gentleman is asking. He is asking that we have until midnight tonight to file the rule on the Department of Defense authorization bill, is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, do we have any kind of agreement that has been worked out on that rule yet?

□ 1745

As a member of the Rules Committee, we do not have a meeting scheduled that I know of right now to report on that rule. I just hesitate to give that unanimous consent until we know what the rule is going to be.

Mr. WRIGHT. The representative of the minority leader stands in front of the acting minority leader and may be conveying information of interest.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what I would like to emphasize here, as I did earlier today in the Rules Committee, we think we are going to be able to get together in a bipartisan way on a rule. But I think that there were still negotiations going on, and I just hesitate to agree right now.

Could we maybe withhold on that just a few minutes until we have had a chance to talk?

Mr. WRIGHT. The answer, I guess, is quite obvious. If we do not have unanimous consent for the Rules Committee to have until midnight tonight to file, since we intend to take up that rule tomorrow, we will have to stay in session until the Rules Committee arrives at the agreement to which the gentleman refers.

If the gentleman wants to require all the Members to have to sit in session tonight until that committee has completed its deliberations——

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire if we should consent to the filing of the rule tonight, and we have had a number of meetings on it and I

know that there is still quite a hassle over it, what would the procedure be then for the balance of this evening around here?

Mr. WRIGHT. If unanimous consent were given for the Rules Committee to have until midnight tonight to file its rule on the Department of Defense authorization bill, it then would be our hope to take up the bill relating to the Helsinki agreements and probably not consume more than 20 or 30 minutes on that. Then we would like to take up a rule on the Treasury-Postal matter.

I would ask unanimous consent that we might have until midnight tonight to file a rule on the Treasury-Postal matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEIBERLING). The Chair will advise the distinguished majority leader that there is currently a unanimous consent request pending relating to correcting the engrossment of the bill on which we have not yet completed action.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in that case, I would not ask that, but would renew my suggestion under the request for consideration of giving the Rules Committee until midnight to file its report on the Department of Defense authorization.

We could utilize some time profitably if, number one, we were able to act upon the Helsinki bill, and then quite possibly the Rules Committee would be prepared to report a rule on the Department of the Treasury and Post Service appropriation.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the Rules Committee did meet already on the Treasury-Postal Service appropriation bill and granted it a rule, and I thought that it was a good rule. As a matter of fact, I think there were 57 or so issues that really needed waivers, and all those things were not waived. In fact, I think only three or four areas like IRS and Customs actually got waivers. But all these other extraneous matters, legislation on appropriations bills, were not waived. It was a good rule. We have the rule.

What happens now? Is the Rules Committee going to go back and get us another rule on that?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is my understanding. I am informed, without knowing any of the merits, that members of the Rules Committee feel that they have committed an oversight and that they need to regroup and reconsider one provision which they intended to include in the rule on the Treasury-Postal appropriation bill. I do not know what it is, but I am simply reporting to the gentleman that, to the best of my knowledge, that is the case.

Now, unless we could get unanimous consent for the consideration of that rule today, then we would have to stay in session until the Rules Committee had reached its judgment, whatever that judgment may be.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, maybe we could back out of this and maybe get on with the business at hand.

The intent is to bring up the Helsinki issue immediately after this discussion.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. That would take 20 or 30 minutes or so.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct.

And then if we have not received unanimous consent for the DOD rule, which, as I understand it, is not a bone of immediate controversy——

Mr. LOTT. I would like to say to the majority leader it may not be a bone of contention, but the minority leader is here not talking with our ranking member on the committee and there are negotiations underway right now. If the gentleman would see fit maybe withhold that until after the Helsinki issue, hopefully we can get some sort of unanimous consent.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is a perfectly acceptable recommendation.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, under that general understanding, I will withdraw my unanimous consent at this time and will respond to the gentleman to the effect that we will take up the Helsinki bill. Perhaps we will consume 20 or 30 minutes on that bill.

Upon the conclusion of the consideration of that bill, it would be my purpose then to renew this request. If for any good reason the request was not granted at that time, we then would propose to take up the highway rule and the highway bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] who is involved in those negotiations right now.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I left a meeting with Mr. ASPIN. We were meeting to discuss this thing just as I was notified that the motion had been made.

If the gentleman will give us 30 minutes or more, I think that we are going to have to offer this in tandem, it would seem. The first portion of it, which we are working on, we think we can offer and then we will have to go back to the Rules Committee at some subsequent time to more clearly define the sequence things that have come up. We are working out the details, and if the gentleman will give us 30 minutes to 1 hour, I think that we can resolve them.

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

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am sure that there are enough Members in the House on both sides, Republicans and Democrats alike, who feel sufficiently strongly about the civil rights accords reached at the Helsinki agreement, that they will more than adequately consume such time as is required in the discussion of those very important accords.

With that understanding, I suppose nothing remains except for us to proceed to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for that.

I would like to just ask a couple more questions I think the Members would like to have information on.

Does the gentleman have any feel for what time we could perhaps anticipate completing our work here tonight?

Mr. WRIGHT. It depends entirely upon whether we get unanimous consent for midnight tonight for the Rules Committee to file a report on the DOD.

Mr. LOTT. Assuming we could work that out, then what time are we talking about.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think we would be in pretty good shape if we get to that point. We will take up the rule on the appropriations bill and, once we pass that rule and there is nothing left to do tonight but general debate, Members could safely go secure in the knowledge that there will be no likelihood of votes. We might conclude general debate tonight, thereby permitting us to do two things tomorrow, complete the 5-minute rule on the amendments on the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill and adopt the rule on the DOD authorization bill so that it will be eligible for consideration beginning on Monday for general debate.

Then we could reasonably expect that we will be out tomorrow in sufficient time so that Members may make such reservations as they care to. We will be out by 3 o'oclock.

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, what is the anticipated schedule for tomorrow?

Mr. WRIGHT. The anticipated schedule for tomorrow, assuming these agreements are reached, the unanimous-consent requests are agreed to wherever necessary, will be that having completed the rule tonight on the Treasury-Postal bill and having completed general debate, allowing Members to understand there will not be any votes after the rule, then tomorrow we would have only two things to do.

□ 1755

One would be to complete the Treasury-Postal bill. The other would be to adopt the rule on the Department of Defense authorization bill.

Mr. LOTT. But the Members can anticipate some votes tomorrow; at least two?

Mr. WRIGHT. There will be votes tomorrow.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the majority leader for that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3113, COORDINATED OPERATION OF CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT AND STATE WATER PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 3113 providing for the coordinated operation of the Central Valley project and State water project in California, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none and without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. UDALL, MILLER of California, COELHO, LEHMAN of California, YOUNG of Alaska, CHENEY, and PASHAYAN.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND CLASSIFIED ANNEX ACCOMPANYING INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform all Members of the House that the Classified Schedule of Authorizations and Classified Annex to the report accompanying H.R. 4759, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, is now available for the review of Members only at the offices of the Intelligence Committee, room H-405 in the Capitol, Monday through Friday.

It is my expectation that the intelligence bill will come before the House in the next several weeks. I suggest that all Members take the opportunity to read the schedule and annex to inform themselves concerning the committee's recommendations on the fiscal year 1987 intelligence and intelligence-related budget.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO REQUEST MODIFIED OPEN RULE ON H.R. 5081, ASSISTANCE FOR DEMOCRACY ACT OF 1986

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House that tomorrow morning at 10:30 a.m. the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be requesting that the Committee on Rules grant a modified open rule on H.R. 5081, the Assistance for Democracy Act of 1986.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5294 TREASURY DEPARTMENT, THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mrs. BURTON of California, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-726) on the resolution (H. Res. 521) waiving certain points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 5294) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HELSINKI HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 371) to designate August 1, 1986, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 371

Whereas August 1, 1986, will be the eleventh anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (hereafter in this preamble referred to as the "Helsinki Accords");

Whereas on August 1, 1975, the Helsinki Accords were agreed to by the Governments of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, the Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Yugoslavia;

Whereas the Helsinki Accords express the commitment of the participating States to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights and freedoms all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "recognize and respect the freedom of the individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States in whose territory national minorities exist to "respect the right of persons belonging to such minorities to equality before the law" and that such States "will afford them the full opportunity for the actual enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms and will, in this manner, protect their legitimate interests in this sphere";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "recognize the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among themselves as among all States";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "constantly respect these rights and freedoms in their mutual relations" and that such States "will endeavor jointly and separately, including in cooperation with the United Nations, to promote universal and effective respect for them";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "confirm the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in this field";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms to "act in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights" and to "fulfill their obligations as set forth in the international declarations and agreements in this field, including inter alia the International Covenants on Human Rights, by which they may be bound";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "facilitate freer movement and contacts, individually and collectively, whether privately or officially, among persons, institutions and organizations of the participating States, and to contribute to the solution of the humanitiarian problems that arise in that connection";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "favorably consider applications for

travel with the purpose of allowing persons to enter or leave the territory temporarily, and on the regular basis if desired, in order to visit members of their families";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "deal in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family" and "to deal with applications in this field as expeditiously as possible";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "examine favorably and on the basis of humanitarian considerations requests for exit or entry permits from persons who have decided to marry a citizen from another participating State";

Whereas the Helsinki Accords also express the commitment of the participating States to "facilitate wider travel by their citizens for personal or professional reasons";

Whereas the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Romania, in agreeing to the Helsinki Accords, have acknowledged an adherence to the principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms as embodied in the Helsinki Accords;

Whereas the aforementioned Governments have violated their commitments to the Helsinki Accords by denying individuals their inherent rights to freedom of religion, thought, conscience, and belief;

Whereas the aforementioned Governments have violated their commitments to the Helsinki Accords by restricting the freer movement of people, ideas, and information;

Whereas the concluding document of the Madrid Review Conference of September 9, 1983, called for Ottawa Human Rights Experts Meeting, the Budapest Cultural Forum, and the Bern Human Contacts Experts Meeting to discuss questions concerning respect for human rights and cooperation in humanitarian fields as embodied in the Helsinki Accords;

Whereas these meetings, which were attended by representatives from all the signatory States, presented important opportunities to address issues of compliance with the human rights and humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Accords; and

Whereas in November 1986 representatives from the signatory States will be meeting in Vienna to review implementation of the Helsinki Accords, including the human rights and humanitarian provisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) August 1, 1986, the eleventh anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Accords is designated as "Helsinki Human Rights Day";

(2) the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation reasserting the American commitment to full implementation of the human rights and humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Accords, urging all signatory nations to abide by their obligations under the Helsinki Accords, and encouraging the people of the United States to join the President and Congress in observance of Helsinki Human Rights Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

(3) the President is further requested to continue his efforts to achieve full implementation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords by raising the issue of noncompliance with the Governments of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Romania at every available opportunity;

(4) the President is further requested to convey to all signatories of the Helsinki Accords that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is a vital element of further progress in the ongoing Helsinki process; and

(5) the President is authorized to convey to allies and friends of the United States that unity on the question of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is the most effective means to promote the full implementation of the human rights and humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Accords.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Ambassadors of the thirty-four Helsinki signatory nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 371, declares August 1, 1986, the 11th anniversary of the Helsinki accords, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day." It asks the President to issue a proclamation reasserting the American commitment to full implementation of the human rights and humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki accords.

This resolution unanimously passed the other body on July 23 and was reported to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The measure was also referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which has no objection to its being considered here today. Senate Joint Resolution 371 is almost identical to House Joint Resolution 667, introduced by Mr. PORTER and Mr. LANTOS, cochairman of the Human Rights Caucus, and 10 other original cosponsors.

I am pleased to be the floor manager for this legislation. During my tenure as chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I have chaired many hearings involving signatories of the Helsinki accords who blatantly violate human rights. One such hearing was conducted yesterday on religious persecution in the Soviet Union. It is up to us in the U.S. Congress to hold member countries accountable for the human rights provisions in the Helsinki accords. Unless we insist on compliance, unless we generate constant pressure, unless we influence international public opinion, the Helsinki accords will be reduced to meaningless dribble instead of lofty ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of past congressional expressions of support for implementation of Helsinki Human Rights provisions and our continual monitoring of the human rights situations in the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. Time and again, resolutions addressing the denial of individual liberties and the imposition of political repression have passed this body. Among the leaders in this area are Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. PORTER. It is precisely these constant and consistent expressions of congressional concern such as the resolution now before us which have given hope to refuseniks, political prisoners, separated families, and the millions of oppressed.

The bill asks the President to continue his efforts to achieve full implementation of the Helsinki accords by raising the issue of noncompliance. It further requests that the President convey to our allies the importance of unity on the question of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It is essential for the United States to make it absolutely clear that an improvement in East-West relations is contingent upon an improvement in human rights conditions.

I commend Senator DECONCINI for introducing Senate Joint Resolution 371. I would greatly appreciate the support of all my colleagues on this important initiative.

□ 1805

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

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all commend my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] for the timely manner in which he brings this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 371, and I urge its unanimous adoption by the House.

On August 1, 1975, representatives of 35 governments in Europe and North America concluded the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe by placing the signatures of their governments on a solemn covenant now known as the Helsinki Final Act. This covenant established the primacy of human rights as the foundation that underlies political and economic cooperation between the countries of Europe. This resolution commemorates the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act.

Unfortunately, the commemoration of this event is not a cause for celebration. Even a casual reading of the Helsinki Final Act—and I might add that this resolution contains extensive excerpts from the act—but even a casual reading of these excerpts should be enough to convince any objective person that the lofty ideals and declarations of purpose to which the signatory countries have committed themselves have been ignored, even reviled,

by the Soviet Union and its satellite countries.

When the Helsinki Final Act was signed 11 years ago, many of us were skeptical. However much we may believe in the principles of freedom and human dignity that are enunciated in that document, it also served to legalize or ratify the Soviet Union's conquest of Eastern Europe—a conquest that has subjugated many peoples and cultures, a conquest that was begun by force of arms and completed by political deceit and treachery that have no parallel in this century.

It was the hope of many people that perhaps this recognition of Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe would be enough to induce concessions by the Kremlin in the area of human rights. But such has not been the case.

I am led to no other conclusion than that the Soviet Union and its puppets in Eastern Europe placed their signatures on the Helsinki Final Act in a cynical and hypocritical attempt to gain an advantage in the propaganda warfare that has kept Europe divided since 1945. Certainly, if they ever had any intention of living up to the human rights standards that are enshrined in this document, they have yet to give any indication of it. Tyranny, repression, and human degradation have continued unabated in Eastern Europe during the past 11 years.

Mr. Speaker, the implication is clear: The war against totalitarianism did not end with the defeat of fascism in 1945. The war continues today. It is not a shooting war in Europe, but it is a war just as real as World War II—and the stakes are just as high. What is ultimately at stake is the survival of freedom and human dignity on the European Continent—the very place where these great ideals first originated many centuries ago.

The record of the past 11 years is bad. Clearly, the Helsinki Final Act has not proven to be a restraint on Soviet belligerence. But the act does have symbolic importance, and it provides us with a tool to use in dealing with the Soviet Union and its cronies. Let us take advantage of the 11-year commemoration on August 1 to rededicate ourselves and our Nation to the principles the Helsinki Final Act contains. Let us strive to turn the act—a piece of paper—into a living reality. Let us call upon the administration to make this solemn covenant the centerpiece of the East/West dialog and of our policy in Europe.

Above all, we must keep faith with the many millions of people who suffer under the yoke of Soviet communism in Europe. Their cries must not go unheard. Nor should we be hesitant in demanding Soviet compliance with the principles the Kremlin pledged to uphold when the Helsinki Final Act was signed.

Over the next 11 years and beyond, we must strive to make the Helsinki Final Act a living expression of the faith that animates and sustains a free society and a free people. The act should be more than just a monument to good intentions, it should be held up as a beacon of hope to those people who are oppressed in Eastern Europe.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I support the joint resolution before us which designates August 1, 1986 as "Helsinki Human Rights Day." This resolution also urges our President to remind all signatories of their obligations under the Helsinki accord.

I commend Senator DECONCINI for this timely legislative initiative.

What could be more important than the freedom and liberty of a human being. Unfortunately, many countries such as the Soviet Union which signed the final act in 1975 ignore their obligations under that solemn agreement. They clearly don't respect human rights and basic freedoms.

Although signatories to the act, they refuse to facilitate freer movement and contacts among persons and organizations of the participating States. Some States have violated their commitment to the accords by failing to favorably consider travel applications by their own citizens. In fact, some nations have restricted the freer movement of people and ideas. They have moved in a direction opposite from where they had pledged to go.

I strongly support this resolution's efforts to call upon all signatory nations to abide by their clear obligations under the accord.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this joint resolution.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], who is also the cochairman of the Helsinki Commission.

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], who chairs the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been a leader in the effort to focus on human rights, not only in the Western Europe theater that deals with the Helsinki accords but throughout the world. I congratulate him for his efforts over the years.

Mr. Speaker, as cochairman, of the U.S. (Helsinki) Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I rise today in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 371, which is identical to House Joint Resolution 667, designating August 1, the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day." I also want to take this opportunity to commend my colleague and fellow Helsinki Commissioner John Porter who introduced House Joint Resolution, 667, for his leadership in the area of human rights and for his initiative in sponsoring this legislation.

On August 1, 1975, the leaders of 33 nations of Western and Eastern Europe, Canada and the United States signed the Helsinki Final Act. Seen as the capstone of détente policy, the Final Act placed respect for fundamental human freedoms squarely within the East-West framework as a basic element of government-to-government relations. Through good faith observance of the Final Act's standards for responsible and humane international conduct, signatory States were to advance along the difficult road toward mutual trust and cooperation.

The Final Act provided a comprehensive, consultative framework encompassing practically all areas of international concern: Military affairs, protection of the environment, trade, human rights, exchange in the areas of culture, science, and technology, human contacts, information, and education. It was an ambitious agenda involving an evolutionary process. By signing the Helsinki Final Act, the Western democracies in essence pledged to keep faith with the persecuted in the East. It is telling to recall that the West failed to anticipate the impact that the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act would have on East bloc citizens. We in the West were not the first to act upon the accords as a means to expose human rights violations in the East. East bloc citizens seized upon the Helsinki provisions as a program for human rights advocacy.

On May 12, 1976, Yury Orlov, a physicist in Moscow, formed a human rights group which called itself the "Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords in the U.S.S.R." better known here in the West as the "Moscow Helsinki Group." Orlov was joined eventually by 21 additional members including Natan Shcharansky and Dr. Yelena Bonner. Their intent—to oversee the Soviet Union's implementation of the Final Act's provisions. Their destiny was persecution, prison, labor camp, internal exile. This spark of human determination and courage spread within the U.S.S.R. to the Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia and Armenia and other nations as well. In January 1977, Charter 77 was founded in Czechoslovakia; KOR began monitoring Helsinki compliance in Poland in September 1979.

The Moscow Group disbanded after several years of brutal repression. The other groups in the U.S.S.R. struggle on in the face of virtually crushing repression. In February, Natan Shcharansky, after 9 years of imprisonment, imposed for no more than wanting to emigrate, crossed the Glienicke bridge to freedom. That crossing was not simply from East to West but a passage between two worlds, from the in-

human conditions of the gulag to a world where fundamental freedoms are cherished and protected. One of the message brought by Shcharansky as that he would not forget those he left behind: In labor camps and prisons, Pentecostals, Baptists, Ukrainian Catholics, the poets.

Eleven years ago, we committed ourselves to uphold certain standards by which we deal with other nations and with our own citizens. Today we recommit ourselves. On November 4, the 35 signatory nations will convene in Vienna to review implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. The U.S. delegation led by Ambassador Warren Zimmerman will, with our allies at Vienna, take up the torch that the Helsinki Watch groups in the Soviet Union, in Czechoslovakia, and in Poland first held up before the world and called attention to the conditions under which they must live. The record of the East bloc nations is dismal. The Final Act contains no enforcement mechanism, the pressure to bear is political and moral. It is for these courageous men and women that Vienna must speak. It is for them and the values the American people hold most dear, that we must ensure Vienna's effectiveness as an international platform for the vigorous pursuit of human rights diplomacy.

□ 1815

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York, a member of the Helsinki Commission and a leader of human rights issue in this area and throughout the world.

Mr. KEMP. I thank my friend for yielding, and also my friends on the minority side of the aisle. I'd like to just take a moment to underscore the very thoughtful and eloquent words that the gentleman from Maryland has used here on the floor of the House on an important day and an important issue.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his friendship and leadership and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have fought long and hard for those Jews and Christians behind the Iron Curtain. These actions clearly reflect that love of freedom which is at the heart of our country and the hearts and minds of freedom-loving men and women everywhere.

By an act of Congress, we have set aside August 1 as Helsinki Human Rights Day. Today we commemorate the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. We take this occasion to reflect upon what this act has meant for the advancement of human rights.

The most important lesson is that human rights do not exist in words or on paper. They become real only as the free institutions are created that ensure their protection. And they only have meaning when significant numbers of individuals can benefit from this protection.

Let's look at three cases which clearly demonstrate the need for greater compliance with the Helsinki accords.

Natan Shcharansky is in Israel, but his brother and mother remain in the Soviet Union.

Soviet chessmasters Anna and Boris Gulko and their son David were permitted to emigrate to Israel in May after 8 years as refuseniks. Boris came to the Capitol today to hold a chess match to help us commemorate Human Rights Day. We had scheduled a telephone call from Leonid Shcharansky in the Soviet Union. The call never came. We can only hope that Leonid wasn't arrested on his way to make the call, as Boris was 3 months ago, and as Leonid's brother, Natan, was so many times before he finally obtained his freedom.

Dr. Yelena Bonner was permitted to come to the United States for desperately needed medical treatment. A condition of her being allowed out of the Soviet Union was that she remain silent about life in the Soviet Union. Dr. Bonner found herself morally unable to comply with this condition. We don't know yet what the repercussions will be for Dr. Bonner and her husband, Dr. Andrei Sakharov. The blanket of silence drawn around them in their internal exile in the closed city of Gorky has become increasingly difficult to penetrate.

These are just three of the thousands of tragic stories which are caused by violations of the Helsinki human rights provisions. I must further point out that the total number of people permitted to emigrate has dropped drastically. Vladimir and Maria Slepak have been refuseniks for over 15 years. Ida Nudel, the Angel of Mercy, is in poor health and may face the Angel of Death. Inna Meiman also faces death because she is unable to obtain proper medical treatment in the Soviet Union. Vladimir Feltsman, award-winning pianist, is still restricted to rehearsing and performing in his apartment.

These are only a few of the hundreds of cases which we have documented, and the hundreds of thousands of cases which exist. And these are not just cases, these are individuals, people, who are suffering unwarranted harassment solely for their "crime" of being Jewish or Christian or Georgian or German, for their "treasonous behavior" of wanting to leave the Soviet Union.

We must use all the means we have available to us to enforce compliance of the Helsinki accords, particularly in light of the upcoming Helsinki Review Conference in Vienna. I must take a moment to commend the work done in this area by such individuals and groups as Lynn Singer of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry, Mark Levin and Billy Keyserling of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Paul Meek and his associates at the International Parliamentary Group for Human Rights in the Soviet Union. Their tireless efforts and single-minded dedication in behalf of the cause continue to be an inspiration to us all.

Our actions as legislators should be no less than theirs. We must act to ensure true compliance with the letter and the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act in all three baskets; that is, economics, security, and human rights.

We can stress the importance the United States places on human rights by conditioning any agreements we negotiate with the Soviets on their improved human rights record. We should not grant most-favored-nation status, or give trade advantages to countries like Romania and the Soviet Union, when they flagrantly violate the principles and standards of the Helsinki Final Act. The Soviets should not be rewarded for their cruel and inhuman oppression of refuseniks.

Nations of the free world, built on respect for human rights, represent the noblest and best experiment of mankind. It falls to us to spread that experiment in democracy and freedom. This is by no means an easy task. But it is our sacred trust to do everything we can to achieve it.

Security and cooperation in Europe—the Helsinki goals—will be ensured only when all of Europe's people live under governments freely chosen by all the people, and responsive to the will of the electorate.

That is the Helsinki pledge that is binding on us all.

We, as Americans, and as people who are blessed with freedom, must do all we can to share this blessing. It is our moral obligation, and our legal obligation under the Helsinki Final Act.

In closing I want to say that as a commissioner, it is an honor and a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Maryland. I not only give my support to him, but also to this effort that has been made by the people who are here on the floor today in the cause of human rights.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks, and more importantly, for the energy and dedication that he has expended on the defense of human rights, as I said, and in support of the Helsinki process.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the second ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Human Rights, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for bringing this measure to the floor at this time, an appropriate time just before the anniversary date of the Helsinki accords.

Mr. Speaker, last year we celebrated the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki accords. At that time, many of us recalled the circumstances under which the final act was signed on August 1, 1975, by 35 nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union. It was a momentous occasion, and one which, over the years, has brought both frustration and joy. We have seen thousands of religious, cultural and political activists begin new lives outside the Soviet Union, but have also been witness to the tragedy of harassment, arrest, beatings, and interrogations perpetrated against men and women who only desire the religious and cultural freedom afforded them by this important document.

In the past year we have participated in numerous expressions of concern, from Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jews to our own Congressional Prayer Fast and Vigil. Many of us have beaten a well-worn path to the Soviet Embassy, in an effort to show our solidarity with those whose spouses and other relatives remain behind the Iron Curtain, and in opportunities to relay that concern to Embassy officials. Senate Joint Resolution 371 and House Joint Resolution 667, which proclaim August 1, 1986, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day" reminds us of the many thousands of those silenced in Soviet prisons, in labor camps, and places of exile.

Men like Yuri Orlov and Iosef Berenshtein continue to suffer mightily for their beliefs; Ida Nudel and Nadezha Fradkova are only two of the many women being crushed under the weight of Soviet oppression. Over the past year, we have also participated in joyous occasions, such as the historic visit of Anatoly Shcharansky to the United States following his momentous walk across the Gleinicke Bridge in Berlin. I look forward to seeing Natan and Avital here again when their Congressional Gold Medals are ready for presentation. We were also gratified to welcome Dr. Mark Nashpitz to our midst, and reviewed Soviet mail practices with Isai and Grigory Goldshtein. Most recently, Chess Master Boris Gulko and his wife who have fled to freedom, are visiting Washington right now in an effort to focus further attention on the issue of human rights.

The commemoration of Helsinki Human Rights Day highlights for the world the necessary compliance and respect for basic human freedoms—the freedoms of movement, speech, religion, and equality before the law. Those of us in the West cannot truly perceive the severe constraints under which the men and women of the Soviet Union live. We hear their plights and we commiserate, we dedicate ourselves on their behalf, and we speak out against the cruelties perpetuated by the Soviet regime. Yet, only those who have lived through the catch-22 existence of the Soviet system truly understand the impact, the severity and the motivation for such brutal behavior.

By reminding the world of the principles set forth in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, we reaffirm our own deep dedication to these precepts. As we look forward to yet another summit meeting, and additional rounds of Helsinki related conferences, we must propound one concept at every opportunity—that of compliance and respect for the act's statement of principles. For it is only when there is compliance with those principles that human rights in the Soviet Union will truly be achieved.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who is a member of the Helsinki Commission and an outstanding member in this effort.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me commend the effort of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the distinguished gentleman from New York for bringing Senate Joint Resolution 371 to the floor.

Let me also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Maryland for their very kind remarks.

Let me say further that it is a great honor and privilege for me to be serving under the leadership of the gentleman from Maryland. As a member of the Helsinki Commission, his leadership has been strong and steadfast and the progress we have made I think has been very great.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to introduce House Joint Resolution 667, along with my cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], and many members of our Caucus Executive Committee.

House Joint Resolution 667 is the same as Senate Joint Resolution 371 before us today. Both resolutions designate August 1, 1986, as Helsinki Human Rights Day and reaffirm American support for human rights and the Helsinki Final Act.

This resolution also calls upon the President to reassert the United States commitment to the Helsinki accords and to continue his effort to achieve full implementation of the Helsinki accords by once more raising the issue of noncompliance.

On August 1, 1975, representatives from 35 countries joined together in Helsinki to sign the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. This agreement covers every aspect of East-West relations, including military security, scientific and cultural exchanges, trade and economic cooperation.

This year marks the 11th anniversary of the signing of the accords. The signing of this agreement buoyed the hopes of many people living in countries who believed it signaled a new era of respect for human rights and improved East-West relations. In many countries Helsinki monitoring groups were established with the purpose of publicizing the standards of the accords and monitoring the application of these standards by their governments.

Unfortunately, the formation of these groups were not encouraged by many of the signatory countries. The Eastern European groups met great opposition from their governments. Yet, the leaders of these groups persisted, despite the efforts by their governments to jail them and to destroy and chill their courage to stand up for human rights. We are still rejoicing over the release of Anatoly Shcharansky, a leader of the Moscow Helsinki Group, but we must continue to remember those who are still fighting to be free including Yelena Bonner, Victoras Petkas, Ida Nudel, and the founder of the Moscow Helsinki Group, Yuri Orlov, who has been a prisoner of conscience since 1977. They are the true world leaders in the fight for human rights.

□ 1830

Unfortunately, today, 11 years later, some of the signatories continue to disregard their human rights commitments. Many of the Eastern-bloc countries restrict religious freedom, deny their citizens the right to emigrate, and imprison human rights activists.

By sponsoring a resolution to call attention to the 11th anniversary of the Helsinki accords, we hope to remind all signatories of the Helsinki Final Act that the United States continues to support full implementation of the accords.

As we look forward to the Vienna Review Conference that begins in November, it is essential that our Government use this meeting as an opportunity not only to reassert the U.S. commitment to the accords, but to make clear to the entire world the continuing violations of Basket III, the human rights provisions, by the Soviets and other Eastern-bloc countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S.J. Resolution 371 and Helsinki Human Rights Day. I

hope that through our efforts to support the Helsinki accords, we can work toward a world dedicated to peace and respect for human rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEIBERLING). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 17 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], who is also an outstanding member of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] for their leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor. I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for authoring this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the Helsinki Commission—as cochairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, and as a proud cosponsor of Mr. PORTER's resolution, I rise to offer my support of Helsinki Human Rights Day, designated for August 1, 1986. This day commemorates the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act by 35 nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union. Even more important, this day serves to focus attention on the ongoing Helsinki process, a process designed to enhance security and cooperation in Europe by focussing on the link between arms control, trade, and human rights.

While I welcome recent steps by the Soviet Government, such as the release of Helsinki monitor Anatoly Shcharansky and the resolution of a number of outstanding United States-Soviet family reunification cases, I remain distressed about overall Soviet performance in the area of human rights.

The Soviet Helsinki Monitors, the sister group to our own Helsinki Commission, continue to be radically oppressed by Soviet authorities. To date, 42 members of Helsinki monitoring and affiliated groups remain in labor camps or in internal exile. The cases of: Lithuanian Helsinki monitor Balys Gajauskas, imprisoned for 33 of his 59 years; Estonian Mart Niklus, in jail since 1981 for his human rights activities; Georgian Helsinki monitors Emmanuel Tvaladze and Tenghiz Gudaza, sentenced just last month to an undisclosed number of years in prison; Georgian Helsinki monitor Merab Kospava, in jail for years and now on the verge of death with tuberculosis; and Ukrainian Catholic activists Yosyf Terelya and Vasl Kobryn, are just a few examples of those who continue to suffer for their commitment to the values embodied in the Helsinki process.

I call to light also, the sacrifice of three Ukrainian monitors who died in prison camps and one Lithuanian who died suspiciously by being hit by a truck. These men in their sacrifice—indeed the ultimate sacrifice—show us that we must not lose our resolve to press for the human rights embodied in the Helsinki Final Act.

There are so many cases where the Helsinki Final Act is violated today. I think of the case of young Kaisa Randpere, the 3-year-old Estonian girl who has spent over half of her young life as a political hostage, separated from her parents who are now living in Sweden. While I have personally hand delivered letters of protest asking for her release, all the way to the Kremlin, and sent numerous letters to the Soviet Ambassador, there's been no movement. We must not give up.

The lack of adequate emigration remains a serious problem. From a high of 51,320 Soviet Jews being allowed to emigrate in 1979 to the two lowest levels, since records have been kept, of 897 and 1,140 for the years 1984 and 1985 respectively, it is clear that the Soviets have slammed the door. Last month's disappointing level of 55 visas, points out that this unfortunate trend is not changing.

Religious persecution continues unabated. Many imprisoned Soviet human rights activists, including Latvian Baptist Janis Rozkalns, continue to be forbidden visitation rights with family members despite Soviet legal guarantees. Under the leadership of Mr. Gorbachev, Soviet authorities continue to persecute Lithuanian Catholics, Ukrainian Catholics, Baptists—of which at least 143 were thrown in jail last year for religious activities—Pentecostals, and Russian Orthodox believers.

The state of the Soviet independent peace movement is equally troubled. The "Trust Group," or "Trustbuilder" officially called the Group for Trust Between the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., continues to be repressed. Last year one of the leaders of this group, Vladimir Brodsky, was sentenced to 3 years in prison for his nonviolent, peaceful protest activities. Other members of the group have been similarly harassed with summarily applied 15-day prison sentences in order to prevent them from meeting with Western peace group representatives on visits to the Soviet Union. One such individual whom I have had the privilege of speaking with personally on a visit to the Soviet Union last October, Dr. Yuri Medvedkov, was picked up and given a 15-day prison sentence after an interview he gave at the outset of the goodwill games. It is not certain whether Dr. Medvedkov has since been released. It is disappointing that Mr. Ted Turner and his Cable Network covering the games did not report on that imprisonment.

The United States has persistently raised issues of Soviet noncompliance at the Ottawa Human Rights Experts Meeting, the Budapest Cultural Forum and Bern Human Contacts Meeting in the past 2 years. And, as we approach the November Vienna Review Meeting, I urge my colleagues and the President to remain firmly committed to the concept of linkage by establishing appropriate environments for human rights control, greater progress in human rights, human contacts and emigration. Once the Soviet Union relizes that we are serious in our commitment, by being a little less anxious to sign treaties before progress in human rights is achieved, the wind in the sails of the Helsinki process can blow stronger.

This day, August 1, 1986, is a day for oppressed people to look up from their painful conditions and see that there are people, people who are enjoying peace with freedom, people who are struggling for their cause.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is a member of the subcommittee and also a member of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and all the others who have had a great deal of impact in bringing this resolution to the floor and have been ongoing defenders of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 371, designating August 1 as "Helsinki Human Rights Day." August 1 of course marks the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki accords.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the CSCE process provides the West with a valuable means to promote respect for human rights in the Soviet Union and among the Warsaw Pact nations.

While I would agree that the record of compliance by those nations has been extremely poor, a fact that is clearly acknowledged in the resolution, a fact that Mr. SOLOMON pointed out in his earlier comments, the Helsinki accords at least establish a comprehensive framework within which we can try to solve some of the more egregious violations.

□ 1840

Absent the accords, Mr. Speaker, the plight of Christians, Jews, and other people of faith would likely be much worse.

Absent the accords, many Soviet Jews would not be living in freedom in Israel and the United States and in other safe harbors in the West.

Absent the accords, Mr. Speaker, there would be fewer checks of Communist violence, hatred, racism, and religious animosity.

I believe the Helsinki accords provide us with an invaluable forum to discuss violations of human rights. It has given us a set of standards to which all have agreed and then must be held accountable.

Moreover, it has survived the inevitable episodes of decline in East-West relations, providing an ongoing forum where allied and nonallied nations may discuss their differences openly.

Most importantly, the Helsinki process provides hope to the true victims of East bloc neglect of human rights, the individual dissidents, human rights activists, and believers in God.

As one Jewish refusenik remarked to me when I was in Moscow in 1982, "You are our only safeguard."

Last year I traveled to Romania to investigate allegations of severe religious repression in that country. In every church we visited, I was told by individual believers who put themselves at great personal risk simply by speaking to a westerner in public that Western efforts on their behalf gave them great hope.

Clearly the Scriptures which tell us that without hope, the people perish, apply to those people.

Mr. Speaker, we in the West must acknowledge that barring a miracle of profound proportions, reforms in the current status of individual freedoms behind the Iron Curtain promise to be incremental at best, but the alternative to do nothing or to do less or to stand idly by, that, Mr. Speaker, we could never do.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Mr. CONNIE MACK, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

I come to speak this evening for two reasons. One is to try to make people aware of the name Anatoly Michelson, an individual who lives in my district. The other is to, at the same time, use his case to make the point that the Soviet Union is continuing to fail to carry out their responsibilities of the agreement that they signed.

Anatoly Michelson is very typical of my district. He is 67 years old; he is retired; he is a father; he is a grandfather, but there is one very significant difference: He left the Soviet Union in 1958 and has not been able to see his wife or daughter for over 30 years. He has a grandson he has never seen.

We have made continued attempts to bring this issue not only in front of the American people, but also to the Soviet Union. We have been rebuffed at every attempt. We have had Senators involved in trying to raise the level of awareness.

So again I take this time this evening to try to—let me say the name again—Anatoly Michelson. He is a grandfather. He is 67. He has heart trouble. He is retired, and he has one last dream that he wants to see fulfilled in his life before he dies. That is that he wants to see his wife, his daughter, and his grandson.

It seems to me that maybe it is time that we added Anatoly's name to the list that everyone reads out when they are talking about those individuals who are being held in the Soviet Union. What we ought to be asking every day is why will they not let this man's wife, daughter, and grandson go? He is 67. How much longer can this evil empire, as we have referred to it, keep this man separated from his family?

So again, I would ask those who represent this body on the Commission to put his name at the top of the list. Let us not forget him. Let us remind everyone of what Anatoly Michelson is going through on a day-to-day basis. His only dream, all he is asking to have happen is to see his wife, his daughter, and his grandson before he dies.

Let us see if we cannot help him gain that wish.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to another member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], who has been extremely active in this effort.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am never prouder of being a Member of this distinguished deliberative body or a member of its Committee on Foreign Affairs or prouder of its chairman and our Republican ranking member or of a subcommittee chairman than I am when we try to bring human rights issues from any country before the freedom-loving citizens of the world.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] set up hearings yesterday that were some of the most significant panel hearings I have every attended in this Congress.

The first panel addressed itself to the persecution of those people of Jewish heritage in the Soviet Union. Because of the dedication to this cause of Soviet Jewry by those members of Jewish heritage and those of us in this House who have visited with persecuted Jewish citizens in the Soviet Union who have allied ourselves with those of Jewish heritage, this issue has received much currency around the world. Have we made significant advances? No. Have we made some advances? Yes.

But an issue that has not received the same prominence is the issue of the persecution of Christians in the Soviet Union and those of the Islamic faith.

In one of my trips to the Soviet Union where I met with persecuted Jewish dissidents, they brought to us Christian dissidents and said, "Why are you not speaking out for your Christian brothers?"

Yesterday, at the gentleman from Pennsylvania's second panel, I was shown a poster of persecuted Christians in the Soviet Union and it was only a one-Christian, fundamentalist denomination. There are no persecuted Catholic Christians here, no Orthodox Russians who are persecuted here, no Armenian Orthodox persecuted Christians from Armenian SSR. These are people imprisoned from just the persecuted Church of the Fundamentalist Christians in the Soviet Union, the Pentecostal Sect.

For each one of these faces, and many, many female faces among them, it represents suffering in one of the gulag camps of the Soviet Union.

Since you cannot submit for the written CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poster, I submit the prisoner list of just this one denomination of Christians, with their prison camp addresses into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE PERSECUTED CHURCH IN THE SOVIET UNION PRISONER LIST, 1986

Abashin, Veniamin Ivanovich. Born: July 18, 1937; 3 children. Arrested: Oct. 9, 1984. Sentence: 2 years. Release: Oct. 9, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. YaI 22/3, p. Shakhovo, Kromsky raion, Orlovskaya obl., 303202 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lydia S. Abashina, ul. Serpukhovskogo 114, g. Orel, 302011 Soviet Union.

Alemasov, Andrei Ivanovich. Born: Oct. 11, 1921; 8 children. Arrested: June 3, 1983. Sentence: 3.5 years. Release: Jan. 3, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. UE 149/10, 2-23, g. Mendeleevsk, Tatarskaya ASSR, 423640 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Klavdia V. Alemasova, ul. M. Gorkogo 33, g. Elabuga, Tatarskaya ASSR, 423630 Soviet Union.

Andriets, Aleksandr Ivanovich. Born: Jan. 20, 1959; 1 child. Arrested: June 1, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: June 1, 1988. First term. Home address (wife): Anna A. Andriets, ul. Schmidta 14, g. Makeevka, Donetskaya obl., 339040 Soviet Union.

Andriets, Anatoly Ivanovich. Born: June 1, 1960; 1 child. Arrested: June 1, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: June 1, 1988. First term. Home address (wife): Olga V. Andriets, ul. Tverskaya 8, g. Kommunarsk, Voroshilovgradskaya obl., 349103 Soviet Union.

Antonov, Ivan Yakovlevich. Born: Aug. 19, 1919; 3 children. Arrested: May 14, 1982. Sentence: 5 yrs str + 5 yrs exile + confiscation. Release May 14, 1992. Fifth term. Camp address: uchr. YaF 306/2-4, g. Kyzyl, Tuvinskaya ASSR, 667003 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Neonila I. Antonova, ul. Kotovskogo 41, g. Kirovograd, 316030 Soviet Union.

Azarov, Mikhail Ivanovich. Born: Sep. 19, 1935; 5 children. Arrested: Aug. 29, 1984. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Aug. 29, 1989.

71-059 O-87-17 (Pt. 13)

Second term. Camp address: uchr. UN 288/1, 4-42, pos. Nizhny Ingash, Krasnoyarsky krai, 663820 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda V. Azarova, ul. Mokrousova 7, kv. 116, g. Belgorod, 308024 Soviet Union.

Babenko, George Aleksandrovich. Born: Nov. 1, 1926; 6 children. Arrested: Apr. 24, 1984. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Apr. 24, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. YuA 45/75, 4-41, st. Belichi, Kievskaya obl., 255700 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Maria I. Babenko, ul. Furmanova 3, g. Belaya Tserkov, Kievskaya obl., 256400 Soviet Union.

Baklazhansky, Vladimir Georgievich. Born: Oct. 13, 1957; 3 children. Arrested: Nov. 28, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: May 28, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. OSch 29/3 "A", s. Broneshty, Orgeevsky raion, Moldavia, 278421 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Yekaterina I. Baklazhanskaya, ul. Ukrainskaya 34a, pos. Tarakliya, Moldavia, 278740 Soviet Union.

Baraniuk, Ivan Andreevich. Born: Jan. 11, 1924; 5 children. Arrested: Nov. 30, 1983. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Nov. 30 1986. Second term. Camp address: uchr. YaE 308/45, 11-112, pos. Makorty, Sofievsky raion, Dnepropetrovskaya obl., 322723 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Eva P. Baraniuk, ul. Korolenko 26, g. Khmelnitsky, Ukraine, 280008 Soviet Union.

Baturin, Nikolai Georgievich. Born: Dec. 15, 1927; 6 children. Arrested: Nov. 5, 1979. Sentence: 5 yrs str. + 2 yrs str*. Release: Sep. 28, 1986. Seventh term (*Resentenced). Camp address: uchr. ZhD 158/4 "Ye", g. Dzambul, Kazakhskaya SSR, 484049 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Valentina M. Baturina, ul. 60 let SSSR 4. kv, 13, g. Shakhty, Rostovskaya obl., 346500 Soviet Union.

Boiko, Nikolai Yerofeevich. Born: Jan. 9, 1922; 7 children. Arrested: Sep. 29, 1980. Sentence: 5 yrs str + 2 yrs str* + 5 yrs exile. Release: Oct. 11, 1992. Third term (*Resentenced). Camp address: uchr. YaB 257/17-2, pos. Elban, Amursky raion, Khabarovsky krai, 682610 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Valentina I. Boiko, ul. Limannaya 8, pos. shevchenko-1, g. Odessa, 272168 Soviet Union..

Bondar, Pyotr Sergeevich. Born: Dec. 31, 1952; 7 children. Arrested: Sep. 4, 1984. Sentence: 2 years. Release: Sep. 14, 1986. First term. Home address (wife): Tatiana I. Bondar ul. Urzhumskaya 23, kv. 2, g. Gorky, 603080 Soviet Union.

Borinsky, Andrei Vasilievich. Born: Jan. 21, 1957. Arrested: Oct. 17, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct. 17, 1988. First term. Home address (mother): Zinaida F. Borinskaya, s. Novaya Synzhereya, Lazovsky raion, Moldavia, 278711 Soviet Union.

Bosko, Vitaly Nikolaevich. Born: Nov. 5, 1949; 8 children. Arrested: Oct. 19, 1984. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Oct. 19, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. OV 302/42, 5-55, pos. Manevichi, Volynskaya obl., 264810 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nina M. Bosko, ul. Matrosova 18, g. Kivertsy, Volynskaya obl., 264220 Soviet Union.

Bublik Grigory Ivanovich. Born: Mar. 23, 1955; 4 children. Arrested: Feb. 22, 1986. First term. Home address (wife): Lubov P. Bublik, ul. Barkovskogo 14, g. Rostov-na-Donu, 344094 Soviet Union.

Bychkov, Leonid Pavlovich. Born: Apr. 12, 1956; 2 children. Arrested: July 16, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Jan. 16, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. YaYa 310/77 "B", g. Berdyansk 10, Zaporozhnaya obl., 332440 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lilia N. Bychkova, ul. Gorkogo 36, g. Znamenka, Kirovogradskaya obl., 317061 Soviet Union.

Bychkov, Stepan Pavlovich. Born: Feb. 8, 1959; 3 children. Arrested: Mar. 26, 1985. Sentence: 2 years. Release: Mar. 26, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. MKh 324/31 ET, g. Izyaslav, Khmelnitskaya obl., 281200 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lubov N. Bychkova, ul. Bozhenko 34, g. Marganets, Dnepropetrovskaya obl., 322971 Soviet Union.

Chertkova, Anna Vasilievna. Born: Dec. 27, 1927. Arrested: 1973. Sentence: in psychiatric hospital. First term. Psychiatric hosp. address: uchr. UE 148, ul. Yershova 49, g. Kazan, Tatarskaya ASSR, 420082 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Anastasia V. Chertkova, ul. Stankevicha 36, t. Alma-Ata, Kazakhskaya SSR, 480003 Soviet Union.

Chervyakova, Natalia Pavlovna. Born: Sep. 26, 1952. Arrested: Aug. 24, 1983. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Aug. 24, 1986. First term. Camp address: Komend. 1, obsch. 1, kom. 18, pos. Kalinina, Maikopsky raion, Krasnodarsky krai, 372562 Soviet Union. Home address (aunt): Antonina V. Shvetsova, ul. Bliznyukovskogo la, g. Mozdok, 363700 Soviet Union.

Chislin, Ivan Nikolaevich. Born: Jan. 1, 1927; 6 children. Arrested: Oct. 12, 1984. Sentence: 4 years + confiscation. Release: Oc. 12, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. OB 21/6, g. Klintsy, Bryanskaya obl., 243100 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ekaterina P. Chislina, ul. Volodarskogo 4, kv. 8, g. Tambov, 392003 Soviet Union.

Chistyakov, Veniamin Grigorievich. Born: May 1, 1935; 11 children. Arrested: Sept. 29, 1982. Sentence: 4 years. Release: Sep. 29. 1986. First term. Camp address: s. n. kh., ul. Grazhdanskaya 2, pos. Aktas, Karagandinskaya obl., 472341 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lubov N. Chistyakova, ul. 2 Liniya 49, pos. zavodskoy, g. Ordzhonikidze, 362907 Soviet Union.

Chudakov, Stanislav Romanovich. Born: Aug. 9, 1945; 2 children. Arrested: Nov. 21, 1985. Sentence: 3.5 years. Release: May 21, 1989. First term. Home address (wife): Galina A. Chudakova, ul. Kolkhoznaya 20, g. Vsevolzhsk, Leningradskaya obl., 188710 Soviet Union.

Danilchenko, Nikolai Grigorievich. Born: May 1, 1928; 7 children. Arrested: Feb. 26, 1985. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Feb. 26, 1988. Second term. Camp address: uchr. UO 68/5-112, g. Apsheronsk, Krasnodarsky krai, 352690 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda Ya. Danilchenko, ul. Rostovskaya 300, g. Kropotkin, Krasnodarsky krai, 211527 Soviet Union.

Daniliuk, Ivan Grigorievich. Born: Jan. 2, 1938; Arrested: Feb. 21, 1982. Sentence: 5 years str. Release: Feb. 21, 1987. Second term. Camp address: s. n. kh., ul Gorkogo 4, kom. 142, g. Shostka, Sumskaya obl., 245110 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Antonina A. Danilyuk, ul. Politayeva 13, kv. 64, g. Chernovtsky, 274018 Soviet Union.

Dik Gerhard Gerhardovich. Born: Jan. 19, 1926; 7 children. Arrested: Oct. 1, 1982. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Oct. 1, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. OV 94/4, otr. 15, pos. Vydrino, Kabansky ration, Buryatskaya ASSR, 671111 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Margarita P. Dik, ul. Shtrekovaya 103, g. Prokopievsk, Kemerovskaya obl, 653022 Soviet Union.

Dubitsky Adam Iosifovich. Born: Dec. 4, 1924; 9 children. Arrested: Nov. 24, 1985. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Nov. 24, 1988. Fourth term. Home address: (wife): Tavifa F. Dubitskaya, ul. Krylova 4, g. Cherkessk, Stavropolsky krai, 357100 Soviet Union

Dubitsky Sergei Adamovich. Born: Nov. 2, 1959; Arrested: Oct. 30, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct. 30, 1988. First term. Home address: (mother): Tavifa F. Dubitskaya, ul. Krylova 4, g. Cherkessk, Stavropolsky krai, 357100 Soviet Union.

Dzhangetov, Kanshaubi Bekirovich. Born: Apr. 12, 1929; 6 children. Arrested: Oct. 30, 1985. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Oct. 30, 1988. Third term. Home address (wife): Antonina G. Dzhangetova, ul. Levonaberezhnaya 3, g. Ust-Dzheguta, Stavropolsky krai, 357200 Soviet Union.

Enns Dmitri Petrovich. Born: Nov. 18, 1953. Arrested: Apr. 17, 1982. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Apr. 17, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. RU 170/2, 8-27, g. Uralsk, Kazakhskaya, SSR, 417901 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Elena Ya. Enns S. Borisovka, Uspensky raion, Pavlodarskaya obl. Kazakhskaya SSR, 638143 Soviet Union.

Ewert Eduard Yakovlevich. Born: Jun 27, 1949; 7 children. Arrested: Jul 12, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Jan. 12, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. YeTs 166/10, 13-131, g. Tselinograd, Kazakhskaya SSR, 47300 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ekaterina V. Ewert, ul. Chkalova 52, g. Makinsk, Tselinogradskaya obl. Kazakhskaya SSR, 474010 Soviet Union.

Filippov Andrei Vladimirovich. Arrested: Dec. 13, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Dec. 13, 1988. First term. Home address: (mother): Anna D. Filippova, Petergofskoye Shosse, 7/1-485, g. Liningrad, 198330 Soviet Union.

Filippov Vladimir Alekseevich. Born: Dec. 20, 1927. 6 children. Arrested: Nov. 21, 1985. Sentence: 4 years str. Release: Nov. 21, 1989. Second term. Home address: (wife): Anna D. Filippova, Petergofskoye Shosse, 7/1-485, g. Liningrad, 198330 Soviet Union.

Freeman Ewald Rheingoldovich. Born: Jan. 29, 1939. 9 children. Arrested: Apr. 17, 1982. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Apr. 17, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. UG 157/9, 3-32, g. Gurev, 465050 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Maria P. Freeman, ul. Lenina 76, s. Olgino, Uspensky raion, Pavlodarskaya obl. Kazakhskaya SSR, 638143 Soviet Union.

Germaniuk Stepan Grigorievich. Born: Aug. 15, 1934. (5 children). Arrested: May 8, 1983. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: May 8, 1986. Second term. Camp address: uchr. Yua. 45/95,. 10-101, pos. Berezan, Barashivetsky raion, Kievskaya obl. 256210 Soviet Union. Home address (daughter): Lilia S. Germaniuk, ul. Chkalova 6, s. Tsupovka, Dergachevsky raion, Kharkovskaya obl., 312020 Soviet Union.

Germaniuk Ulyana Sergeevna. Born: July 26, 1930; 5 children. Arrested: July 23, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: July 23, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. YuZh 313/54, 13-21, g. Kharkov. Ukraine, 310124 Soviet Union. Home address (daughter): Lilia S. Germaniuk, ul. Chkalovab, s. Tsupovka, Dergachevsky raion, Kharkovskaya obl., 312020 Soviet Union.

Gertsen Susanna Germanovna. Born: Oct. 19, 1928. Arrested: Apr. 22, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Apr. 22, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. OP 32/2, 6-61, s. Stepnoye, Alamedinsky raion, Kirgizskaya SSR, 722169 Soviet Union. Home address (sister): Justina G. Gertsen, s. Kuterlya, p/o Podolsk, Krasnogvardeisky raion, Orenburgskaya obl., 461151 Sovet Union.

Goloschapov Pavel Dorofeevich. Born: Mar. 10, 1929; 4 children. Arrested: June 9,

1985. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Dec. 9, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. UYu 400/1 "K", pos. Komsomolsky, g. Donskoy, Tulskaya obl., 301781 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Tatiana F. Goloschapova, ul. 2 Sadovaya 21, pos. Dubovka, Uzlovskoy raion, Tulskaya obl., 301661 Soviet Union.

Goryanin Mikhail Aleksandrovich. Born: Dec. 11, 1951; 6 children. Arrested: Apr. 15, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Apr. 15, 1988. First term. Home address (wife): Vera N. Garyanina, ul. Proletarskaya 288, g. Tikhoretsk, Krasnodarsky Krai, 352100 Soviet Union.

Gottman Leongard Genrikhovich. Born: Aug. 5, 1923; 8 children. Arrested: Nov. 14, 1985. Sentence: 2 years str. Release: Nov. 14, 1987. Fourth term. Camp address: uchr. Uye 394/15, g. Salavat, Bashkirskaya ASSR, 453200 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nina G. Gottman, ul. Oktyabrskaya 31, g. Davlekanovo, Bashkirskaya ASSR, 452120 Soviet Union.

Gritsenko Vasily Ivanovich. Born: May 21, 1949; 5 children. Arrested: Apr. 11, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Apr. 11, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. OP 17/16, otr. 9, g. Poltava, 315040 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Vera V. Gritsenko, ul. Kominterna 7, s. Malaya Saltanovka, Kievskaya obl., 255138 Soviet Union.

Ivanov Arkady Pavlovich. Born: Jan. 1, 1932; 10 children. Arrested: Sept. 1, 1983. Sentence: in psychiatric hospital. Psychiatric hosp. address: psikhbolnitsa otd. 3, pos. Semenovsk, g. Ioshkar-Ola, Mariiskaya ASSR, Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nina G. Ivanova, ul. Pushkina 2a, kv. 41, p. Silikatny, Leninsky raion, Mariiskaya ASSR, 425060 Soviet Union.

Ivaschenko Anatoli Yakovlevich. Born: Feb. 17, 1952; 4 children. Arrested: Mar. 21, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Sept. 21, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. OR 318/76-8, st. Rafalovka, Vladimiretsky raion, Rovenskaya obl. 265968 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda A. Ivaschenko, ul. Kalinina 48a, pos. Khutory, Cherkasskaya obl., 258209 Soviet Union.

Ivaschenko Lubov Yakovlevna. Born: Mar. 29, 1961. Arrested: Oct. 17, 1985. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Apr. 17, 1988. First term. Home address (mother): Anna I. Ivaschenko, ul. Petrovskogo 87a, p/o Petrovskoye, Kievo-Svyatoshinsky raion, 255203 Soviet Union.

Ivaschenko Yakov Yefremovich. Born: May 10, 1932; 11 children. Arrested: May 22, 1981. Sentence: 4 years plus 4 yrs. exile. Release: May 22, 1989. First term. Exile address: ul. Ordzhonikidze 8-15, pos. Zyryanka, Verkhne-Kolymsky raion, Yakutskaya ASSR, 678770 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Anna I. Ivaschenko, ul. Petrovskogo 87a, p/o Petrovskoye, Kievo-Svyatoshinsky raion, 255203 Soviet Union.

Kalyashin Aleksei Aleksandrovich. Born: Jan. 2, 1955. Arrested: Sept. 1, 1981. Sentence: 3 yrs. str. plus 2.5 years str.* Release: Mar. 1, 1987. Second term (*Resentenced). Camp address: uchr. 201/8-12 "D", g. Gubakha, Permskaya obl., 618294 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nina G. Kalyashina, ul. Sevastopolskaya 239a, kv. 2, g. Irkutsk, 664048 Soviet Union.

Kara Ivan Ivanovich. Born: Dec. 25, 1953; 3 children. Arrested: Nov. 27, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: May 28, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. OSch 29/9, 44-K, g. Kishinev, Moldavia, 277012 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda P. Kara, ul. Ukrainskaya 32a, pos. Tarakliya, Moldavia, 278740 Soviet Union.

Kerstan, Emelyan Fridrikhovich. Born: Dec 5, 1934, 6 children. Arrested: Oct 31, 1982. Sentence: 5 years + conf. Release: Oct 21, 1987 First term. Camp address uchr. UYa 64/29, 10-101, g. Navoi 5, 706800 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Maria V. Kerstan, ul. Trudovaya 3-1 tupik 20, g. Samarkand, Uzbekaskaya SSR, 703002 Soviet Union.

Khailo Vladimir Pavlovich. Born: Apr 15, 1932, 14 children. Arrested: Nov 14, 1980. Sentence: in psychiatric hospital. Psychiatric hosp. address: SPB 23/1, otd. 1, g. Blagoveschensk-7, Amurskaya obl., 675007 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Maria Ye. Khailo, ul. Severnaya 11, g. Krasny Luch, Voroshilovgradskaya obl., 394004 Soviet Union.

Khorev Mikhail Ivanovich. Born: Dec 19, 1931, 3 children Arrested: Jan 27, 1980. Sentence: 5 yrs str + 2 yrs str*. Release: Dec 19, 1986. Fourth term (*Resentenced). Camp address: uchr. OV 94/2, otr. 25, pos. Yuzhny, g. Ulan-Ude, Buryatskaya ASSR, 670016 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Vera G. Khoreva, ul. Minskaya 28, kv. 30, g. Kishinev, Moldavia 277015 Soviet Union.

Kim Vyacheslav Ilich. Born: Sep 9, 1952, 1 child. Arrested: May 10, 1984. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: May 10, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. UYa 64/42, 6-42, g. Zaravshan, Navoinskaya obl., 706801 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ludmila N. Kim, 2-i kvartal 27a, kv. 33, massiv Vodnik, g. Narimanov, Tashkentskaya obl., 702312 Soviet Union.

Kinas Ivan Ervinovich. Born: Jul 5, 1951, 4 children. Arrested: Feb 13, 1982. Sentence: 5 years str + conf. Release: Feb 13, 1987. Second term. Exile address: ul. Kirova 188a, s. Belovodskoye, Moskovsky raion, Kirgizskaya SSR, 722040 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Erna A. Kinas, family with husband in exile.

Kirov Kharlampy Vasilievich. Born: Feb 2, 1942. Arrested: Sep 16, 1983. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Sep 16, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. OSch 29/3 "K", s Broneshty, Orgeevsky raion, Moldavia, 278421 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ulyana I. Kirova, ul. Budennogo 16, s. Novoselovka, Tarakliisky raion, MSSR, 278743 Soviet Union.

Kis Roman Yaroslavovich. Born: May 9, 1949, 1 child. Arrested: Nov. 30, 1985. Sentence: 1 year str. Release: Nov 30, 1986. Home address (wife): Miroslava V. Gudskaya ul. Kutuzova 118, kv. 11 g. Lvov Soviet Union.

Klassen Rudolph Davidovich. Born: Sept. 24, 1931. Arrested: Jun 20, 1980. Sentence: 3 years str + 3 yrs str. Release: June 3, 1986. Third term (*Resentenced). Camp address: uchr. YaD 40/7 "A," pos. Tabaga, Yakutskaya ASSR, 677908 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Talita V. Klassen, ul. Maly Proyezd 19a, g. Karaganda, Kazakhskaya SSR, 470015 Soviet Union.

Klimoschenko Nikolai Stepanovich. Born: Feb 16, 1937, 8 children. Arrested: Jan 25, 1985. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Jan 25, 1988. Second term. Camp address: uchr. YuYe 313/33, 12-123, g. Kirovskoye, Donetskaya obl., 343716 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Vera G. Klimoschenko, ul. D. Ulyanova 150, g. Kherson, Ukraine, 325001 Soviet Union.

Korop, Vladimir Sergeevich. Born: Jun 24, 1942, 8 children. Arrested: Dec 11, 1984. Sentence: 2 years. Release: Dec 11, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. UYu 400/1 "K," pos. Komsomolsky, g. Donskoy, Tulskaya obl., 301781 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Valentina V. Korop, ul. Proletarskaya 92, pos. Kamenetsky, Tulskaya obl., 301650 Soviet Union.

Kosteniuk, Vladimir Iosifovich. Born: Aug 15, 1929, 3 children. Arrested: Sep 23, 1983. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Sep 23, 1986. Second term. Camp address: uchr. UL 314/15-6, g. Perevalsk-3, Voroshilovgradskaya obl., 349140 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Zinaida I. Kosteniuk, ul. Kopernika 2a, kv. 12, g. Chernovtsy, Ukraine, 274022 Soviet Union.

Kostiuchenko, Grigory Vasilievich. Born: Oct 6, 1934, 10 children. Arrested: Sep 29, 1984. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Sep 29, 1987. Fifth term. Camp address: uchr. UO 68/4, 10-21, g. Armavir, Krasnodarsky krai, 352900 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lubov F. Kostiuchenko, ul. Bratskaya 219, g. Timashevsk, Krasnodarsky krai, 353760 Soviet Union.

Kravchuk Yakov Ivanovich. Born: Nov 5, 1955, 1 child. Arrested: Jul 5, 1984. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Jul 5, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. YeT 322/112-7, g. Kopychintsy, Gusyatinsky raion, Ternopolskaya obl., 283510 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lubov A. Kravchuk, ul. Komsomolskaya 41, g. Kivertsy, Volynskaya obl., 264220 Soviet Union.

Kreker Yakov Abramovich. Born: Nov 11, 1934. Arrested: Sep 15, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Sep 15, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. UR 65/3, 2-24, g. Novokuibyshevsk, 446214 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Margarita A. Kreker, ul. Michurina 28, g. Otradny, Kuibyshevskaya obl., 446430 Soviet Union.

Krugovikh Aleksandr Vasilievich. Born: Oct 27, 1946, 5 children. Arrested: Jan 25, 1984. Sentence: 4 years. Release: Jan 25, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. UL 314/24-151, g. Petrovskoye, Voroshilovgradskaya obl., 349333 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Tamara A. Krugovikh, ul. Mendeleyeva 58, g. Makeyevka, Donetskaya obl., 339027 Soviet Union.

Kurkin Aleksei Yakovlevich. Born: Aug 7, 1950, 6 children. Arrested: Oct 9, 1984. Sentence: 4 years. Release: Oct 9, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. UN 1612/40, 7-72, g. Kemerovo, 650028 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Antonina P. Kurkina, ul. Sovietskaya 110, kv, 11, g. Dmitrovsk, Orlovskaya obl., 303240 Soviet Union.

Leven Nikolai Viktorovich. Born: Jan 28, 1958. Arrested: Jul 12, 1984. Sentence: 2 years. Release: Jul 12, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. RU 170/2, 5-25, g. Uralsk, Kazakhskaya SSR, 417901 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Anna K. Leven, ul. Gastello 24, g. Makinsk, Tselinogradskaya obl., 474010 Soviet Union.

Makhovitsky Fyodor Vladimirovich. Born: Oct 5, 1930, 7 children. Arrested: Aug 14, 1981. Sentence: 5 years str + conf. Release: Aug 14, 1986. Second term. Camp address: uchr. K 231/2, 9-7. p/o Lesnoi, Verkhnekamsky raion, Kirovskaya obl., 612870 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Klavdia A. Makhovitskaya, ul. Podvodnika Kuzmina 20, g. Leningrad, 198215 Soviet Union.

Markevich Veniamin Aleksandrovich. Born: Apr 19, 1938, 11 children. Arrested: Oct 1, 1982. Sentence: 5 years str. Release: Oct 1, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. YaD 40/6-12, pos. Mokhsogollokh, Yakutskaya ASSR, 678020 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lubov I. Markevich, ul. Dalnaya 62, pos. Zavodskoi, g. Ordzhonikidze, 362907 Soviet Union.

Misin Nikolai Ivanovich. Born: Sep 2, 1927, 4 children. Arrested: Dec 7, 1983. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Dec 7, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. 25/6 "Z," st. Stenkino, Ryazanskaya obl., 391005 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Aleksandra Ye.

Misina, ul. Chapaeva 114, pos. Kanischevo, g. Ryazan, 390039 Soviet Union.

Mueller Ella Ivanovna. Born: Dec 3, 1948. Arrested: Jul 26, 1985. Sentence: 1 year. Release: July 26, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. YaV 48/5-10, g. Chelyabinsk, 454617 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Erna W. Mueller, ul. Fizkulturnaya 14, pos. Lokomotivny, g. Chelyabinsk, 454051 Soviet Union.

Naprienko, Valentin Yerofeyevich. Born: Jan 22, 1950, 4 children. Arrested: Jul 20, 1985. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Jul 20, 1988. Second term. Camp address: uchr. YuYe 312/33, 10-102, g. Kirovsk, Donetskaya obl., Soviet Union. Home address: (wife): Tatiana N. Naprienko, ul. Dryzhby 2, g. Petushki, Vladimirskaya obl., 601100 Soviet Union.

Naprienko, Veniamin Yerofeyevich. Born: Aug 9, 1945, 5 children. Arrested: Jul 9, 1984. Sentence: 2 years. Release: Jul 9, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. OV 94/4-10, pos. Vydrino, Kabansky raion, Buryatskaya ASSR, 671111 Soviet Union. Home address: (wife): Natalia N. Naprienko, ul. Znamenskaya 8, kv. 98, g. Moscow 107392 Soviet Union.

Nikitkov, Aleksandr Valentinovich. Born: Aug 3, 1944, 6 children. Arrested: Dec 14, 1983. Sentence: 5 years str. Release: Dec 14, 1988. Second term. Camp address: uchr. IZ 47/1, g. Magadan, 685000 Soviet Union. Home address: (wife): Zinaida V. Nikitkova, ul. Chapaeva 113, pos. Kanischevo, g. Ryazan, 390039 Soviet Union.

Okhotin, Vladimir Andreevich, Born: Apr 30, 1942, 8 children. Arrested: Nov 13, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: May 13, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. UO 68/12, 12-121, pos. Oktyabrsky, Primorsko-Akhtarsky raion, Krasnodarsky krai, 353874 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda A. Okhotina, ul. Uralskaya 182, kv. 187, g. Krasnodar, 350080 Soviet Union.

Omelyanchuk, Nikolai Ivanovich, Born: May 3, 1957, Arrested: Sep 13, 1983. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Sep 13, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. Sh 320/8-6, pos. Severny, Cherdynsky raion, Permskaya obl., 618633 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Vera O. Omelyanchuk, s. Dobroe, Kamen-Kashirsky raion, Volynskaya obl., 264542 Soviet Union.

Palanichuk, Ivan Ivanovich, Born: Sep 2, 1949, 5 children. Arrested: Apr 3, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Oct 3, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. YeT 322/112-5, g. Kopychintsy, Gusyatinsky raion, Ternopolskaya obl., 283510 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lydia S. Palanichuk, s. Komarovo, Kelmenetsky raion, Chernovitskaya obl., 275126 Soviet Union.

Pankrats, Olga Ivanovna, Born: Jan 1, 1955. Arrested: Feb 21, 1986. Sentence: Release: First term. Home address (mother): Ekaterina I. Pankrats, ul. Lesnaya 1, khutor Novo-Pokrovka, g. Prokhladny, Kbassr, 361000 Soviet Union.

Pavlenko, Aleksandr Ivanovich, Born: Oct 18, 1952, 4 children. Arrested: Mar 21, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Sep 21, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. YaYa 310/77 "K", g. Berdyansk, Zaporozhskaya obl., 332440 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Tatiana S. Pavlenko, ul. Schorsa 128a, pos. Khutory, Cherkasskaya obl., 258209 Soviet Union.

Peredereev, Vasily Ivanovich, Born: Dec 10, 1931. Arrested: Nov 2, 1985. Sentence: 2 years str. Release: Nov 2, 1987. Second term. Home address (wife): Efrosinya I. Peredereeva, ul. Esenina 43, pos. Nezhdannaya, g. Shakhty, 346518 Soviet Union.

Peters Genrikh Danilovich, Born: Jun 18, 1947, 7 children. Arrested: Dec 26, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years str. Release: Jun 26, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. GM 172/3, 9-91, g. Shevchenko, Mangyshlakskaya obl. 466200 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Elizaveta A. Peters, ul. Sovietskaya 5, s. Martuk, Aktiubinskaya obl., Kazakhskaya SSR, 464020 Soviet Union.

Peters Ivan Isaakovich, Born: Aug 17, 1929, 8 children. Arrested: May 17, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: May 17, 1988. Second term. Camp address: uchr. 123/45, zona 2, s. Chaisovkhoz, g. Tsulukidze, Gruzinskaya, SSR, 384230 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Elena D. Peters, p/o Bzyb, g. Gagra, Abkhazskaya ASSR, 384895.

Peters Peter Danilovich, Born: Jun 6, 1942. Arrested: Jan 27, 1984. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Jan 27, 1987. Fifth term. Camp address: uchr. YaYa 398/13-2, st. Nikolaevskaya, Konstantinovsky raion, Rostovskaya obl. 346692 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Ekaterina P. Peters, ul. Ukrainskaya 53, s. Martuk, Aktiubinskaya obl., Kazakhskaya SSR, 464020 Soviet Union.

Peters Pyotr Abramovich, Born: Jul 19, 1955, 3 children. Arrested: Nov 23, 1984. Sentence: 2 years str. Release: Nov 23, 1986. Second term. Camp address: uchr. OV 156/2 "M", g. Ust-Kamenogorsk, 492005 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Yadviga Ya. Peters, ul. Aktiubinskaya 27, s. Martuk, Aktiubinskaya obl. Kazakhskaya SSR, 464020 Soviet Union.

Pikalov Viktor Anatolevich, Born: Sep 20, 1950, 2 children. Arrested: Dec 11, 1984. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Dec 11, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. UYu 400/4 "Zh", g. Plavsk, Tulskaya obl., 301050 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Tatiana A. Pikalova, ul. Proletarskaya 59, pos. Kamenetsky, Tulskaya obl., Uzlovskoy raion, 301650 Soviet Union.

Pilipchuk Vladimir Nikolaevich, Born: Sep 12, 1985, 5 children. Arrested: Oct 9, 1984. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct 9, 1987. First term. Home address (wife): Vera I. Pilipchuk, ul. Burova 26, kv. 201, g. Orel, 302025 Soviet Union.

Polischuk Nikolasi Petrovich, Born: Mar 2, 1944, 10 children. Arrested: Sep 26, 1981. Sentence: 4 years + 4 yrs exile. Release: Sep 26, 1989. First term. Exile addresss: s. Kedrovy Shor, Pechorsky raion, Komi ASSR, 169702 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Valentina K. Polischuk, ul. Novestroyek 17, g. Novograd-Volynsky Zhitomirskaya obl. 26053 Soviet Union.

Popov Nikolai Filippovich, Born: Mar 27, 1927, 8 children. Arrested: Dec 14, 1983. Sentence: 5 years str. Release: Dec 14, 1988. Third term. Camp address: uchr. YaD 40/6 "Ye" pos. Mokhsogollokh, Yakutakaya ASSR, 678020 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda S. Popova, ul. Zarechnaya 15, kv. 1, g. Ryazan, 390010 Soviet Union.

Pshenitsyn Mikhail Aleksandrovich, Born: Nov 20, 1945, 7 children. Arrested: Nov 27, 1985. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Nov 27, 1988. Second term. Home address (wife): Tamara M. Pshenitsyna, ul. Prigorodnaya 99, g. Zheleznodorozhny, Moskovskaya obl. 143980 Soviet Union.

Pugachev Mikhail Artyomovich, Born: Nov 15, 1935, 10 children. Arrested: Nov. 14, 1985. Sentence: 2 years str. Release: Nov 14, 1987. Third term. Camp Address: uchr. UYe 394/2-14 g. Salavat, Baskhirskaya ASSR, 453200 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Margarita G. Pugacheva, ul. Ufimskaya 1/3, g. Davlekanovo, Bashkirskaya ASSR, 452120 Soviet Union.

Pushkov Eugene Nikiforovich, Born: Mar 6, 1941, 8 children. Arrested: May 27, 1983. Sentence: 5 years str +3 yrs exile. Release: May 27, 1991. Second term. Camp address: uchr. N 240/4, g. Ivdel, Sverdlovskaya obl. 624570 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lubov P. Pushkova, ul. Krasnaya 3, g. Khartsyzsk, Donetskaya obl. 343770 Soviet Union.

Razorvin Pavel Mikhailovich, Born: Sep 7, 1951, 2 children. Arrested: Apr 11, 1985. Sentence: 1 year (begins Apr 1986). Release: Apr 11, 1987. First term. Home address (wife): Ludmila Razorvina, ul. Frezirovschhikov 80, kv.2, g. Perm, 614060 Soviet Union.

Reshetov Vasily Pavlovich, Born: Feb 5, 1921; 6 children. Arrested: Apr 10, 1985. Sentence: 3 years plus conf. Release: Apr 10, 1990. Sentence begins Apr 10, 1987. First term. Home address (wife): Nina M. Reshetova, ul. Mendeleyeva 52, g. Tambov, 392016 Soviet Union.

Rikhert Wilhelm Yakovlevich, Born: Dec 24, 1929; 6 children. Arrested: May 17, 1985. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Nov 17, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. 123/45, zona 2, s. Chaisovkhoz, g. Tsulukidze, Gruzinskaya SSR, 384230 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Anna A. Rikhert, ul. Kondzhariya 6, p/o Bsyb, g. Gagra, Abkhazskaya ASSR, 384895 Soviet Union.

Rogalsky Viktor Pavlovich, Born: Nov 2, 1953; 5 children. Arrested: May 17, 1985. Sentence: 2 years. Release: May 17, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. 123/47-3, s. Nameshevy, g. Tsulukidze, Gruzinskaya SSR, 384230 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Maria Ya. Rogalskaya, p/o Bsyb. g. Gagra, Abkhazskaya ASSR, 384895 Soviet Union.

Romaniuk Vladimir Nikolaevich, Born: Dec 7, 1958. Arrested: Nov 5, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: May 5, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. YeT 322/112-9, g. Kopychintsy, Gusyatinsky raion, Ternopolskaya obl., 283510 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda V. Romaniuk, s. Komarovka, Kremenetsky raion, Ternopolskaya obl., 283293 Soviet Union.

Rublenko Anatoly Timofeevich, Born: Nov 25, 1949; 3 children. Arrested: Feb 3, 1982. Sentence: 6 years str plus 3 yrs exile. Release: Feb 3, 1991. Second term. Camp address: uchr. YaE 308/89, 8-81, g. Dnepropetrovsk, Ukraine, 320104 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lubov Ya. Rublenko, ul. Shefskaya 34, g. Nikolaev, Ukraine, 327037 Soviet Union.

Rumachik Pyotr Vasilievich, Born: Jul 1, 1931; 6 children. Arrested: Aug 15, 1985. Sentence: 5 years str. Release: Aug 15, 1990. Sixth term. Home address (wife): Lubov V. Rumachik, ul. Bolnichnaya 13, kv. 51, g. Dedovsk, Moskovskaya obl., 143530 Soviet Union.

Runov, Anatoly Fedorovich. Born: Jan 24, 1938. Arrested: Jan 24, 1983. Sentence: in psychiatric hospital. Second term. Psychiatric hosp. address: psikhbolnitsa K-108, uchr. US 20 ST-5, g. Leningrad, 195108 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Zoya I. Runova, ul. L. Chaikinoi 7, g. Gorodets, Gorkovskaya obl., 606430 Soviet Union.

Rusavuk, Pyotr Andreevich. Born: Sep 24, 1957. 5 children. Arrested: May 22, 1984. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Nov 22, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. OR 318/76-11, st. Rafalovka, Rovenskaya obl., 265968 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezha A. Rusavuk, ul. Vladimirskaya 83, kv. 76, g. Kovel, Volynskaya obl., 264410 Soviet Union.

Rytikov, Pavel Timofeevich. Born: Jul 20, 1930. 10 children. Arrested: Jan 29, 1986.

Sentence: 1.5 years str. Release: Jul. 29, 1987, Fourth term. Home address (wife): Galina Yu. Rytikova, ul. Podgornaya 30, g. Krasnodon, Voroshilovgradskaya obl., 399340 Soviet Union.

Savchenko, Nikolai Romanovich. Born: Nov 27, 1925. 6 children. Arrested: Jun 11, 1985. Sentence: 2.5 years str. Release: Dec 11, 1987. Third term. Camp address: uchr. UKh 16/9 "D", g. Omsk, 644027 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ludmila L. Savchenko, ul. Smeny 16, g. Omsk, 644030 Soviet Union.

Saveleva, Valentina Ivanovna. Born: Dec 4, 1954. Arrested: Jan 28, 1982. Sentence: 5 years + conf. Release: Jan 28, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. UK 272/11-2, pos. Bozoi, Irkutskaya obl., 666111 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Yulia P. Saveleva, ul. Burovaya 244, g. Budennovsk, Stavropolsky krai, 357920 Soviet Union.

Savenkov, Mikhail Alekseevich. Born: Jul 25, 1925. 4 children. Arrested: Sep 2, 1983. Sentence: 4 years str. Release: Sep 2, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. UF 91/15-14, st. Tabulga, Chistoozerny raion, Novosibirskaya obl., 632710 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Polina M. Savenkova, ul. Engelsa 79, kv. 2, g. Voronezh, 394018 Soviet Union.

Shepel, Nikolai Emelyanovich. Born: Dec 18, 1938. 7 children. Arrested: Jan 26, 1984. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Jan 26, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. YeCh 325/68, 3-92, s. Tagancha, Kanevsky raion, Cherkasskaya obl., 258323 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ekaterina Ya. Shepel, ul. Kalinina 63, pos. Khutory, Cherkasskaya obl., 258209 Soviet Union.

Shevchenko, Natalia Timofeevna. Born: Feb 21, 1956. Arrested: Oct 17, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct 17, 1988. First term. Home address (mother): Yevdokiya F. Shevchenko, s. Novoselovka, Petrovka 2, Tarutinsky raion, Odesskaya obl., 272724 Soviet Union.

Shevyakov, Ivan Ivanovich. Born: Sep 28, 1929. 5 children. Arrested: Mar 4, 1982. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Mar 4, 1987. First term. Camp address: s. n. kh., s/k-27, pos. Liman, Astrakhanskaya obl., 410416 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Vera I. Shevyakova, ul. Kalinina 37, g. Kizlyar, Dagestanskaya ASSR, 368800 Soviet Union.

Shidych, Ivan Grigorievich. Born: Jun 14, 1936. 7 children. Arrested: Jul 29, 1982. Sentence: 3 yrs str +2 yrs str*. Release: Jan 29, 1988. Third term (*Resentenced). Camp address: uchr. GM 172/1-5, g. Shevchenko, Mangyshlakskayha obl., 466200 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Evdokia V. Shidych, ul. Chkalova 34, g. Zyryanovsk, Kazakhskaya SSR, 493730 Soviet Union.

Shmidt, Boris Yakovlevich. Born: Feb 25, 1920. 8 children. Arrested: Aug 11, 1982. Sentence: 4 years. Release: Aug 11, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. UN 1612/40, 12-122, g. Kemerovo, 652000 Soviet Union.

Home address (wife): Agnessa P. Shmidt, ul. Stroitelei 25, g. Anzhero-Sudzhensk, Kemerovskaya obl., 652090 Soviet Union.

Shoshin, Mikhail Nikolaevich. Born: Jun 3, 1929. 3 children. Arrested: Dec 21, 1984. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Dec 21, 1987. First term. Home address (wife): Evgenia I. Shoshina, Uzky pereulok 16, g. Arzamas, Gorkovskaya obl., 607220 Soviet Union.

Shteffen Ivan Petrovich. Born: May 11, 1927. 5 children. Arrested: May 14, 1985. Sentence: 5 years str. Release: May 14, 1990. Third term. Camp address: uchr. UT 174/1, 15-151, g. Arkalyk, Turgaiskaya obl., 459830 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Elfrida G. Shteffan, ul. Severnaya 11, g. Issyk-2, Alma-Atinskaya obl., 483360 Soviet Union.

Shvetsova Dina Vladimirovna. Born: Feb 17, 1961. Arrested: Aug 24, 1983. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Aug 24, 1986. First term. Camp address: komend. 1, obsch. 1, kom. 18, pos. Kalinina, Maikopsky raion, Krasnodarsky krai, 372562 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Antonina V. Shvetsova, ul. Bliznyukovskogo la, g. Mozdok, 363700 Soviet Union.

Skornyakov Yakov Grigorievich. Born: Aug 8, 1928. 9 children. Arrested: Jul 19, 1978. Sentence: 5 years str + 3 yrs str*. Release: Jul 19, 1986. Third term (*Resentenced). Camp address: uchr. GM 172/5 "Z", g. Novy Uzen, Mangyshlakskaya obl., 466207 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nina S. Skornyakova, per. 3-i Trudovoi 19, g. Dzhambul, Kazakhskaya SSR, 484002 Soviet Union.

Sliusar Vasily Leontevich. Born: Jan 1, 1930. 6 children. Arrested: Oct 19, 1984. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct 19, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. IV 301/59, 2-22, s. Trudovoye, Peschansky raion, Vinnitskaya, obl., 288371 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Nadezhda I. Sliusar, ul. Kosmonatov 65, g. Kivertsy, Volynskaya obl., 264220 Soviet Union.

Tarasova Zinaida Petrovna. Born: 1942. Arrested: Oct 17, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct 17, 1988. Second term. Home address (mother): Anastasia Ye. Tarasova, Voroschievsky s/s, d. Rassylnaya, Kurskaya obl., Soviet Union.

Timchuk Ivan Vasilievich. Born: May 18, 1919. 6 children. Arrested: Sep 18, 1984. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Sep 18, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. YuYe 312/87, 2-23, g. Gorlovka, Donetskaya obl., 338035 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Regina I. Timchuk, p. Lenina "V" d. 72, g. Makeyevka-3, Donetskaya obl., 339003 Soviet Union.

Tkach Vasily Ivanovich. Born: May 31, 1946. 3 children. Arrested: Feb 5, 1984. Sentence: 3.5 years. Release: Aug 5, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. YuZh 313/17-180, pos. Oktyabrsky, Balakleisky raion, Kharkovskaya obl., 313810 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Maria A. Tkach, 1 per. Chapayeva 10, g. Novograd-Volynsky, Zhitomirskaya obl., 260500 Soviet Union.

Tkachenko Ivan Ivanovich. Born: Jun 5, 1959. Arrested: Jul 12, 1984. Sentence: 2 years. Release: Jul 12, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. UAP 162/7, 12-122, g. Pavlodar, Kazakhskaya SSR, Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Aleksandra I. Tkachenko, ul. Chkalova 36, Rudnik Bestyube, Selitinsky raion, Tselinogradskaya obl., 474150 Soviet Union.

Tkachenko Nikolai Sergeevich. Born: Jun 1, 1932. 3 children. Arrested: Jun 11, 1985. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Jun 11, 1990. First term. Home address (wife): Polina Ye. Tkachenko, ul. Timiryazeva 43, g. Shibekino, Belgorodskaya obl., 309250 Soviet Union.

Tolstopyatov Ivan Alekseevich. Born: Jun 26, 1936. 9 children. Arrested: Apr 10, 1985. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Oct 10, 1987. First term. Camp address: uchr. YaT 30/7 "V", pos. Polevoy, Kirsanovsky raion, Tambovskaya obl., 393354 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Lydia A. Tolstopyatova, ul. Tregulaevskaya 86, g. Tambov, 392002 Soviet Union.

Tsitsyn Boris Andreevich. Born: Oct 12, 1926. 8 children. Arrested: May 13, 1983. Sentence: 3 years. Release: May 13, 1986. First term. Camp address: uchr. 288/28, 19-119, p/o Khairuzovka, Ilansky raion, Krasnodarsky krai, 663850 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Maria V. Tsitsyna, ul. Gastello 14, g. Krasnoyarsk, 660070 Soviet Union.

Tuliupa Vladimir Fedorovich. Born: Jan 2, 1940. 7 children. Arrested: Jul 10, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Jul 10, 1988. First term. Camp address: ul. Zavodskaya 15, kom. 10, pos. Turynino, g. Kaluga-20, 249120 Soviet Union. Home address: Olga I. Tuliupa, Ofitsersky prospekt 69 "B", kv. 2, g. Donetsk, 340096 Soviet Union.

Vlasenko, Vladimir Mefodievich. Born: Dec. 14, 1954. 2 children. Arrested: Feb. 3, 1982. Sentence: 4 yrs + 2 yrs exile + conf. Release: Feb. 3, 1988. First term. Home address (wife): Ludmila P. Vlasenko, ul. Kotsyubinskogo 42/2, g. Nikolaev, 327037 Soviet Union.

Wolf, Andrei Korneevich. Born: May 7, 1958. 3 children. Arrested: Nov 25, 1984. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Nov 25, 1989. First term. Camp address: uchr. LA 155/2 "K", pos. Zarechny, Iliisky raion, Alma-Atinskaya obl., Kazakhskaya SSR, 483333 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ekaterina Ya. Wolf, ul. M. Gorkogo 190, g. Issyk, Alma-Atinskaya obl., 483360 Soviet Union.

Wolf, Egor Korneevich. Born: May 31, 1955. 5 children. Arrested: Nov 24, 1984. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Nov 24, 1989. First term. Camp address: uchr. UK 161/2, 4-43, g. Kustanai-12, 458012 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Elena B. Wolf, ul. Urozhainaya 26a g. Issyk, Alma-Atinskaya obl., 483360 Soviet Union.

Yanushevskaya, Anna Rikhardovna. Born: Feb 26, 1954. Arrested: Oct 17, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct 17, 1988. First term. Home address (mother): Susana P. Yanushevskaya, ul. Michurina 37, s. Pokrovka, Iliisky raion, Alma-Atinskaya obl., 483330 Soviet Union.

Yanushevskaya, Elena Rikhardovna. Born: Dec 13, 1956. Arrested: Oct 17, 1985. Sentence: 3 years. Release: Oct 17, 1988. First term. Home address (mother): Susana P. Yanushevskaya, ul. Michurina 37, s. Pokrovka, Iliisky raion, Alma-Atinskaya obl., 483330 Soviet Union.

Yefremov, Veniamin Sergeyevich. Born: Apr 9, 1958. Arrested: Dec 13, 1985. Sentence: 2.5 years. Release: Jun 13, 1988. First term. Home address (wife): Tatiana N. Yefremova, Novoizmailovsky prospekt 3, kv. 276, g. Leningrad, 196128 Soviet Union.

Yudintsev, Vasily Ivanovich. Born: Feb 1, 1931. 13 children. Arrested: Feb 21, 1986. Sentence: Release: Second term. Home address (son): Aleksandr V. Yudintsev, ul. Lermontova 63, g. Khartsysk, Donetskaya obl., 343700 Soviet Union.

Yudintseva, Serafima Anatolevna. Born: Jan 12, 1938. 13 children. Arrested: Mar 1, 1985. Sentence: 2 years to begin Mar 1, 1987. Release: Mar 1, 1989. First term. Home address (son): Aleksandr V. Yudintsev, ul. Lermontova 63, g. Khartsyzsk, Donetskaya obl., 343700 Soviet Union.

Zhukovskaya, Evelina Stepanovna. Born: Jul 2, 1940. Arrested: May 13, 1983. Sentence: 5 years. Release: May 13, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. YuL 34/5-25, g. Kozlovka, Chuvashskaya ASSR, 429430 Soviet Union. Home address (mother): Serafima V. Lyakhova, ul. Lenina 120, kv. 25, g. Stavropol, 355012 Soviet Union.

Zimens, Pyotr Yakovlevich. Born: Aug 18, 1950. Arrested: Dec 25, 1985. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Dec 25, 1988. Second term. Camp address: uchr. OK 160/5, 4-43, s. Novoukrainka, Volodarsky raion, Kokchetavskaya obl., 476210 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Frida E. Zimens, ul. Lermon-

tova 117, g. Schuchinsk, Kokchetavskaya obl., 476410 Soviet Union.

Zinchenko, Pavel Petrovich. Born: Jun 18, 1958. 1 child. Arrested: Jun 19, 1983. Sentence: 5 years. Release: Jun 19, 1988. First term. Camp address: uchr. YuYe 312/2 "A" 5, g. Dzerzhinsk-2, Donetskaya obl., 343550 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Ludmila A. Zinchenko, per. Glazunova 16a, g. Kharkov, 310137 Soviet Union.

Zinchenko, Vladimir Petrovich. Born: Jun 13, 1950. 2 children. Arrested: Feb 27, 1984. Sentence: 3 years str. Release: Feb 27, 1987. Second term. Camp address: uchr. ZhKh 385/7-11, st. Potma, pos. Sosnovka, Zubovo-Polyansky raion, Mordovskaya ASSR, 431120 Soviet Union. Home address (wife): Vera G. Zinchenko, ul. P. Romanova 2, kor. 2, kv. 119, g. Moscow, 109193 Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an article on Christian women facing increasing persecution, by the Council of Evangelical Baptist Churches of the Soviet Union for the RECORD.

CHRISTIAN WOMEN FACE INCREASING PERSECUTION

Christian women are getting arrested more and more frequently in the Soviet Union. Two were pulled off a train in Mineralnye Vody in June 1986, and taken to a local jail for questioning. Margaret Gottman, 29, a pastor's daughter, and Zinaida Vilchinskaya, 55, a pastor's wife, are still being held in police custody.

The actual charges are not yet known, but are believed to be related to the fact that both women are relatives of Christian prisoners.

Margaret Gottman is the daughter of Leongard Gottman, a Baptist pastor from Davlekanovo, who is now serving his fourth prison term for Christian activities.

Zinaida Vilchinskaya is the mother of Galina Vilchinskaya, a young girl who served five years imprisonment for teaching at a children's summer Bible camp, and the wife of Vladimir Vilchinsky, pastor of a Baptist congregation in Brest which has been subjected to police raids and exhorbitant fines during the past year.

Mrs. Vilchinskaya is also known to be an active member of the Council of Prisoners' Relatives (CPR), a support group organized in 1964 by wives and mothers of imprisoned Baptist leaders. These women meet together, pray together, comfort each other, help each other, and collect information and letters about what is happening to Christians in their country. Their regular publication, Bulletin, provides documentation of arrests, trials, beatings, fines, confiscation of property, house searches, deprivation of parental rights, and internment in psychiatric hospitals. The CPR Bulletin, circulated among the independent Evangelical Baptist churches in the Soviet Union, is widely recognized as the most reliable source of information regarding persecution of Baptists.

Soviet authorities have never appreciated systematic documentation of their illegal activities. In this case, they are attempting to curtail the spread of information by terrorizing the middle-aged women who collect and publish it.

For example, Aleksandra Kozorezova, 50, CPR director, had just welcomed her husband, Aleksei Kozorezov, home from five years of imprisonment, when police raided their house, this time searching for her. She was advised by local church leaders to go underground in July 1985.

Serafima Yudintseva, 48, was arrested and sentenced to two years imprisonment, effective when the youngest of her thirteen children turns five next year. Her husband, Vasily Yudintsev, was arrested in February 1986, just weeks before their eldest son Andrei, arrested at age 18, returned home after three and one-half years imprisonment.

Ulyana Germaniuk, 56, was arrested and sentenced to three years imprisonment in July 1985, while her husband, preacher stepan Germaniuk, was still in his third year of a strict regime sentence.

Criminal proceedings have been started against Valentina Firsova, Maria Freeman, Elena Enns, Vera Khoreva, Lubov Rumachik, and Lubov Kostiuchenko. Several other wives and mothers of Christian prisoners face continual harassment and the threat of arrest.

Mr. Speaker, I also submit the statement yesterday before the gentleman from Pennsylvania's subcommittee by the Honorable Richard Schifter, who is an excellent choice for our Assistant Secretary of State at the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs at our State Department.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD SCHIFTER

As this is Part Two in a series of hearings on the subject of religion in the Soviet Union, I would like to start out by setting forth my understanding of the significant difference between the subject matter of the first hearing and the subject matter of the present hearing.

The first hearing focused on the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. Jews, in the Soviet scheme of things, are viewed not as a religious group but as an ethnic group, or, to use Soviet terminology, as a nationality. Jews suffer discrimination in the Soviet Union because anti-Semitism—discrimination based purely on ancestry—has become state policy. Whether a Jew attends services in a synagogue or in other ways practices his religion makes a marginal difference at best.

The situation is vastly different with persons who practice the Christian faith and, perhaps to a lesser extent, also with Moslems. Soviet citizens born into ethnic groups that historically have adopted Christianity or Islam as their religion have the opportunity of rising to the very top of the Soviet Union's governmental pyramid, provided they don't identify themselves with the religious faith of their ethnic groups. If they do, they limit their opportunities for advancement. The severity of these limitations is proportional to the extent of the person's religious involvement.

In recent years, to be sure, we have heard eye-witness reports from highly respected American religious personalities as to the tolerance of religious observance in the Soviet Union. These visitors to the Soviet Union reported accurately and fairly what they saw. They were, of course, unable to report what was hidden from their view.

What these recent visitors to the Soviet Union may have thought they might encounter was an active crusade against all forms of religion, a continuing deep, publicly-manifested commitment to atheism. They were pleasantly surprised not to encounter evidence of an overt atheistic campaign. What they failed to understand fully is that a newer approach to the repression of religion had taken the place of the earlier campaign for atheistic doctrine.

Atheism was undoubtedly an important element of the ideological foundation on which the Bolsheviks erected their state. But, like other facets of that ideology, the commitment to atheism has been significantly attenuated. In this, the 69th year of its existence, the Soviet state is committed largely to maintaining in power its ruling class, "The New Class", as Milovan Djilas called it.

It is in this context that the Soviet attitude toward religion can be readily understood. To the extent to which religion can serve the ruling class it will be used. To the extent to which it interferes with the objectives of the ruling class it will be suppressed.

A few years ago Jeane Kirkpatrick reminded us all of the significant difference between totalitarian and authoritarian systems. She was roundly criticized for her observations by persons who were unable to disprove the validity of her thesis. The manner in which religion is dealt with in the Soviet Union offers an object lesson in the operation of a totalitarian system.

The Soviet Union's ruling class, known as the Nomenklatura, consists of the leaders of government, the leaders of the party, the leaders of the military, and the leaders of the various governmentally-operated economic, educational, scientific and cultural institutions. What is expected of this leadership group is loyalty to each other, loyalty to the system that maintains these leaders in power. What is expected of them is, therefore, a single-minded commitment which must not be diluted by a set of potentially conflicting loyalties. The practice of a religious faith would suggest such a conflicting loyalty and is, therefore, deemed unacceptable. It follows that no known religious believer may join the Nomenklatura.

Immediately below the leadership group is the pool of persons who have been identified as potential candidates for leadership, the lower-ranking members of the Communist Party. They, too, must in this totalitarian scheme be free of the danger of another set of loyalties. Known religious believers are, therefore, disqualified from entering the group that can qualify for leadership positions.

But then there is that great mass of people which constitutes the country's rank and file. As George Orwell suggested in his remarkably prescient outline of the future course of a Leninist state, different rules apply to the common people. In today's Soviet Union these persons may engage in religious observance as long as that is done in a place authorized by the government, at a time authorized by the government, and in a format authorized by the government.

Under a statutory scheme first put together in 1929, religion may be practiced in the Soviet Union under the auspices of religious associations duly licensed by the government for this purpose. These licensed associations must, in order to remain licensed, act in accordance with the rules, regulations, and specific instructions of the council of Religious Affairs, the body that supervises all licensed religious activities in the Soviet Union. The Council, in turn, works through regional commissioners, with whom the religious associations must register. A Commissioner can refuse to register an association or he can cancel a registration without citing any reason.

By utilizing this regualtory scheme, the Soviet government allows the performance of traditional rituals, traditional prayers, and traditional religious practices which do not involve significant interaction among religious believers. To illustrate the point I just made: believers may pray together, may

sing together, but they may not engage in discussions on religious topics.

What is true of the individual believer, is also true of the clergy. The clergy may perform rituals, may lead congregations in prayer, but may not otherwise interact with believers. Moreover, what is expected of the clergy is support of the state when called upon, including supporting of the state's foreign policy objectives at international gatherings or on vistis abroad. There are some clergymen who may perform the tasks assigned to them by the state out of conviction. There are others who view these tasks as the price they must pay in order to be able to carry on their religious traditions. Beyond that, it has been suggested that the clergy has been infiltrated by the KGB and that KGB operatives might even be hearing confession.

So far I have described what in the Soviet Union constitutes the authorized practice of religion. That is what American religious personalities have been able to witness in the Soviet Union. It is a new format of an old tradition, that of creating Potemkin villages.

What the visitors don't see is what goes on with regard to religious observance in the Soviet Union outside the officially-sanctioned ceremonial occasions. What they don't see are the unlicensed activities which are carried on illegally and at serious risk to the participants. What the totalitarian system of the Soviet Union does not tolerate is any form of association of individuals outside the duly licensed pattern. Bible study groups, religious discussion groups, religious gatherings in places not duly authorized by the government, religious meetings not authorized by the government, religious events held under the auspices of unlicensed religious groups can all lead to criminal prosecution and punishment. To make sure that the laws on this subject are enforced, a system of special volunteer spy committees has been created whose job it is to report violators. These neighborhood committees, which are called "Public Commissions for Control Over Observance of the Laws About Religious Cults", watch over their neighbors and they report violators to the authorities. That is how Evangelical Christians, Mennonites, Baptists, Pentecostals, as well as Lithuanian or Ukrainian Catholics, get into trouble, as do those Russian Orthodox who refuse to be co-opted by the state.

To the chagrin of the authorities, interest in religion on the part of the Soviet people has been on the increase in recent years. This has included not only participation in governmentally-authorized religious observance but also in what in the Soviet Union are deemed illegal religious activities. Violations of the law have become too numerous to permit them to be enforced rigidly and consistently. As a result, a good many violations tend to be ignored. But when the KGB decides to move, it clamps down hard. Persons guilty of the illegal practice of religion are sent off for many years to a prison, labor colony, or forced into exile, often on trumped-up charges. In those cases in which it appears inconvenient to invoke what in the post-Stalin era has been called "Socialist Legality", namely a criminal proceeding, the luckless religious practitioner is sent off to an institution for the mentally ill. Whether one device is used or another, a climate of fear is engendered among those whose faith requires of them religious practice other than that which the state has deigned to license.

Though the advocacy of atheism is, as I noted earlier, no longer a high priority item in the Soviet Union, it is still the prevailing philosophy in the schools. That is where efforts are made by teachers to indoctrinate children with the Soviet Union's state religion of Communism and where children from believing families are held up for ridicule. This is, therefore, one more hardship imposed on the families of religious believers.

The practices which I have here described are all in contravention of the provisions of such international instruments as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration Against Religious Intolerance, documents approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations without objection from the Soviet Union. They are also in violation of the Helsinki Final Act, a document subscribed to in 1975 by General Secretary Brezhnev. What, we need to ask ourselves, did the Soviet Union have in mind when it acquiesced in undertakings which it had no intention of observing? The answer is that it probably considered it less embarrassing to go along with the text and then ignore it rather than to make an issue of the matter.

What we who believe in freedom of religion need to do is make it clear that such conduct is not acceptable, that it will be noted, will be publicized, and the Soviet Union will be criticized for its failure to observe the internationally-recognized standards of freedom of religion.

Will that make any difference? We can't be sure. But what we can be sure of is that those persons, including religious leaders, who look the other way when religious believers in the Soviet Union are deprived of their rights, allow these repressive activities to continue. Only by pointing out that what is done is wrong, by shining a spotlight on the wrongdoers, can we hope to effect change. What this Committee is doing today is to shine a spotlight on the problem. That is indeed a significant contribution to the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schifter, in his opening paragraph, said this to the gentleman's committee:

This is part two in a series of hearings on the subject of religion in the Soviet Union. I would like to start out by setting forth my understanding of the significant difference between the subject matter of the first hearing and the subject matter of the second panel hearing.

The first hearing focused on the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. Jews, in the Soviet scheme of things, are viewed not as a religious group but as an ethnic group, or, to use Soviet terminology, as a nationality. Jews suffer discrimination in the Soviet Union because anti-Semitism—discrimination based purely on ancestry—has become state policy. Whether a Jew attends services in a synagogue or in other ways practices his religion makes a marginal difference.

□ 1850

The situation is vastly different with persons who practice the Christian faith, and perhaps to a lesser extent also with Moslems.

Soviet citizens born into ethnic groups that historically have adopted Christianity or Islam as their religion have the opportunity of rising to the very top, which means that Jews do not any longer, of the Soviet Union's governmental pyramid provided they do not identify themselves with the religious faith of their ethnic group. If they do, they limit their opportunities for advancement and the severity of these limitations is directly proportional to the extent of the person's religious involvement, and so goes Mr. Schifter's excellent statement which I have inserted in the RECORD.

Now, Mr. Speaker, someone mentioned Ted Turner's name in an earlier presentation. I believe it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [DON RITTER]. Ted Turner, over my service in the House, has become more than an acquaintance. I consider him a friend.

I am going to appeal to Mr. Turner publicly to try and balance the record from the Goodwill Games and his laying that wreath on Lenin's tomb to try, because I think he is a fair man, to try and get some of the message out on what he calls the world's most important network, and since it is on 24 hours a day and it also has a separate CNN channel 2 with headline news 24 hours a day, maybe they are a double-whammy, most important network.

I want him to balance on CNN the story of religious persecution in the Soviet Union.

Now, we seem to have a front-burner mentality in the news media in the United States where we can only handle one issue at a time. The issue that seems to be up now is South Africa. I do not mind how much heat we put on South Africa for the horrible violations of human rights in that country; but have may colleagues and the citizens in this country noticed that religious people like Bishop Tutu and Rev. Alan Boesak can travel out of their country any time they want, into the free world, to Europe, to the capitols, London, Paris, and Washington, DC, and make their case about the human rights violations in South Africa?

Who is allowed to travel out of the Soviet Union to come here and make a case for the religious persecution in the Soviet Union? I ask Mr. Turner to go to these groups, like the panel that appeared before Mr. YATRON'S committee yesterday, and let that message get out of this intense persecution of Christians and orthodox faith people, Moslems and the continued story we are trying to get out on the persecution of Soviet Jews.

There are at least 1,000 people, maybe 10,000 in those Gulag concentration camps because they love their god. They want to go to synagogue. They want to go to church and pray to Jesus. They want to practice their orthodox faith and give homage to Jesus or they want to practice their Islamic faith.

This is a story that is so distorted on our networks; for example, by name the "Phil Donahue Show," where he takes one of the leading, paid agents and propagandists of the Soviet

Union, Vladimir Posner, and puts him center stage on America's most watched talk show, alone, in a chair for two back-to-back shows, 2 solid hours, and Phil Donahue allows Vladimir Posner to use the NBC studios at 30 Rockefeller Plaza, and syndicated through multimedia entertainment, Donahue's own syndication company, to over 216 American stations, Australian stations, 6 stations in Canada—he lets Posner say, "There is no religious persecution in the Soviet Union."

What a travesty. Let us get these groups on the "Phil Donahue Show" that appeared yesterday before Mr. YATRON's committee.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who has been the greatest inspiration in Congress for the Helsinki accords.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] who is chairman of the Human Rights International Organization Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Let me also express my appreciation to the House cochairman of the Helsinki Commission and the members of the Helsinki Commission, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and also the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, represented here today by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS]. All have joined vigorously in the struggle for the recognition of human rights as an important matter in international affairs, and also because of the subject itself.

So it is very appropriate indeed that all of these groups come together, and my colleagues, all of whom are interested in this matter, to rededicate ourselves to the designation of a particular day.

All of them are important, but I dare say all of us agree that this day has a particular importance, designating August 1 of this year on the anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki accords.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution (S.J. Res. 371) which designates August 1, 1986, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day" and calls upon the President to issue a proclamation reasserting the commitment of the United States to full implementation of the human rights and humanitarian provisions of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act.

This resolution unanimously passed the other body on July 23 and is nearly identical to House Joint Resolution 667 which was introduced by our colleagues, Mr. LANTOS and Mr. PORTER, the cochairmen of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, Mr. YATRON, the distinguished chairman of the Human Rights Subcommittee, Mr. HOYER, the cochairman of the Helsinki Commission, and 59 other cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as the former Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, known as the Helsinki Commission, which monitors Soviet and East European compliance with the human rights provision of the Helsinki accords, I have witnessed first-hand the importance of expressions of congressional support for human rights. We in the Congress must remain steadfast in our defense of human rights and redouble our efforts to draw the glare of international public opinion onto those governments that abuse the human rights of their citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 371 is similar to a measure adopted by the Congress last year which designated May 7, 1985, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day." That date was the opening day of the 35-nation meeting of experts on human rights that was held in Ottawa, Canada, By designating May 7, 1985, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day" we strengthened the hand of the U.S. delegation to this special human rights meeting and publicly supported their efforts to achieve greater respect for human rights in all Helsinki countries.

The date change in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, was made to focus attention on the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki accords by the heads of state of the United States, Canada, the Soviet Union, and 32 European nations.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 371 calls upon the President to continue his efforts to achieve full implemention of the Helsinki accords' human rights and humanitarian provisions by raising at every available opportunity, both in bilateral and multilateral fora, the issue of Soviet and East European human rights violations.

The resolution also calls upon the President to enlist the support of our allies in promoting respect for human rights in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Finally, the measure requests the President to communicate to the other 34 signatories of the Helsinki accords our position that respect for human rights is vital to further progress in the ongoing effort to achieve total compliance with the accords, thus making it clear that progress in human rights is an essential component of improved East-West relations.

Never in modern history have the heads of states of 35 states come together to agree, as was done in the case of the Helsinki accords on a statement of principles which guide the conduct between countries and guide the conduct of countries to their own peoples.

All in an effort to improve the situation that exists on man's treatment to man.

While there is no enforcement mechanism in this agreement, no police, no judge, no jury in the technical sense, to bring about compliance by these heads of states and their governments, to these strong, broad principles and concepts, there is in fact a jury. There is in fact, an enforcement; and that is us, the people of the world, with a particular opportunity and responsibility to the people of the United States because of who we are, and the fundamental beliefs in our own Government upon which this great Nation was founded.

That is the reason we bear a special challenge and responsibility in the compliance with these precepts. We not only believe, and we are not perfect, but we try to implement with due recognition of the fact that we still have a lot to do; but in comparison with the rest of the world, particularly those behind the Iron Curtain, I think we can be justly proud of our human rights record in the book of history.

Therefore, it is of particular note that one of the great institutions of the people of the United States, the Congress; directly responsible to the people, embodying all the elements of the great principles of our Government, takes the time to actually pass legislation designating a day of rededication to these principles.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I have been off the floor, but I am pleased that I came back on the floor when the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is speaking.

I think all of us on this floor understand and know that no one in the United States, indeed perhaps in the world, has been any more faithful to the Helsinki process, to informing our citizens in the United States and indeed the publics of the Western World, the importance of the Helsinki accords and the Helsinki process, as has the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida, DANTE FASCELL.

I would be remiss, as cochairman of the Helsinki Commission, as his successor after more than 10 years of outstanding and courageous leadership on this issue if I did not note, as we pass this resolution which Congressman PORTER has introduced and which, as I indicated earlier, is most appropriate. If we did not also take the opportunity to thank and to congratulate the

chairman for his commitment to the Helsinki process.

□ 1900

No American, indeed perhaps, as I said earlier, no person in the world has dedicated himself to furthering the aims of the Helsinki Final Act any more than our chairman.

I congratulate him on that.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland, who is a very worthy successor as chairman on behalf of the House of Representatives of the Helsinki Commission. I would be less than human if I did not say "thanks" for coming back to the floor and reminding me of the fact that I had the opportunity to serve as chairman of the Helsinki Commission.

What I was about to say, because of the appropriateness of the House and the Congress acting on this resolution, is that serving on the Helsinki Commission and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] on the Human Rights Subcommittee and with the House caucus on human rights, all of that has had a profound effect on me as an individual. In my service in the Congress I do not know that just being involved as I was in other matters would have had that kind of effect. But the opportunity of service gave me a direct insight into the whole process, you might say, of human nature in the international sense, the politics of it, the brutality of it and the courage of it. And so it has deeply affected my own thinking and my own stance with respect to not only legislative matters here in the Congress but my general attitude on foreign policy and other issues.

Very important, significant. I am sure that all of you, my colleagues who have had a chance to serve directly either in the congressional caucus, on the Human Rights Subcommittee, or in the Helsinki Commission have experienced the same thing. First, there is a feeling of respect for the fact that this was an unusual document. It had never occurred before in history. This was one, signed by heads of state.

Then there was a general awareness of the brutality and the lack of compliance, and that while all these good things had been said, nevertheless people were suffering and dying and being harassed. It was very difficult if not impossible to reach out and say at any one point that we are making progress. Mankind is making progress in some way, in the way we treat people, in the way we treat each other; and that despite the struggle that is going on ideologically between nations, that there is something more fundamental here that is extremely disturbing to all of us.

That raised the question of "Well, what are you doing about it? How can you do anything about it? Why is Helsinki any good?" There are unenforceable accords, no visible progress that can be made, so why do we continue to adhere to something of this kind? Why do we not just walk away from it? The answer to that came from the people themselves who were struggling, who had great faith in the principles which this country espouses, and for us to ever underestimate the tremendous reception and understanding all over the world that exists about this country, and the precepts under which we operate, would be a mistake.

It is a focus, it is a light, it is hope that springs eternal, that people who are mistreated, maltreated or otherwise harassed, hope and pray and struggle for the day when they, too, can have some measure of sustenance. Every one of the people that we have talked to, all of us, has said constantly to us, "Don't stop. Just keep doing what you are doing. Never get frustrated. Never give up hope. We on the other side are the ones who are willingly making the commitment. Don't feel sorry for us. We commit our lives, the lives of our families, we commit our future, we commit all our worldly goods in the hope that someday we, too, can have the opportunity to live like you do."

Now if that is not encouragement enough, I do not know what is. It smooths out all of the frustration, it gives all of us the determination to go on, to go to the next review conference in Vienna and to sit there, to have the opportunity to listen to the brutality and the lack of progress in the implementation. But the fact is that the very process of Helsinki has made it possible, as my colleagues have previously pointed out, that we have the opportunity to make it a very important part of international process. That is what Helsinki has meant, and it has also meant that a great many people have real hope in what the congressional caucus is doing, what the Human Rights Subcommittee is doing, what the Helsinki Commission is doing and what the Congress is doing.

This resolution, which we will adopt today, will be noted in the dimmest, darkest corners of the world. It will tell those people they have not been forgotten. That is the sustenance they need. When somebody who spends 9 years in solitary confinement with no light for simply advocating the right of freedom of religion, that person respects and understands what we are doing here if nobody else does. So this is a very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise as a Member of Congress to say that I strongly support it and endorse it, to make the commitment with my colleagues that despite the odds, despite the adversity, despite mankind's own stubbornness is dealing with men, we will persevere simply by saying, "You, too, wherever you are, shall have the right to do what we are doing today."

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the third CSCE followup meeting in Vienna this November, it is vital that we continue to emphasize respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. I commend my colleagues on the Helsinki Commission and the Human Rights Subcommittee for their initiative in introducing this legislation, and I urge our colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the Senate joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. PORTER. 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 389, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—389

Akaka	Burton (CA)	Dellums
Alexander	Burton (IN)	Derrick
Anderson	Bustamante	DeWine
Andrews	Byron	Dickinson
Annunzio	Callahan	Dicks
Anthony	Carper	Dingell
Applegate	Carr	DioGuardi
Archer	Chandler	Dixon
Armey	Chapman	Donnelly
Aspin	Chappell	Dorgan (ND)
Atkins	Chappie	Dornan (CA)
AuCoin	Cheney	Dowdy
Barnard	Clinger	Downey
Bartlett	Coats	Dreier
Barton	Cobey	Duncan
Bateman	Coble	Durbin
Bates	Coelho	Dwyer
Beilenson	Coleman (MO)	Dyson
Bennett	Coleman (TX)	Early
Bentley	Collins	Eckart (OH)
Bereuter	Combest	Eckert (NY)
Berman	Conte	Edwards (CA)
Biaggi	Cooper	Edwards (OK)
Bilirakis	Coughlin	Emerson
Bliley	Courter	Erdreich
Boehlert	Coyne	Evans (IA)
Boggs	Craig	Evans (IL)
Boland	Crockett	Fascell
Bonior (MI)	Daniel	Fawell
Borski	Dannemeyer	Fazio
Bosco	Darden	Feighan
Boulter	Daschle	Fiedler
Brooks	Daub	Fields
Brown (CO)	Davis	Fish
Bruce	de la Garza	Flippo
Bryant	DeLay	Florio

Foley
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldon
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—1

Crane

NOT VOTING—41

Ackerman
Badham
Barnes
Bedell
Bevill
Boner (TN)
Bonker
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Campbell
Carney
Clay
Conyers
Dymally
Edgar
English
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Garcia
Gephardt
Goodling
Grotberg
Hartnett
Hillis
Horton
Lundine
Mitchell
Moore
Parris
Pursell
Roe
Roybal
Rudd
Skelton
Sweeney
Whitehurst

□ 1925

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 5300, OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1986

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Budget, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-727) on the bill (H.R. 5300) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 1986, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A RULE ON A BILL TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR 1987

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a rule on the authorization for the Department of Defense for 1987.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] for an inquiry.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Washington to explain. We have been closeted now for some hour or two trying to come to an agreement.

Would the gentleman please explain what the agreement is that will be included in the rule that will be filed as of midnight tonight?

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield, it will be our intention to seek a rule which would provide for the order of debate and consideration of amendments for Monday and Tuesday of next week, considering that it would be necessary to request a second rule for the remainder of the consideration of the Department of Defense authorization bill.

We have, I might say, discussed this matter with the chairman and ranking members of the Armed Services Committee on both sides as well as members of the Rules Committee, and it would be anticipated that there would be no votes on Monday; that we would consider suspensions on Monday and general debate only on the Department of Defense authorization bill.

On Tuesday, we would consider amendments and general debate on military reorganization for 2 hours, followed by a possible vote on that issue. Then we would take up, for 3 hours, debate on military procurement with the anticipated voting beginning on that subject after 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

We would anticipate a very late session on Tuesday. Members should probably anticipate a session as late as midnight.

On Wednesday, we would proceed with the Department of Defense authorization bill only under terms of a second rule yet to be agreed and voted upon. We would consider first on Wednesday the override question on the textile bill followed by consideration of any votes on suspensions ordered on Monday.

I might say that there is a primary election in the States of Michigan, Kansas, and Missouri on Tuesday, and we are attempting to accommodate, as much as possible, the return of those Members for voting on the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what would be the program then for the balance of this evening and tomorrow, because we have promised Members they would be in session tomorrow, too.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the distinguished minority leader will yield, if this unanimous-consent request is agreed to, this would terminate legislative business for the evening.

We come in tomorrow. The first thing tomorrow would be the consideration of the rule for the first 2 days of debate, through Tuesday, on the Department of Defense authorization bill.

Thereafter, we would hope to take up the rule for the consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, and then proceed with the consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, finishing well within the time promised of 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the membership that at the conclusion of legislative business today that I have that special order in combination with my colleague, Mr. CRANE, to honor and respect the late, honorable GEORGE O'BRIEN from our great State of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1935

ENTITLEMENT TO VA HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY PUBLIC LAW 99-272

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SEIBERLING). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an exchange of correspondence which has taken place between the committee and Mr. Donald Ivers, General Counsel of the Veterans' Administration. These letters discuss an important issue which was resolved with the enactment of the veterans' health care eligibility reform provision contained in section 19011 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985, Public Law 99-272.

I am concerned about the implementation of this measure after reviewing a draft analysis of the legislation prepared by Mr. Ivers' office. In that draft analysis, which was never approved or issued by the General Counsel, there was a suggestion that this legislation, which made significant changes in veterans' health care eligibility, did not require the Administrator to care for certain veterans. In his reply to the committee's inquiry, the General Counsel attempted to assure the committee that the VA agrees "that the use of the word 'shall' in section 610(a)(1) imposes a requirement, and was not intended to vest the Administrator with discretion regarding the provision of hospital care" to veterans. Nevertheless, the General Counsel's reply refers to an argumentative and poorly reasoned "White Paper" concerning this legislation, and this reference concerns me greatly.

Mr. colleagues should know that the VA lobbied very hard to impose a very strict means test for most non-service-connected veterans. These veterans would have been required to pay for their health care until their income did not exceed approximately $11,400 for a single veteran and approximately $15,000 for a married veteran. The administration proposal was rejected by the committee, both Democrats and Republicans. In lieu of the administration's proposal, the Congress enacted Public Law 99-272, a measure that now requires the VA to take care of certain veterans. The administration made every effort to delete the requirement that health care be furnished to veterans in the proposal considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Since it was unsuccessful in getting its strict means test enacted, the VA wanted to keep the status quo which permitted the administration to deny needed health care to eligible veterans.

In the midst of our negotiations with the Senate on this legislation, the General Counsel prepared this "White Paper" at the request of the Senate after it became apparent that the House was going to insist on enacting legislation that gave an entitlement to health care for service-connected and low-income veterans. The basic thrust of this paper is that Congress couldn't do what it wanted to do, which was to mandate that the Administrator furnish needed inpatient care to eligible veterans. I want my colleagues to know that the General Counsel's view is legally wrong, and I urge the General Counsel to stop citing this paper or relying on it in any way. It is not the law, and it is not a fair reading of what Congress enacted.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, I feel compelled to stress how important our measure, to delineate eligibility and to require the VA to care for those eligible, is for all veterans. Under the new section 610, Congress has determined that these veterans not only deserve, but are entitled to VA inpatient care. I strongly urge all my colleagues to be aware of the changes in the law and to understand the critical import of these measures for veterans across the country.

Copies of correspondence between the committee and Mr. Ivers follow:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 11, 1986.

Mr. DONALD IVERS,
General Counsel, Veterans Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. IVERS: We would like to convey to you our thoughts and the thoughts of other members of the committee concerning the legislation which we agreed to as part of the Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985, which the President signed on Monday. In doing so, we would like to express the committee's great concern with respect to the implementation of this measure, particularly the health-care eligibility reform contained in section 19011 of the bill. Our concern is heightened following our review of an analysis of the enrolled enactment of H.R. 3128 which we are led to believe was prepared by your office. It is our sincere hope that this analysis is a draft document and not your final opinion concerning the effect of this legislation, since it appears to ignore much of what was intended when the Congress enacted this measure.

We would like to correct any misimpressions that may have arisen concerning the eligibility reform provisions of the Act. We are particularly referring to the analysis of the enrolled bill which stated that it: "could be read to signal an intention to at least diminish the Administrator's discretion to deny needed care. The conference report on the bill strongly indicates, however, that Congressional intent is to mandate only that *if VA facilities and resources are available and capable of providing needed care and services,* the Administrator must furnish the care and services to any eligible veteran. . . VA subscribes to that interpretation." (emphasis supplied.)

Mr. Ivers, you and your staff must understand the fundamental mistake made by this analysis. It is a cardinal rule of statutory interpretation that if the language of a statute is clear, there is no need to examine the legislative history to see if the language of the statute has some hidden meaning. We frankly can't see how we could have been more clear in expressing Congressional intent for inpatient care. We deleted the language in the old section 610 stating that "the Administrator, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, may furnish hospital care" and changed it to read, "The Administrator shall provide hospital care" to various categories of veterans. Is the language ambiguous? Hardly. It seems quite clear to us. May means may and shall means shall. We have removed any discretionary authority that the Administrator had previously. Thus, your analysis should begin and end with the statutory language because it is plain and unambiguous on its face.

Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that the conference agreement, when referring to veterans who are entitled to inpatient care, makes no reference whatsoever to the phrase "if VA facilities and resources are available and capable of providing needed care." The conference report begins its analysis of the subject provision by stating that the "conference agreement (section 19011(a)) generally follows the House provision. . . . [T]he conference agreement would require the Administrator to furnish needed hospital care through VA facilities, and authorize the Administrator to furnish needed hospital care in non-VA facilities as authorized" to all of the veterans listed in 610(a)(1). As Mr. Hammerschmidt remarked during the House debate on this measure last December, "for the first time ever, the Government is committed to providing hospital care for service-connected and truly needy veterans. For the first time ever, the universe of veterans for whom the VA is going to provide hospital care is clearly defined."

We are completely baffled by the statement contained in this analysis that the "[c]onference report reflects Congressional understanding that, at the present time, VA facilities and resources do not exist to provide all types of health care to all veterans eligible to receive care". If this were the Congressional understanding, why would Senator Murkowski state: "We believe the VA does have the capacity to treat these nine categories" of veterans who are entitled to health care. S. 18212 (December 19, 1985). For the House's position on this issue please review pages 781 to 783 of House Report 300, which accompanied the reconciliation bill. It should also be pointed out that the conferees struck language which had been informally suggested by your office concerning the Administrator's discretion to determine the appropriateness of furnishing medical services, because this language was found to be inconsistent with the concept of entitlement.

The conference agreement follows the House bill, at least with respect to eligibility for inpatient care. There has been no transformation or inexplicable deviation from the original intention of the sponsors of this legislation. Our pledge with respect to the veterans whose eligibility is specified in this

legislation has not been recast into one which someone believes is more achievable; the words are the same, and we can assure you, we still mean them.

We would like to emphasize one other aspect of the conference agreement which is evidently the subject of some dispute. The Senate bill would have created a statutory list of priorities for all types of health care. The conference agreement rejected this approach for inpatient and nursing home care, after much deliberation and consideration of the existing priority scheme embodied in VA regulations.

Mr. Ivers, we think veterans deserve a clear and unmistakable description of what the conference agreement means for them. What we have done, and what the President has agreed to is to delineate eligibility and require the VA to care for those made eligible under new section 610. There is no question about our intention. The law requires the VA to take care of all of these veterans when a determination is made that they need care. There is no discretion for the Administrator to do otherwise for any veteran in these categories.

In summary, the Congress has made the determination that all categories of veterans under new section 610 deserve and are entitled to VA inpatient care. These veterans are not to be turned away when seeking needed care. The agency must provide for their care and how that is to be done is clearly spelled out in our committee report and the Statement of the Managers. If the agency or the Administration is opposed to the law we enacted, and which was signed by the President, it can always ask the Congress to change the law. Until the law is changed we fully expect the agency to instruct all hospital directors what they are now required to do in providing inpatient hospital care to our veterans, and to otherwise insure that the law is faithfully implemented.

Sincerely,

G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY,
Chairman.

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
Ranking Minority Member.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 12, 1986.

Hon. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for yours and Congressman Hammerschmidt's letter of April 11 conveying your thoughts regarding the interpretation of section 19011 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985, Public Law No. 99-272. Apparently an early draft of the Agency's proposed report on the Enrolled Enactment of H.R. 3128 contained language which left the impression that we interpret the new law differently from its congressional architects.

The central issue you raised with respect to the draft analysis is with its discussion of the word "shall" in 38 U.S.C. § 610, as that section was amended by the new law. Let me emphasize that I do not believe there is any fundamental difference between your interpretation of that provision and our own. Thus, we agree that the use of the word "shall" in section 610(a)(1) imposes a requirement, and was not intended to vest the Administrator with discretion regarding the provision of hospital care to the categories of veterans listed in the new section 610(a)(1).

It would seem helpful in this regard to set in context two references in our draft analysis: First, a reference to a congressional expression of intent to mandate that VA furnish care only if VA facilities and resources are available and capable of providing needed care and services; and second, the notion that the conference report reflects understanding that, at the present time, VA facilities and resources do not exist to provide all types of health care to all veterans eligible to receive care. Both references were based on the following language in the conference agreement: "The conferees intend that, for the categories of veterans specified in section 610(a)(1) of title 38 (as revised by this section)—those to whom the Administrator is required to furnish hospital care—the VA's *sole obligation* with respect to needed hospital care for these veterans is (1) if a veteran is in immediate need of hospitalization, to furnish an appropriate bed at the VA facility where the veteran applies or, if none is available there, to furnish a contract bed (as authorized under current law as recodified in new section 603) or to arrange to admit the veteran to the nearest VA medical center (VAMC), or Department of Defense facility with which the VA has a sharing agreement, with an available bed, or (2) if the veteran needs non-immediate hospitalization, to (A) schedule the veteran for admission where the veteran applied, if the schedule there permits, or (B) refer the veteran for scheduling and admission to the nearest VAMC, or DOD facility with which the VA has a sharing agreement, with an available bed and facilitate the veteran's admission there." (Emphasis added.)

The change in law certainly highlights the priority and attention VA must give to providing needed hospital care for service-connected, financially-needy, and other veterans specified in section 610(a)(1). The above-quoted language does acknowledge, however, that needed hospital care cannot necessarily be provided at a specific VA facility to all veterans at the time it is requested, even to those veterans in the highest category of eligibility. If the VA facility to which the veteran applies for care is unable to furnish care in a timely fashion, VA's obligation would first be to provide the required care on a contract basis, if that is possible. It is noteworthy that VA's authority to provide contract care continues to be quite limited under the new law. Thus, contract hospital care generally cannot be provided to non-service-connected veterans, despite their inability to defray the expenses of such care. If contract care cannot be furnished, VA would be required to inform the veteran of the nearest VA facility, or DOD facility (if VA has a sharing agreement with it) which could provide timely care, and VA would assist the veteran in applying for care at such facility. VA may not reimburse the veteran for the cost of travel to such a facility unless the veteran meets the requirements of 38 U.S.C. § 111.

While the point is perhaps largely hypothetical at this time in light of current occupancy rates at VA medical centers generally, it is conceivable that at some point in the future VA might lack the resources and facilities system-wide to provide timely hospital care to all the spectrum of veterans listed in section 610(a)(1). As we indicated in a White Paper sent to your staff in November 1985, in connection with a draft of H.R. 3128, we do not regard section 610(a)(1) as creating an "entitlement" which would allow an eligible veteran who is denied care due to lack of resources, to legally compel the government to furnish care immediately, by contract or otherwise. The law only creates a requirement that care will be provided in VA facilities, or facilities VA contracts with, are available to provide care.

We trust this clarifies our views on the important issues you raised. It appears that those views closely parallel the understanding of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs who expressed his position on this subject in the enclosed letter. A similar letter has been sent to Congressman Hammerschmidt.

Sincerly yours,

DONALD L. IVERS.
General Counsel.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE SPECIAL PAY FOR SERVICE MEMBERS PROFICIENT IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, a critical part of our intelligence-gathering operation is the knowledge of foreign languages. I am not referring just to those foreign languages that almost all of us have been exposed to, or just to those that are of obvious importance like Russian and Spanish, but also of Korean, and Arabic, and Polish, and Vietnamese, among many others.

Many of these languages are quite difficult and can require years of careful and determined study. And once you have learned a language it is easily and quickly forgotten without continued study and use.

Our intelligence efforts require thorough knowledge of foreign languages. Today, more than 22,000 of our uniformed personnel are involved in jobs that require many hours of outside work acquiring and maintaining a foreign language skill that is necessary to perform their duties. And yet, we do not compensate our service men and women for the time and effort that they invest and the level of skill that they acquire. The State Department pays its linguists extra money for language proficiency, as do the National Security Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency; only the Department of Defense does not compensate for this skill.

For this reason, I am today introducing legislation which would provide special pay for military service members who are proficient in foreign languages, so long as these languages improve the capabilities of our Armed Forces.

If this legislation is adopted, the Secretary of Defense would first identify those languages which are necessary to carry out our national defense. Then, any service member with a certified proficiency in one or more of these languages would receive extra pay as long as: First, the service member is qualified in a military specialty or is performing military duties requiring this language proficiency; second, the service member is currently being trained to enhance a language proficiency; or third, the Department of Defense has a critical need for this language.

Under this legislation, the service member would be entitled to receive as much as $250

per month added on to his or her monthly pay, but this is the ceiling on a service member's pay. In order to receive the full ceiling amount, a service member would have to maintain a high level of proficiency in at least two hard languages for which there is a demonstrable need, such as Russian and Korean. As I say, the $250 limit is only a ceiling; the rest of the special pay scale is graduated down from that ceiling level.

If enacted, this program would cost about $18.3 million in the first year. All of us in this body are rightly concerned with the level of defense spending. We can, and we must, make every effort to keep spending down to respectable, responsible, and accountable levels. But this money would not be added on to the President's budget request. In fact, the $18.3 million necessary to carry out this program was set aside in the President's budget for this very purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed primarily to improve our intelligence work. At a time when terrorists threaten American citizens all over the world, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons to more and more countries continues, the need for improved intelligence becomes even more important. Perhaps the most critical part of our intelligence gathering effort is the knowledge of foreign languages. And if we are going to require a knowledge of foreign languages—or if this knowledge is going to assist us in gathering intelligence—then it is only right that we provide special pay to the service members who acquire and maintain this knowledge.

As long as we are unwilling to compensate our service members for the skills they acquire and maintain, we will be unable to retain them in active duty. And as long as the best and most skilled intelligence operatives keep leaving the service, our intelligence operations will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of this legislation are clear. First of all, it will encourage our men and women in uniform to obtain, and enhance, their foreign language capabilities. And through the individual efforts of our service members, our own intelligence-gathering abilities will improve, as well.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today would be an important step forward in increasing retention by providing incentives for improved skills, and would improve our intelligence-gathering abilities. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

H.R. 5306

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE PROFICIENT IN A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 316. Special pay: foreign language proficiency pay

"(a) A member of the armed forces who—

"(1) is entitled to basic pay;

"(2) has been certified by the Secretary concerned within the past 12 months to be proficient in a foreign language identified by the Secretary of Defense as necessary for the national defense; and

"(3)(A) is qualified in a military specialty requiring such proficiency;

"(B) received training, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned;

"(C) is assigned to military duties requiring such a proficiency; or

"(D) is proficient in a foreign language for which the Secretary concerned may have a critical need,

may be paid special pay, in addition to any other pay or allowance to which the member is entitled, in the amount set forth in subsection (b).

"(b) The monthly rate for special pay under subsection (a) may not exceed $250. The amount of special pay which a member may be paid under this section may not be included in computing the amount of any increase in pay authorized by any other provision of this title or in computing retired pay, separation pay, severance pay, or readjustment pay.

"(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned and to the extent provided for by appropriations, when a member of a reserve component of the armed forces, or of the National Guard, who is entitled to compensation under section 206 of this title, fulfills the criteria for special pay as described in subsection (a), except the requirement of subsection (a)(1), the member may be paid an increase in compensation equal to 1/30th of the monthly special pay authorized by subsection (b) for the performance of that duty by a member who is entitled to basic pay. The member is entitled to the increase for as long as he is qualified for it, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which he is engaged for at least two hours, including that performed on a Sunday or holiday, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, duty or appropriate duties, as the Secretary may prescribe under section 206(a) of this title. This subsection does not apply to a member who is entitled to basic pay under section 204 of this title.

"(d) This section shall be administered under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the armed forces under his jurisdiction and by the Secretary of Transportation for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy.".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"316. Special pay; foreign language proficiency pay.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 316 of title 37, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 1986.

NEED TO COMPEL LTV CORP. TO CONTINUE ITS RETIREE BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's steel crisis has taken on a new sense of urgency since the LTV Corp., the second largest steelmaker in the United States, filed for bankruptcy on July 17. This bankruptcy not only raises serious questions regarding the ability of the American steel industry to maintain its international competitiveness, but it also raises vital concerns about the impact of the bankruptcy upon the American economy, in general, as well as upon the employees and retirees of the steel industry.

Our immediate concern today is with the unilateral action taken by LTV to terminate all of its health and life insurance benefits for its 78,000 retirees. These retirees immediately lost their coverage for doctor and hospital expenses, which has created many hardships and insecurities for the former steelworkers. These employee benefits were self-insured by the company and carried out on a noncontributory basis for the retirees. The value of these health benefits is between $200 and 250 per month per retiree, so the payment of this premium is well beyond the ability of most of the retirees to assume.

While our bankruptcy laws are intended to protect companies from creditors and let them reorganize, these laws are not intended to permit companies to terminate their benefits to retirees. This action by LTV on July 17 was in violation of title 11, section 113(f), of the bankruptcy laws which require that agreements negotiated by the union are protected against unilateral abrogation. Instead, LTV must follow the bankruptcy court procedures, since the bankruptcy court has jurisdiction over the final disposition of the bankruptcy settlement. Therefore, LTV cannot unilaterally terminate its labor agreements until a decision is reached by the bankruptcy court.

It is interesting to note that since congressional concern and action has led to proposals with regards to forcing LTV to meet its obligations toward its retirees, that LTV has gone to the bankruptcy court to request that it be allowed to continue these payments for the next 6 months. A bankruptcy court in New York ruled yesterday that LTV may make these payments for the next 6 months. In the interim LTV says it is planning to negotiate with the union a new program of pension benefits. While we are pleased that LTV now recognizes its responsibilities to its retirees at least in the short run, we feel the payments should be continued for the entire duration of the time that it takes for the bankruptcy court to reach a final settlement with regards LTV's liabilities. Continuing these payments for 6 months is not the solution to the problem. LTV made the agreement with the union in good faith and should be expected to fulfill these obligations in full until the court reaches its decision.

Therefore, the reason behind H.R. 5283 is more imperative than ever—to ensure that the retirees continue to receive their medical and life insurance coverage until a bankruptcy court rules otherwise. If LTV is allowed to abandon this responsibility, it will have a devastating impact upon all retirees of companies which are facing economic difficulties. We need to assure these citizens that their rights will not be neglected.

In addition to the health and life insurance benefits, the LTV bankruptcy has threatened basic pension benefits. Although these pension benefits are insured by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, a Federal takeover of LTV's pension obligation will increase Federal liabilities by $1.5 billion. We will need to find additional revenues to fund this Corporation, which will be extremely troublesome given our current efforts to decrease the Fed-

eral deficit, not add to it. Thus, we must make every effort to ensure that LTV meets its obligations before resorting to the Federal Government. However, retirees should be assured they will not be neglected by us and that their benefits will be continued.

While the bankruptcy of LTV is the case in question today, other steel companies are also in danger of bankruptcy proceedings. Perhaps it is time for us to once again focus upon the need for this industry to become revitalized in order to restore its international competitiveness. The steel industry is a fundamental part of our industrial base, so we need to maintain its economic strength, without sacrificing its employees, in order to ensure our economic competitiveness.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 5310, INTERNATIONAL DRUG TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H.R. 5310, the International Drug Traffic Enforcement Act, on behalf of myself, Mr. RANGEL—who is chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control—and a number of other concerned members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Speaker, I commend you for your leadership in addressing the serious drug problem this Nation is facing in a comprehensive and bipartisan fashion through the formulation of an omnibus antidrug bill. I am proud to be introducing this bill on behalf of the Committee on Ways and Means to do our part to stem the tide of imported drugs, which is having such a devastating impact on America's youth.

Our borders have become open sieves through which the drug trade flows virtually unimpeded. It is now only possible for the Customs Service and other relevant agencies to apprehend a small portion of the narcotics entering the United States. A major part of the problem is that our current customs laws in this area date back to the 1930's. Penalties for failure to observe certain Customs regulations are insignificant and many of the clearance procedures actually favor the drug smuggler. It is essential that we modernize these laws and give our Customs officials the weapons to fight this insidious evil.

We must also do far more to attack drugs at the source. Pressure must be brought to bear on countries that tolerate or collaborate with illegal drug traffickers. The use of most-favored-nation and other tariff preferences such as the Generalized System of Preferences and the Caribbean Basin Initiative to secure greater cooperation is, in my judgment, the most effective and fairest means of securing such cooperation. Countries which benefit from drug trade should not expect preferential trade benefits, and inaction on the part of any country should be met with a firm response by our Government.

Mr. Speaker, the International Drug Traffic Enforcement Act contains major revisions to the customs laws in order to strengthen the drug enforcement and interdiction activities of th U.S. Customs Service. These amendments would add new penalties and reporting requirements to the Tariff Act, enable Customs to engage in undercover activities more freely, place new controls on vehicles or vessels arriving in the United States in order to deter smuggling, and expand the customs forfeiture fund which is used to finance drug interdiction efforts.

The bill would also create greater incentives for countries to cooperate with the United States in eradicating drug crops and apprehending drug smugglers. The President would be required to deny most-favored-nation [MFN] treatment and other preferential tariff treatment to countries that are the source of illegal drugs if they refuse to cooperate in arresting illegal drug traffic.

A detailed summary of the bill's provisions is set forth below.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge to work closely with you and the members of my committee to see that this bill is reported in a timely fashion to be included in the omnibus package.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 5310, THE INTERNATIONAL DRUG TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT ACT

To facilitate the enforcement of the customs laws against illegal drug traffic, and for other purposes

SEC. 1. Short Title. "International Drug Traffic Enforcement Act of 1986."

TITLE I. AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Subtitle A. Reference to the Tariff Act of 1930

SEC. 101. Reference is to title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Subtitle B. General provisions

SEC. 111. Definitions. Amends section 401, T.A. to include "monetary instruments." Adds "controlled substance" as used in Controlled Substances Act. Defines "prohibited" and "restricted" as referring to merchandise, the importation of which is not legally permitted or which is imported without meeting the conditions set by law.

SEC. 112. Amends Sec. 433, T.A. to require immediate rather than 24 hour reporting of all vessels. Allows Secretary to determine place and manner of reporting and to extend reporting time if necessary. Also includes requirements for vehicle and aircraft reporting which were previously in sec. 459 or regulations. Prohibits departures or discharge of persons of any articles without Customs approval. Requires master, pilot or person in charge to present such documents, papers or manifests as Secretary may require.

SEC. 113. Amends Sec. 436, T.A. to increase criminal penalties for failure to comply with sec. 433. Adds specific penalties for aircraft (rather than general $500 aircraft penalty) and civil penalties for all violations of reporting arrival or entry requirements.

SEC. 114. Amends Sec. 454, T.A. to raise civil penalties for illegal discharge of passengers.

SEC. 115. Amends Sec. 459, T.A. to require pedestrians to report to Customs immediately and remain until cleared. It also requires pedestrians to cross into the U.S. only at approved crossings. Persons aboard conveyances are required to remain aboard the conveyance until cleared. If they depart the conveyance they have an obligation to report to Customs. If the conveyance was not properly reported, all persons aboard have an independent obligation to report to Customs and to report the circumstances of their arrival. Imposes criminal penalties for the first time for sec. 459 violations. All civil penalties are also increased.

SEC. 116. Amends Sec. 509, T.A. to permit summons to be issued for any documents relevant to any Customs investigation. Present law is limited to import documents required to be kept under Sec. 508.

SEC. 117. Amends Sec. 584, T.A. to repeal the prepenalty procedure in manifesting violations; to increase penalties for manifest violations and drugs on board conveyances.

SEC. 118. Amends Sec. 586, T.A. to increase penalties for illegal transfers and transshipments of merchandise.

SEC. 119. Adds a new Sec. 590, T.A. to close some of the loopholes in aviation smuggling laws; to prohibit "drops" to vessels; to provide for forfeiture for smuggling acts whether or not drugs are found aboard; to provide criminal penalties for violations.

SEC. 120. Amends Sec. 594, T.A. to substitute the normal administrative or judicial forfeiture proceedings for the admiralty proceedings now required to forfeit property to secure payment of monetary penalties which are liens under the Customs laws; to close the loopholes used by common carriers.

SEC. 121. Amends Sec. 595, T.A. to expand the Customs civil search warrant to permit its use in seizing any article subject to seizure under laws enforced by Customs.

SEC. 122. Amends Sec. 595a, T.A. to conform to the changes made in Sec. 594, and to add a new subsection (c) permitting civil forfeiture of merchandise imported contrary to law.

SEC. 123. Amends Sec. 613, T.A. to treat mitigated forfeiture payments in the same manner as the proceeds of sale and to treat seizure and forfeiture expenses incurred by customs as priority costs.

SEC. 124. Amends Sec. 619, T.A. to permit informers awards to be determined in amounts up to 25% in lieu of the present mandatory 25%. Would also treat informers awards as an "expense of the forfeiture" for purposes of the Customs Forfeiture Fund.

SEC. 125. Amends Sec. 621, T.A. to provide that the statute of limitations in civil cases runs from the time that the penalty notice is issued rather than the time court action is instituted.

SEC. 126. Amends Sec. 622, T.A. to make it clear that landing certificates may be required to meet international obligations, such as agreements to reduce or prevent smuggling, as well as to protect the revenue.

SEC. 127. Adds a new Sec. 628, T.A. to clarify the authority of the Secretary to exchange information with foreign customs and law enforcement officials.

SEC. 128. Adds a new Sec. 629, T.A. to permit customs officers to be stationed in foreign countries and to extend U.S. Customs laws to foreign locations when permitted by treaty, bilateral agreement or foreign law.

SEC. 129. Adds a new section 630 to the Tariff Act to provide exemptions from certain laws for activities involving a commercial cover in undercover operations.

SEC. 130. Amends the Secretary's subpoena authority to make administrative subpoena available in all import and export and currency investigations. These provisions previously applied only to drug investigations. These provisions are also being moved from title 21 to a new section 631 in the Tariff Act (Title 19).

SEC. 131. Effective date. Amendments made by this subtitle will take effect the fifteenth day after enactment.

Subtitle C. Customs Forfeiture Fund

SEC. 141. Amends Sec. 613A, T.A. to—

(a) Extend the operation of the Customs Forfeiture Fund for a 5-year period, until September 30, 1992;

(b) Increase the ceiling on authorized appropriations from the fund from $10 million to $20 million; and

(c) Expand the list of expenses which can be paid for out of the fund to include:

(1) Expenditures for special and undercover enforcement operations;

(2) Investigative costs leading up to seizures; and

(3) The costs of equipping for law enforcement functions, vessels, vehicles and aircraft in Customs' possession (the law currently only allows for such expenditures for forfeited vessels, vehicles and aircraft).

TITLE II. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Amends 19 U.S.C. 1432a to extend the reporting requirements to vessels involved in transshipment on the high seas or in Customs waters.

SEC. 202. Amends 46 U.S.C. 12109 to make it clear that pleasure yachts are only exempt from formal entry and clearance but must comply with the other customs laws.

SEC. 203. Amends RS 3071 (19 U.S.C. 507) to allow Customs officers to demand the assistance of any person regardless of distance (present law limits such demands to 3 miles) and raises the penalty for refusal to assist to $1,000 from $5 to $200. Provides "good samaritan" defense to any person, not employed by the federal government, assisting Customs.

SEC. 204. Amends section 1009 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 959) to prohibit a U.S. citizen or any person on a U.S. aircraft from possessing or transporting controlled substances outside the U.S.

TITLE III. DENIAL OF TRADE BENEFITS TO UNCOOPERATIVE DRUG SOURCE NATIONS

SEC. 301. Short Title. "Narcotics Control Trade Act."

SEC. 302. Requires President to designate as an "uncooperative drug source nation" any foreign country determined

(a) To be a direct or indirect source of illicit drugs; and

(b) To have not cooperated with the United States Government to prevent these illicit drugs from significantly affecting the United States.

SEC. 303. Removes from eligibility for MFN and GSP status any country designated as an "uncooperative drug source nation."

SEC. 304. Requires President to remove designation as "uncooperative drug source nation" prior to restoral of MFN or GSP treatment.

SEC. 305. Defines "narcotic and psychotropic drugs and other controlled substances" as in the Foreign Assistance Act.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order tonight, in conjunction with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PHIL CRANE, so that all of us might pay our respects and tribute to our late departed friend and colleague, GEORGE O'BRIEN, for who we all had such affection and admiration.

The last time most of us saw GEORGE was right here in the House, standing right here in the well at this microphone, during the debate on aid to the Contras in Nicaragua. The fact that he was here, the fact that he was able to stand, after pulling himself out of his wheelchair, was a testament to his courage and to his dedication to this institution.

It was one of the greatest moments, the most touching moments, I can ever recall as a Member of the House of Representatives.

That phrase of Lincoln's—"the last, full measure of devotion"—is not out of place when you recall GEORGE standing here, humbly acknowledging our standing ovation for his courage and his sense of duty.

He was quite a man and quite a patriot in his own quiet, gentle way.

Earlier this week, when the newspapers were filled with the great news of the release of Father Jenco, I thought of GEORGE's efforts to obtain Father Jenco's freedom.

Father Jenco was born in Joliet, IL. GEORGE, who represented that city, really performed above and beyond the call of duty to comfort Father Jenco's family and to explore every conceivable avenue of progress to help Father Jenco.

GEORGE went to Syria, he talked to world leaders, he worked unceasingly for Father Jenco's freedom.

Last year GEORGE came to my office with members of the Jenco family so they could tell me firsthand of their concerns. The family was frustrated in their attempts to gain the release of their beloved relative. That is understandable. But you could also tell that they trusted GEORGE, and that they knew he was doing his best for them.

I mention the Jenco case because in my mind it symbolizes GEORGE's approach to politics and people. He was warm, he was friendly, he was always ready to try to raise your spirits and get the job done.

In the political world, where so often we tend to forget, in the heat of battle, the human element, GEORGE was content to go his gentle, caring way. He was a genuinely nice human being. If anyone thinks such words are faint praise, I can only say that genuinely nice human beings are, in my experience, a rare and cherished commodity.

GEORGE was born on June 17, 1917, in Chicago. He was educated at Northwestern University and Yale University Law School. He served with the 8th and 12th Air Force during World War II. After service as a county supervisor and after other distinguished local service, both as an attorney and in public life, GEORGE was elected to the State legislature in 1971, and in 1972 he was elected to this House of Representatives.

I guess it was really right here in this body where I got to know GEORGE and his vivacious wife, Mary Lou, so well. In our Illinois delegation meetings we could always turn to GEORGE for a bit of levity and buoying up of our spirits when other people's dobbers may be down.

We served together on the Appropriations Committee, and I was most happy to support our late departed friend, Les Arends, in seeing that GEORGE was appointed to the Appropriations Committee and confirmed by the entire Republican Conference. We served, as a matter of fact, on the very same subcommittee, the old Health, Education and Welfare Committee. The bill that we were considering today would have been one of GEORGE's special pet bills to talk about, and he would contribute to the debate in this body in those deliberations.

We played golf a few times together, and, boy, those were wonderful times. He loved to particpate and to compete, particularly when we had the Republican-Democratic outings. We socialized a great deal.

Our Illinois delegation is a closely knit group. We all like to get together and know one another's families. And GEORGE was always there telling Irish stories of one kind or another. He could tell them just about as good as the President down the street, and they were maybe just a bit funnier than some of those the President tells today.

Singing and harmonizing was his forte, and, of course, this Member loves that medium very much. There were any number of occasions when into the wee hours of the morning GEORGE just wanted to sing one more song for the occasion.

Many of us attended GEORGE's funeral out in his home community. It was a very moving ceremony at GEORGE's church. I am reminded that the Bishop that day said specifically, "May you have music all the days of your life," speaking of the music that was a part of GEORGE's life and making mention of the fact that he was such a loving, gentle, humorous individual. It was a beautiful service. There was a string orchestra there that, in combination with a chorus, did a beautiful job. Those who spoke on that occasion included the bishop and Senator ALAN DIXON, the senior Senator from our State, and Congressman CARLOS MOORHEAD from California, who spoke for Members of the House.

I must confess that if I were to have been called upon to make any of the

appropriate comments at that time, I just do not think, with the closeness of our relationship, that old Bob or a number of our colleagues that I see here this evening could have stood up without terrible emotional trauma.

So it was one of those beautiful services. And certainly we want to extend, yes, even at this belated hour, our unbounded sympathy to Caryl O'Brien Bloch and Mary Deborah Pershey, GEORGE's two daughters, and the grandchildren, Bryan, Brandon, and Anthony. I would say this to them: Your father and your grandfather was a dear, dear friend to so many of us. And I guess all of us would surely have to agree that we might not have known him but for the fact that the community of interest in politics brought us together in this body, and then finding ourselves working so closely together and then getting to know one another so well, we came to regard him as yes, a professional associate, but much, much more importantly, a dear personal friend.

We are going to miss GEORGE a great deal, as we did today in those deliberations. I am just very sad that we have to come to this juncture where we have to take a special order to eulogize one of our great departed friends, GEORGE O'BRIEN.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

It is a sad moment when we have to commiserate among ourselves for the loss of a dear friend, someone we had counted on for years to be there and support us with his love and his laughter and all of the great Irish attributes that were uniquely GEORGE O'BRIEN's.

Mary Lou, his wife, and GEORGE made a beautiful couple in many, many different ways. They were inseparable. They were always ready to smile and always ready to inquire how you felt and how they could be helpful to you in your daily occupation.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was characterized by so many attributes. I would say courage is his most outstanding attribute. He faced his final illness with great courage and dignity and set an example for all of us in that regard. And as ALAN DIXON said, he will always remember him for his last official act, which was for his country, when he came here and cast that difficult vote on that dramatic event.

Speaking of courage in political life, GEORGE O'BRIEN had the very unhappy, distasteful necessity of combatting a dear friend, Ed Derwinski, in a primary. GEORGE and Ed were the dearest of friends, but GEORGE was a Congressman who felt he owed it to his constituency to continue to represent them, so again, with grace and with gentleness but nontheless with vigor, GEORGE and Ed battled out a primary, and GEORGE won.

But he was courageous in other ways, too. He always stood up for the unborn. In that committee, the Appropriations Committee, it was not easy—and it is never easy—to defend the preborn because so many people do not see the issue as GEORGE saw it or as I saw it, but he could always be counted on to be there to cast that tough vote. And I am sure this evening that GEORGE is in the company of a lot of little souls that never made it to this world but knew that he was one of their great defenders.

GEORGE's sense of humor was magnificent. You could always count on him to lighten your day with a story or a limerick, and they were always uniquely Irish. I will never forget, because I have retold it so many times, the last joke he told me, which has a poignancy considering that GEORGE is no longer with us.

He told me that when he was in Ireland the last time, he roamed through cemeteries, copying down from tombstones things that amused him. And he brought this one back, and this is what it said:

"Here lies Brigadier General Bryan Mulroney, shot by his servant August 27, 1898."

And he said there was some scroll work and a few angels flying, and then at the bottom it said: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Well, GEORGE O'BRIEN was a good and faithful servant to his family, to his community, and to his country, and certainly everything he did bears characterizing as well done.

Let me close by quoting a poem that GEORGE O'BRIEN quoted when Tennyson Guyer passed away. GEORGE made some beautiful, sweet remarks about our friend, Tenny Guyer, and in so doing he quoted a poem by Noel Coward which Noel Coward wrote about 6 months before his death and which was never published and which certainly applied to Tenny Guyer and certainly applies to GEORGE O'BRIEN. Here is what Noel Coward wrote:

When I have fears as Keats had fears of the moment I will cease to be,
I comfort myself with vanished years, remembered laughter, remembered tears, the peace of the tranquil sea,
And I think of my friends who are dead and gone,
How happy are they I cannot yet know,
But happy am I who loved them so.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE O'BRIEN wanted to be Ambassador to Ireland. Now he is our Ambassador to Heaven.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his beautiful contribution.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE could be a partisan Republican at times, but I think one of his strengths in the House of Representatives was the fact that it was so easy for him to reach across the aisle to the Democratic side.

□ 1945

I think it is very appropriate that I yield at this juncture to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, Mr. NEAL SMITH, who knew him so well.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

I have never known a person, I do not believe, who was more gentle or honest or sincere or helpful to his fellow man than GEORGE O'BRIEN. He was also thinking of other people.

Now, we served together. He was the ranking member of the subcommittee I am privileged to chair. He was also on the HHS Subcommittee on Appropriations where I have been for many, many years. I have seen him time after time after time be so concerned about the welfare of others whenever anything came up along that line.

We traveled together in many, many countries, because we had a responsibility for the State Department and the Commerce Department and export programs and others. He and his wife were very good travelers, but always there.

You could see that he was so concerned about other people. He could draw down on great experiences he had had in his lifetime. I remember things that happened in New York years ago, which happened in Chicago and happened in the service, always valuable things that were in his background that were very important to us, but he was always also, although he was interested in the things on the subcommittee I chaired, he was very, very interested in the National Institutes of Health. Really, that is where he ended up giving a considerable amount of help in his closing days. I guess it is fitting that he had always been interested in the National Institutes of Health and issues that were out there.

We were always very sorry to hear, all of us I know, that his illness was more than back trouble. He had told me about his back trouble for a number of years and then he found out that it was more than back trouble that was causing this pain, so we were very sorry to hear about that.

But I remember the last words he said to me. I said, "GEORGE, we are praying, and anything we can do and anything we can think of, all we want is that you can finally get stronger and well."

And he said, "NEAL, I'm getting stronger everyday," and he knew he was not getting stronger. He did not want anyone to feel sorry for him. That was just shortly before he died. He was that kind of person.

We will miss GEORGE. Bea and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to his family in the days to come.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman who had a neighboring district to GEORGE out there in Illinois, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. LYNN MARTIN.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, our leader.

Occasionally, when we are talking about a colleague, we make that person less than the full person they were in life. We list their virtues and sometimes miss then a little of the fire, so I am going to tell you that GEORGE had two faults.

One, he had a wonderful Irish temper and that was part of his edge and part of why he fought and part of his charm.

Second, and GEORGE, you know it is true, some of his jokes were dreadful. Oh, every single day GEORGE O'BRIEN told me a joke, because I am Irish, too. Because I am Irish, I am a perfect foil, but even I had to say sometimes, "GEORGE, that is simply the worst joke I have ever heard."

And GEORGE would say, "Well, I'll go tell it to someone else. Maybe they will have a different idea."

The other thing GEORGE would do, and I am not sure some of you know this, this is from Mary Lou, but it is also true because I have heard it from his district. He and Mary Lou had the kind of marriage that was envied enormously by other people in the district. When GEORGE went home and Mary Lou was not with him, he would tell an entire audience how much he missed her. That is right, a political audience, a rotary, a chamber of commerce, a labor union, he would way. "I miss her presence. I miss her scent."

Do you know what that did to every woman in the audience? They leaned over to their husbands, hit them on the head and said, "Why can't you be more like GEORGE O'BRIEN?"

Now, that could mean that GEORGE would be hated by the gentlemen, except it was obviously so real. That envy that men and women alike had for that relationship remains, because the years they had together are more than 100 years others could have had, because they were so much a part of each other.

They also had two daughters, and so do I. When I came here and I had never been to Washington before, both of them came up to me and wanted to know immediately about my children.

Now, there is very little you can ask another human being that they do not want to talk about, but when they meet your children and love them, and every single time talk about their daughters and your daughters, I just have to say from Julia Martin and Caroline Martin, they felt that Mary Lou and GEORGE O'BRIEN were the epitome of a beautiful, bright, caring couple, who were also part of the U.S. Congress and made it a little easier for them once in awhile to have a mother who was here.

There was only one thing wrong with GEORGE's funeral, not the number of friends there and not the beautiful kind of celebration by the bishop of Joliet and not the lack of a choir singing "Pontiff Angelicus." I think GEORGE would have wanted a couple of jokes, because it was something he did for us everyday.

Courage, sure; bright, yes, he went to Yale; loving, you bet, and caring and a friend.

And may I say to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HENRY HYDE, yes, he is in heaven, but I think it is still OK for us to miss him.

GEORGE, we miss you a lot.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when we put together this group of eulogies, as is customary in the House of Representatives in printed form, I am sure that GEORGE's widow, Mary Lou, will really appreciate particularly the very poignant comments and remarks of the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our colleagues, the distinguished minority leader from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL and Mr. CRANE, for giving us this opportunity to pay our respects to GEORGE O'BRIEN.

This is an institution that puts a premium on legislative achievement. I served with GEORGE on the Appropriations Committee, and for a short time on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary. I can, therefore, attest to his skill as a legislator and believe me there was none better. But it is not only as a legislator that I will remember GEORGE. We often get so caught up in the work of the House that we forget that this institution, like most, is made up of people, and that it runs best when the people who serve in it treat each other with kindness and respect. That is how I will remember GEORGE O'BRIEN—as a man of great integrity and deep conviction who never failed to perform the little acts of kindness and civility. It is those acts that make it possible for a House composed of people with markedly different philosophies and personalities to function. The admiration and affection that GEORGE enjoyed on both sides of the aisle was a testament to the fact that he was, to put it quite simply, a genuinely nice guy. That quality helped make him as effective as he was. I think it explains why his death has left such a large void in this House.

Sometimes a single issue can encapsulate all of the qualities that define a person. The determination with which GEORGE O'BRIEN pursued the release of the Americans held captive in Lebanon, was that kind of issue. It was an issue that GEORGE kept alive, in this House, the media, and in the conduct of foreign policy. Certainly his interest was a product of his concern for one of the capitives, Father Lawrence Jenco, who had been a resident of his district. But I think GEORGE's commitment to winning the hostages' release went beyond the fact that a former constituent was in trouble. GEORGE truly empathized with the hostages and their families, and their cause literally became his own. Although his death came before Father Jenco's release, I believe GEORGE looked down on that happy event and was pleased; not because he had had a lot to do with it, but because the suffering of one American and his family had come to an end.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a good and decent man who served the people of the United States with great distinction. I know that, that certain knowledge, will be of some comfort to his gracious and devoted wife, Mary Lou, and their two daughters and three grandsons at this difficult time. I extend my condolences to them, and to all the members of the O'BRIEN family.

□ 2000

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the distinguished chairman for his very appropriate remarks.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRANE. I thank our distinguished leader for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to join in the tribute that we pay to our departed colleague tonight, and say that probably when you think about GEORGE, qualities come to mind that our distinguished colleague from just west of me in Illinois come to mind, and that is GEORGE's warmth, his smiles, his wit. I cannot think of a time that GEORGE O'BRIEN ever said a mean or unkind word about anyone. That kind of summarizes GEORGE, and yet we are in a rancorous body sometimes, and the last time GEORGE made his appearance here it was a very rancorous night.

He came on the floor in his wheelchair at the request, if he could make it, of our distingushed minority leader. I have told you that, Mr. Leader, that that was the nicest request that you could have made of GEORGE, because GEORGE was given the opportunity that night when he came on the floor over here in his wheelchair, and he did it at your request out of a sense of duty and loyalty, and he got the appropriate sendoff from this Chamber

on a bipartisan basis that was appropriate, and he paid tribute to the collegial atmosphere of this body.

I want to pay a special tribute to our leader for appealing to him to come here that last night that he cast a vote. It turned out to be the last vote that GEORGE ever cast in his life, but I know that our leader has been criticized for appealing to a man who was ill, and in a wheelchair, to make a special effort to be here for what was a special vote from our perspective.

You should not feel any guilt over that, because the fact of the matter is that this body conveyed to GEORGE that night the special affection that we have for one another. It was one of the more resounding ovations—more than we normally give a President when he comes to deliver a State of the Union Address—an expression of affection from this body to someone who was very special to all of us. That is something that had to have been a lasting recollection to GEORGE in his declining moments. But more importantly to Mary Lou and to the children and to the grandchildren and the relatives, friends, loved ones, it was a kind of a tribute that was extraordinary. And you made that possible by making an appeal to GEORGE to do his thing and do it consistent with what GEORGE believed to be right.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives, the State of Illinois, and the Nation lost a friend and an outstanding servant when death took Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN.

The native Chicagoan most admirably served his country and Illinois constituency for almost 14 years. He turned down certain reelection when he withdrew from a race this year upon learning of the seriousness of his illness.

GEORGE first served his country during World War II, rising to the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Army Air Corps.

The people of the Fourth Illinois Congressional District knew and trusted GEORGE O'BRIEN. They had seen him protect their interests for almost a decade and a half. They saw the results of his efforts. What they guessed but never witnessed was the ardor with which he fought for them behind the scenes on the many fronts of Washington's bureaucracy, as well as in the committees of Congress, and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

He considered the interests of his constituents as his first responsibility. The fight we remember best is the one he never gave up to revitalize the Joliet Army ammunition plant.

It is unfortunate that GEORGE did not live to see the release by his captors of the Reverend Lawrence M. Jenco of Joliet. Only days after the death of GEORGE, Father Jenco was given his freedom.

It was just about a year ago that the Congressman traveled to Damascus to confer with Syrian President Assad, seeking assistance from Assad in gaining the release of the priest. GEORGE O'BRIEN never gave up his fight to free Father Jenco.

GEORGE's final appearance here on the floor of House of Representatives provided a dramatic moment for all of us. Despite the severity of his illness, GEORGE left his sickbed and came to this Chamber in a wheelchair. He cast a vote in support of President Reagan's request for aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, and then returned to the hospital. The President's request was approved by a narrow margin which GEORGE had so valiantly helped to create.

GEORGE O'BRIEN made life more pleasant for all of us who knew him with his refreshing smile, kind words and Irish wit. More important, of course, GEORGE O'BRIEN dedicated his life to serving his constituents and his country. Our hearts go out to his loving wife Mary Lou, his daughters, relatives, and friends. Our comfort comes from the knowledge that we haven't said "goodbye", but rather, "so long, GEORGE, we'll be seeing you."

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman particularly for his personal reference there. It was a difficult call, but it was GEORGE's call, in combination with Mary Lou's.

Yes; I inquired as to whether or not our dear friend, GEORGE, would like to participate in that vote, recognizing that it was going to be a tight one. Yes; we would love to have his vote, we needed it, but, you know, follow doctor's orders.

It also served as a catalyst to garner several other votes, and so it was a very, very critical appearance that GEORGE made that night, and I think he recognized that. As the gentleman from Illinois has so well described the situation that evening, in retrospect, you know, it was a nice way for GEORGE to sing his swan song supposedly to this House of Representatives.

He really did it in superb fashion, and I was so visibly moved when I knew that it was rather painful, but it just seemed that there was a surge of some strength from the good Lord that would bring him from his wheelchair to this very microphone and make the kind of comments that he did in acknowledging that beautiful accolade that he received from all this standing House of Representatives. That was something very special, and it is something special that he bequeathed to all the rest of us, because for me it said now there is real respect and admiration of a man's peers in this very distinguished body. It was a moving moment.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. I thank my distinguished friend, the minority leader, for yielding, and want to thank him and Mr. CRANE for taking this time to pay tribute to a great American.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with mixed emotions. I am sad that we no longer have the great honor of serving with a dear friend, GEORGE O'BRIEN, but I am also happy when I think of his life and his work.

I remember coming back from Les Arends' funeral on the plane, and he told me this joke, and I have used it several times in meetings, and always got a big laugh.

He was telling about the Irishman who had been out one night and had a few too many to drink, and he was trying to get the key in the door, and his wife heard him about 4 o'clock in the morning. She got up and opened the door, and here is the Irishman all hung over like this, and his wife said, "What do you have to say for yourself?"

He said, "Well, Hon, I didn't come with a prepared speech, but I'm open to questions."

I have told that several times, and I always gave GEORGE the credit for it. I think that was the epitome of GEORGE. He was always outstretched arms and a big smile.

Like HENRY I would like to dedicate a poem to the memory of this great American, this great father, this great citizen of our State of Illinois. I think embodied in this poem is really the life and works of GEORGE O'BRIEN, because he was always giving himself unselfishly for somebody else.

I saw an old man going down a lone highway,
When he came to the evening cold and gray.
And to a chasm vast and deep and wide,
The old man crossed over to the other side.
And when on the other side,
He turned back and built a bridge to span the tide.
"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim near,
"You're wasting your strength with building here.
Your journey may end with the passing of this day;
You may never again come this way.
You've already crossed the chasm vast and deep and wide,
Why build a bridge on the other side?"
"Oh," he lifted his old grey head,
"Good friend, in the path I have come," he said,
"There follows after me today, a youth whose feet must pass this way.
He too must cross in the twilight dim
Good friend, I'm building this bridge for him."

That is the life and the work of GEORGE O'BRIEN—always doing something for someone else. So I am happy to be able to rise and join you and our great delegation and these other friends from all over this great coun-

try in paying tribute to a great man, GEORGE O'BRIEN. Thank you so much.

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

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

□ 2010

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader for yielding and I want to thank him for taking this special order so that we can pay tribute to GEORGE O'BRIEN.

It has been well said here this evening about GEORGE's dedication to his country and devotion to his duties as representative of his constituents here in Washington.

I think those who recall GEORGE's efforts on behalf of American hostages in Lebanon rejoice with the news of the release of Father Martin Jenco. Father Jenco grew up in GEORGE's district.

It was almost ironic, I guess you could say, that that was one of the main themes at the funeral, which I had the privilege of attending.

I am sure GEORGE O'BRIEN's personal intervention with his meeting with Syrian President Assad last year contributed to the release of Father Jenco this past weekend.

Maybe, as our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] pointed out, maybe even somehow all of that did reach the hearts of those who had been holding him captive.

It is too bad that GEORGE was not alive to see that, but, of course, he knows it and is highly pleased.

In addition, GEORGE's contribution to the legislative process as ranking Republican on the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was instrumental in forging positions that could be supported by both sides. He promoted the policy initiatives of the administration while protecting the interests of his constituents and preserving the prerogatives of the House in the appropriations process. His warm, personal approach enabled him to achieve agreement through reason and cooperation rather than confrontation.

He was a nice man and a good friend of everyone.

I agree that one of the most moving experiences any of us have ever had was seeing GEORGE O'BRIEN come to the well on the night of June 25 on a vitally important matter.

You could see the transformation. When he came in, he was in a wheelchair; he looked very old and very sick, very feeble, but he managed to stand up and walk to the microphone and deliver a stirring address.

You could almost see him revived, as it were. I certainly agree with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] said earlier. I think that your asking him, Mr. Leader, to come here was not only something good for the cause, which it was, no question about that, but it was good for GEORGE O'BRIEN.

The way that his colleagues stood and applauded him was the real tribute to GEORGE O'BRIEN, far more than we do here tonight. That was something that is not afforded to many Members of this body.

I think that all of us are and should be grateful to you, as the gentleman from Illinois said.

My condolences and those of my wife Norma, go to his wife Mary Lou and his family. Their loss is our loss as well, but we can console them and ourselves with the knowledge that we had the privilege to know GEORGE and to serve with him, and that his efforts did make a difference for his constituents and for our country.

Again, his inspiration and example on June 25 are something that we can all take to heart and follow.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman and I am happy to yield to another one of his good Democratic friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS].

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois and I consider it absolutely essential to be here personally on my own behalf and also on behalf of the Steel Caucus, to spread on the RECORD what I personally and what the caucus generally feel and felt about our good friend and colleague, GEORGE O'BRIEN.

It was some 10 years ago that we put the caucus together. GEORGE was a lynchpin in the concept of the Steel Caucus and also in the many ramifications which transversed visits to the White House during the Nixon administration, the Ford administration, Jimmy Carter coming along and now into this President.

He helped form that Steel Caucus and I think that Steel Caucus speaks for itself on some of the issues that it has supported. On every one of those issues, GEORGE O'BRIEN, serving in the official capacity, because we do have and did have a bipartisian approach to the problems, as a vice chairman of the entire caucus, and then as vice chairman of the executive committee.

What he contributed, I think, is irreplaceable, because he gave us stability in the caucus. He was not only a good friend, but a mentor insofar as he has been around Congress for many years. We had the benefit of his sage advice. He was always a leveling factor in any of our controversies. As many of our colleagues have said on the record, I agree, he was just a nice, dedicated, good colleague.

When GEORGE O'BRIEN would say something, GEORGE meant it and you could almost bet your life on it. That is the way it was. It was never tampered with. No addition was made to it and what he said was always based upon the facts.

He was a close, cooperative effective member of the Steel Caucus. Personally, I would like to spread on the RECORD, on behalf of myself and even the sitting chairman now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] who asked me to make sure that I included him in these remarks.

First, we are going to miss him, and miss him so desperately and authentically. Second, I do not think we are going to be able to find a practical replacement for GEORGE. Yes; we will have other colleagues serve with us, but none in the method and the manner in which he served, with that unequaled personality, the sincerity, and effectiveness that we all know surrounded GEORGE O'BRIEN from the day he got here until now, this unfortunate time that he is leaving us.

Based upon those personal observations over a 10-year period, I want to conclude by saying that it is my personal pleasure knowing him and working with him. I think the caucus benefited tremendously because of him. I think this Nation has lost a dedicated legislator.

I think, in conclusion, that although I know his family misses him, I think and I agree with others who have said where GEORGE O'BRIEN has gone is predestined. We all feel we are going to miss him terribly, but I know one thing. His mark is here; it is indelible, and I just hope that his family and grandchildren and all of his relatives, direct and indirect, have a chance to read some of these very gracious and sincere remarks including those that I have spread on the RECORD because I want to finally close by saying they have been put in the RECORD with the greatest sincerity I could muster on behalf of myself, my colleagues, and the entire Steel Caucus, and also the chairman, JOHN MURTHA.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for making mention of that very important role that GEORGE played in this House.

I remember that when the caucus was initially begun, and he implored me as having a steel company in my own district, that I ought to become a member. And that he was a very forceful member of that organization, as the gentleman has indicated and it was one of his special likes because that was part of his district, it had to be represented, and sometimes even if it offended his own administration, the point had to be made and he could make it in such good grace, and I appreciate the gentleman's very valuable contribution to the eulogy.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished minority leader for

arranging the special order honoring our former Colleague GEORGE O'BRIEN. I am pleased to be able to rise to pay tribute to our esteemed colleague, the Congressman from Illinois GEORGE M. O'BRIEN. We are all saddened by his death. He was a dedicated American—an inspiring figure to all of us in this Chamber and to his constituents in the Fourth District of Illinois. Due to his outstanding service, Congressman O'BRIEN was chosen to serve seven consecutive terms in this body by his constituents in Chicago.

GEORGE O'BRIEN never lost his brilliance as an outstanding legislator and his good humor during his tenure in the House. He never hesitated to go it alone, as he stood firm by his beliefs.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was initially elected in 1972 along with the rest of us in the 93d Congress. Since that time I had been honored to serve with him and was proud to work with GEORGE, to seek his counsel on a variety of issues, and to call him "friend".

Throughout his 14 years in the House GEORGE O'BRIEN avoided confrontation, preferring to get results through cooperation. To quote his distinguished chairman, NEAL SMITH: "We were able to get together and work things out. He doesn't relish confrontation; he'd rather be effective."

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, PAUL SIMON said, "He was an honorable and superb public servant. He was kind and he was genuine. He had a good sense of where partisanship gives way to cooperation."

Not too long ago, before he traveled abroad to appeal to the Syrian President, Hafez Assad, about freeing our hostages in Lebanon, I had the opportunity to confer with GEORGE at length about his mission and was moved with regard to his deep concern for their well-being. One of those hostages, Father Lawrence Martin Jenco, a native of GEORGE O'BRIEN's district, has now been released due in part to those efforts of Congressman O'BRIEN.

Most of us knew that GEORGE O'BRIEN was a lifelong resident of Chicago, but did not know that he was also a Phi Betta Kappa graduate of Northwestern University and a graduate of the Yale Law School. Nor did many of us know that GEORGE served in the 8th and 12th Air Forces during World War II and was discharged a lieutenant colonel.

To GEORGE's lovely devoted wife, Mary Lou; his two daughters, Caryl Isabel Bloch and Mary Deborah Pershey, and three grandsons, we join in offering our condolences.

Our 93d class will sorely miss our good friend and great colleague, GEORGE O'BRIEN. I am thankful that we all had the opportunity of being with and extending our acclamation to GEORGE when he courageously came to answer his last rollcall in the body.

□ 2020

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to another one of his good friends, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say to the gentleman and all of GEORGE's friends tonight that I had missed the notice that there was going to be this special order, and I happened to walk onto the floor and hear the eloquent and beautiful words being spoken by his friends tonight.

I did not want to leave without adding my own expression of deep admiration and frankly love for a human being that I think was matchless in the time I have been in the Congress.

I want to just share with my colleagues two experiences I had with GEORGE O'BRIEN. They were both memorable; I will certainly remember them always. It reminds me in many ways of what my colleague from Illinois, KEN GRAY, said about GEORGE. He said he was always doing something for someone else.

When I was first elected to the Congress, I came with that large—BOB, I know you will remember this class—that large Democratic class of the 94th Congress, and there were so many people on the floor on opening day when we took the oath of office that I and my two children had to sit over on your side of the aisle because this side was packed.

I remember sitting right there in the middle of your colleagues, and sitting there right beside me was a friendly teddy bear of a man, as Mr. CRANE said; and he turned to me and he said "Hi, I'm GEORGE O'BRIEN." He said what is your name? I introduced myself. He took a special interest in my children and from that day until the last, he always inquired about how Stacy and Kelly were doing; he would remember the details of what their activities in school were, the colleges that they selected; and the caring this man showed was truly remarkable.

GEORGE also knew and made it a matter of his own personal concern that I came down with a kidney condition about 4 years ago, and no Member of the House on either side of the aisle has inquired more often as to how I was doing, and I am grateful that I have done well.

GEORGE was always concerned and always asking; that is the kind of guy he was. In fact, we worked together; he was a member of the Labor-HHS Committee. We worked together on something else that will be a monument to GEORGE O'BRIEN; and that is Regional Kidney Research Centers around the country.

GEORGE understood the problems of kidney disease and he worked very hard, and I worked with him on this, and I was amazed that the day after GEORGE's death, after the markup was complete, I got a call from his staff because his staff said GEORGE wanted me to know that the funding for those centers that we had worked for, for some 4 years, was in the bill heading to the floor.

GEORGE O'BRIEN holds a special place in my heart, and if I were to use a word to describe him, and maybe it is an important thing to state at a time when there are so many tensions across this center aisle that divides these two parties, is that he was a teacher.

He taught us that we are Democrats and we are Republicans; but we are more than that, we are human beings, real people, with real needs, real wants, real hopes, real dreams, and he reached out and touched each one of us in that sense, too.

As long as we can remember that lesson, I think we will be a better body and better individual Members as a result.

I am glad the gentleman has taken out this time, and I am glad that I have been able to participate and I am going to miss GEORGE, and I wish his family and all his loved ones my very best.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very touching references to his association with our departed friend, GEORGE. Very moving.

I am happy to yield to my friend from Illinois, another one of his neighboring colleagues, Mr. MADIGAN.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding to me. I would say to our distinguished leader that this evening has reminded me of what a special privilege it is to be a member of the Illinois congressional delegation, because of the eloquent things that have been said here by you, by Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, by Mr. HYDE, and others.

I think that GEORGE O'BRIEN, if he were here, at this point he would want to lighten this up a little bit. So I want to recall for you, if I may, that I was twice blessed, because I served not only with GEORGE O'BRIEN here in the Congress of the United States, but I had him for a seat mate in the Illinois Legislature.

HENRY HYDE and I had arrived there a little bit before GEORGE, and I was invited to a dinner one evening of freshman members of the legislature, and sat with GEORGE and Mary Lou that evening. I remember watching GEORGE walk into the room and thinking that it was Ben Cartwright, the fellow on the Bonanza TV program, they looked so much alike to me.

GEORGE told me, as LES said he had this remarkable memory, he told me that night when I told him that he looked like Ben Cartwright, he said, "Well, you look like somebody, too."

For the next 16 years he would periodically say to me, "You do look like someone, but I haven't figured out yet who it is."

He was still saying that to me in the last days of his life. He was a tall, distinguished, soft-spoken gentleman. He was my seat mate, and he and I came to Washington together.

I remember when we were there in the legislature, I would say to my leader from Illinois, that it was not an easy time in Illinois; there was a lot of unrest on the campus; riots in Chicago; racial unrest in southern Illinois, and I remember GEORGE coming in one morning and telling me how he had paced the floor the night before in his apartment over in Lincoln Towers, trying to think of a constructive way that he could be involved in addressing that gap that he saw between black and white in Illinois; between teacher and student in Illinois; and I remember being moved by how deeply he was caught up in those things, and how much he wanted to contribute to their solution.

But at the same time, if there was a good humor man in the Illinois congressional delegation, it was the gentleman from Joliet, GEORGE O'BRIEN.

We have talked about his humor and how bad the humor could be, but even when it was bad it was funny because it was so bad.

In the 1982 campaign, I inherited some territory from GEORGE because of redistricting. I had began that year to run in part of his home county, and one night in the town of Peotone I was scheduled to debate my opponent, and I did not know that GEORGE O'BRIEN was in 50 miles of the place.

Just as it was time to debate, he walked up, nudged me, whispered to me, "I'm going to handle this guy for you," took the podium and sang a song to this crowd of people assembled there. He had written a song about me to the tune of the Irish song, "Herrigan." As the Irish would say, the crowd was his and the rest of the night was his, and the debate never took place, and he really did handle that guy for me.

He was a wonderful guy, and Evelyn and I were watching television, the news about Father Jenco and I said, "My goodness, I wish GEORGE could know that." She said, "He knows it because he did it."

Well, I do not want to offend the gentleman from Illinois in the well [Mr. MICHEL], so I am going to continue to say publicly that he is the best singer in the Illinois delegation; but GEORGE was clearly the second best, and while we have lost a friend for a time, St. Peter has gained a good Irish baritone.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the distinguished elder statesman of this House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his kindness in yielding.

Like my colleagues, I am heavy hearted at the passing of GEORGE O'BRIEN. GEORGE O'BRIEN was truly a nobleman.

□ 2030

I think every man, woman on this floor loved him, respected him, admired him. He was a man of wide legislative interests which he pursued with great diligence. He was deeply dedicated to his work. He loved this House and he loved his colleagues in this Chamber. He loved America. And he served it with great dedication and devotion.

He was a man of warm human quality.

I played golf with him on a number of occasions, and always enjoyed it. He could hit that golf ball a long way. I used to tell people in the presence of GEORGE, "You know what they do down at Cape Kennedy when they get ready to launch those shuttles? They get GEORGE down there and let him hit the ball up into the sky, and then the shuttle follows GEORGE's golf balls up into the heavens.

So he would laugh. We had many happy occasions together. I thought a great deal of GEORGE. He was one of those men who somehow brightened the path of life which he trod. He made things better and brighter where he was. He made the day a little bit better when he greeted you with his warm exuberance, his warm smile, and sometimes his warm handshake.

So in the passing of GEORGE O'BRIEN we have lost a brother the like of which we shall not see again.

I want to extend the greatest condolences of my heart to his loved ones, and I want to pay to GEORGE O'BRIEN what Shakespeare has Antony pay to the fallen Brutus on the field of Philippi: "His life was gentle, and the elements so mix'd in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world 'this was a man!' "

Thank you.

Mr. MICHEL. That is beautiful, Mr. Chairman. I want to take this opportunity to thank so many of our Members, after a lengthy legislative day, for staying here and participating in this great tribute to GEORGE O'BRIEN.

At this juncture I am happy to yield to my dear friend from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

You know, I am not from Illinois, but GEORGE O'BRIEN sometimes made you wish you were. He was that kind of a man. I guess like LES AUCOIN mentioned earlier, I think GEORGE O'BRIEN used to make a habit on opening day of a session of sitting down next to a freshman Member because I can recall my first day in this Chamber, I was sitting right back there and I did not know anybody, hardly. There was not anybody from New York in that freshman delegation. I felt kind of alone. Sure enough, in walks this great, big Irish man, and he sits down next to me and puts out his hand, and he says, "Hi, I'm GEORGE O'BRIEN from Illinois. Who are you?" I told him. From that day on we just became the greatest of friends.

He was a friend. And for 100 different reasons I wanted to stay here tonight and pay tribute to him and his wonderful wife, Mary Lou. But, you know, that day when we sat here the first time, GEORGE said he was proud to be from Illinois, he said he was proud to be of Irish ancestry, and he said he was proud to be a Member of this body.

He went on and told me why, as we sat there, for 35 or 40 minutes. And everything he told me came to be true because this is a body where camaraderie is so great, where we have great respect for each other. But something else happened a little later.

The minority leader appointed GEORGE O'BRIEN as a delegate to the North Atlantic Assembly, where he served for many years. He appointed me that year when I was new. And in traveling to Europe that particular year we have an opportunity to debate the issues before the North Atlantic Assembly. He and I were sitting there, and some of the people from some of the countries were standing up and berating America, as they do quite often, and back in those days I did not have all the patience and all the diplomacy that GEORGE O'BRIEN had, even though he was a hot-tempered Irish man. He kept his temper inward.

I recall him patting me on the knee saying, "GERRY, just wait, we will get our turn."

As the day went on, the debate went on, GEORGE O'BRIEN turned to me, he had tears in his eyes, and he said to me, he said, "GERRY, you know, I am so proud of our country, America, and I am so proud to be an American." And I looked at him and, you know, nobody ever meant that more than he did. He really meant it. And when he came in that door on that fateful night that we debated the particular bill and he sat there in that wheelchair, I think half the Members or maybe all of the Members of this House had tears in their eyes when they looked at GEORGE because he was such a dynamic man. And to see him like that, and when he got up out of that wheelchair in his condition and walked to that podium, I could just see him from those days before when he turned to me and he said, "GERRY, I am so proud to be an American."

He was so proud to take that podium where the minority leader is standing

to say the words that he said, and to cast his vote for America.

God bless him. He was a wonderful man. We never will forget him.

I thank the minority leader for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for his moving comments, and I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. I thank the minority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I appear here this evening with all of my colleagues in this House to express memories about a very great man.

GEORGE O'BRIEN and I first met on a CO-DEL, when we were traveling with another of our late colleagues, the late Joe Addabbo of the Appropriations Committee.

That was the first time that I had met GEORGE and Mary Lou. We had an awful nice time together. We got to know one another and we just shared many, many fond occasions together.

On that trip my daughter was traveling with me, and during the course of the trip she became ill, and both GEORGE and Mary Lou at every turn were inquiring about Shelly, wanted to know whether she was better and expressed that type of concern throughout the entire trip.

Even after we came back, every time I would see either GEORGE or Mary Lou they would want to know, "How is Shelly?"

This friendship that we struck up on this trip continued. GEORGE and I were serving on the same subcommittee on appropriations, Labor, and Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee.

I recall one day GEORGE told me that he was giving an educational conference in his congressional district and wanted to know if I would be willing to come out to his district and participate in that conference. I told him I would be delighted to do so.

We made arrangements for me to come out, and I arrived out there in the evening before the conference. GEORGE was having a little reception for all the participants. When I arrived, I was suffering with a tremendous cold. GEORGE became very concerned about my cold, left his reception, went out into his district, found some medicine, brought the medicine back to me. He was just that concerned, that he would leave all of his guests to go out and do that for me.

When you speak of his humor, the next day when I spoke, knowing of his humor, as I opened up my remarks on the occasion, I said to this audience—and it was predominantly a majority of white audience, but young people from all over his district—I said, "I'll bet all of you are wondering what a black liberal Democrat from Ohio is doing in the district of a white conservative Republican in Illinois." Well, the audience just cracked up.

Well, when I finished speaking, GEORGE came over and his favorite way of greeting me was "LOU, you rascal you." He said, "LOU, you rascal you, after you opened up that speech the way you had everybody in your hand, it was so great."

He just loved that speech.

Afterward, whenever I saw him, he would make some reference to that speech and the fact that I came into his district and spent that time with him.

But having served with him on that subcommittee, I know of his dedication to health and to education. GEORGE spent a great deal of time with the witnesses who appeared before that committee, as the gentleman from Illinois, the minority leader, knows, because he served on that committee much longer than either GEORGE or I.

But GEORGE used his skill as an old trial lawyer to bring out the kinds of things that he felt were important in those areas. He often made reference to the fact that he had been a trial lawyer at one time, and it was something he was very proud of. But you also could see it in the skill that he exhibited in terms of being able to elicit from the witnesses the kind of information that he wanted. Then I guess his last appearance in the House is something that I will always remember.

During the 18 years I served in this body, there have been a few times when something catches you here in your throat, and this was one of those occasions. When all of us saw this friend of ours come into this Chamber and we saw the Members in this Chamber spontaneously rise to pay respect to him and then to see all of us line up over on that side of the Chamber to get a chance to shake his hand and to speak to him. I suppose I will never forget and will always remember those beautiful words he expressed when he spoke of what it meant to him to have served in this body.

You knew that he meant it, and you were proud that he had the opportunity to be able to make it to that podium and be able to make those last remarks in this body.

Then last, the other thing I will always remember about him is the tremendous love that he had for Mary Lou. I have heard others in this Chamber tonight speak of that love eloquently, and it is so true. I have known a lot of men who loved their wives; I have known a lot of wives who have loved their husbands. But I have never known of anyone who expressed it more than GEORGE O'BRIEN did. That was something, if you knew GEORGE O'BRIEN, you just knew he loved Mary Lou. He made it clear to anyone and everyone wherever he went that that was his heart and his love, and I think of all the things that I will remember about him, I will probably remember that the most.

I thank the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our dear friend, Mr. CRANE, had a followon special order, but he had to leave the Chamber. I am most happy that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will continue with this special order.

Before yielding, I would also like to include a tribute to GEORGE O'BRIEN from our former colleague, Robert McClory, who served with GEORGE for the years that the two of them were serving in this body:

Our colleague, Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN, who passed on last Thursday, July 17, was a very decent man. In recalling GEORGE O'BRIEN's life, I am anxious to avoid any fulsome praise. At the same time there are so many descriptive adjectives that come to my mind that I cannot help but employ these words in describing one who approached that level of human perfection which we ascribe to the Biblical definition of man as "created in the image and likeness of God.

"Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN possessed those qualities of gentleness, civility, dignity, honor, respect and love which endeared him to friends and constituents—even political and personal rivals with whom he came in contact in the course of his long and honorable public and private life.

Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN looked every part the political and public leader which he represented as a prominent and highly respected colleague in the U.S. House of Representatives. His leadership on domestic and international issues secured benefits to constituents and to Americans throughout the Nation in whose behalf he served as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

On a very personal basis I recall the sympathetic and able support and cooperation which Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN provided during his Congressional Service. My wife, Doris, and I became close personal friends with GEORGE and his beautiful and devoted wife, Mary Lou. The close relationship which we established and maintained throughout our years in the U.S. House of Representatives together—and thereafter—resulted in blessings which Doris and I cherish as a part of the eternal life which his mortal passing cannot erase.

Joining as I do at this hour with many other former colleagues, I am proud and grateful to have enjoyed a close personal and public relationship with Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN and to pause now in prayerful respect and devotion to his memory—and to communicate in behalf of my wife, Doris, and me our love, respect and compassion to his beloved wife, Mary Lou, and other members of the family.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue the special order previously conducted by the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of the people here for holding this special order on behalf of GEORGE O'BRIEN. I do not have a major speech but just a few impressions.

I worked with GEORGE O'BRIEN on the Steel Caucus for the last 7½ years. He was a significant contributor to the executive committee of that caucus in more ways than one. Many of you have spoken about the ways in which GEORGE O'BRIEN made his contributions. To this Member, who often sat next to Mr. O'BRIEN, I will say that, if you were in a not-so-great mood and if things were troubling you, the best person you could ever want to sit next to was GEORGE O'BRIEN.

He radiated an aura of self-contentment, happiness, well-being, and he had this remarkable ability to communicate it to other people.

He brought a lot of life and a lot of good will to those extended sessions of the executive committee of the Steel Caucus.

I was looking at the Webster's dictionary definition of a gentleman. It talked a lot about breeding and family and education. I thought to myself that it was somewhat incomplete, or the definition was emphasizing some features which were not as important as some other features like fineness of character and capability for good will and just the ability to be gentle and kind and caring.

□ 2045

If we ever wanted to rewrite the Webster's definition of a gentleman, I would think we should go to this special order tonight and synthesize some of the comments that were made about GEORGE O'BRIEN. I think, my colleagues, that that would provide us and posterity with a definition of the word "gentleman." It would be unsurpassed.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments. I understand the gentleman is in the midst of a Superfund conference, and we certainly appreciate his participation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I did not know GEORGE that well, but I did have an opportunity the first year I was here to take a trip to New York with my wife Rose Marie and his wife Mary Lou. We spent a wonderful weekend there in New York, with GEORGE and his wife showing us the ropes of the city, showing us the ropes of the trip that we were on. We took several meals with them, and we went to several different activities with them.

A lot of great things have been said here tonight about GEORGE O'BRIEN, and certainly one of them was his great love for his wife that was certainly reciprocated through Mary Lou to him. But I believe the thing that stands out more than anything else is that GEORGE O'BRIEN was indeed a gentleman. I have heard other Members reiterate that tonight, but I wanted to come down here. I had submitted a statement for the RECORD, but I decided to come down here tonight, because certainly I had never met anyone in my entire life, anyone, who could be called a gentleman more than GEORGE O'BRIEN.

He has made my stay here in Washington, DC, more enjoyable, and I think he has made my life more worthwhile by simply of having had the opportunity to know him, even though it was on only a limited basis.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], a member of the Appropriations Committee with GEORGE.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the three gentlemen from Illinois for arranging this evening, Mr. MICHEL and Mr. CRANE for taking this special order, and Mr. PORTER for extending the time so that all of us could have an opportunity to participate.

It was something that I count one of the brighter parts of my congressional career that I had an opportunity on a number of occasions to work very closely with GEORGE O'BRIEN.

One time was a time when he was just tremendously helpful to me. There was a mixup at the Economic Development Administration. As a result, it looked as if certain projects in New York City to which they had informally committed would get caught up in some rescisions. I came to GEORGE with the problem. He was ranking minority member of that appropriations subcommittee, and he really threw himself heart and soul into resolving it, and the crisis was averted as a result of GEORGE's efforts. I was always and eternally grateful to him for that.

The other occasions, I think, when I saw GEORGE in action really reflected GEORGE's concern for people who needed help.

When I first got here in 1978, GEORGE was quick to enlist me in his concern for the handicapped, and particularly his concern for accessibility to transportation for the handicapped. I remember the fight that year which he led and in which I worked by his side to try to ensure that federally funded mass transit would enable those who are handicapped nonetheless to get around and participate in the full life of our society. I think that was really a measure of GEORGE.

Of course, as so many have mentioned this evening, his efforts on behalf of Father Jenco in the final year of his life were another remarkable testimony to what GEORGE O'BRIEN stood for, because here, as GEORGE's own life was slipping away, and he must have known it, nonetheless he threw himself wholeheartedly into this case to try to make sure that Father Jenco would ultimately be free. It is, of course, a great tragedy that GEORGE did not live to see the day of that freedom, but it is certainly true that GEORGE's effort in keeping that case in the forefront of people's minds played a very important role in the ultimate freedom for Father Jenco.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join all the Members who have spoken here tonight in expressing my condolences to Mary Lou and to the other members of GEORGE's family. The Nation has lost a great legislator and we have all lost a great friend.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], a member of the Appropriations Committee and a colleague of GEORGE there.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to my other colleagues describe GEORGE O'BRIEN, and I am reminded that unfortunately in this Chamber that we served, often our impressions of our colleagues are based on snapshot incidents in our lives where our paths crossed with one another. Fortunately, I was blessed to meet GEORGE O'BRIEN soon after I came to Washington, and then to serve for a little over a year with him on the Appropriations Committee.

I think what has been said is so appropriate about GEORGE. He was in fact a gentleman. It is a term that is used so often and, yet, when you think about the origin, it must have been a person of grace, of special grace, a civilized and cultured grace, who could work so well with other people.

I noticed this about GEORGE, too. He took his job as Congressman very seriously, but he never took himself seri-

ously. I think that also is a mark of someone who is very successful in this chamber.

GEORGE O'BRIEN could light up a room with his wit and good humor. I have seen him do it so many times. I can recall at the Appropriations Committee when he would have an important amendment before him and he might stumble in the process of describing it. He would turn it into a joke in a second, and everyone in the room would laugh, and then he would move on to the business of the day. I am going to miss that. It is needed so much in life, and certainly in this Chamber.

He was a man of great values, too. His marriage to Mary Lou meant so much. I guess we all can recall that final moment he stood on the floor here and he described how important service in this Chamber had been to his life. He was brought in in a wheelchair to cast his vote. He did make note of a woman sitting in the gallery, Mary Lou, with him again at that hour, standing beside him during those important times.

When I first came here, I was a little concerned. GEORGE was a Republican and I am a Democrat. I wondered, how much can I trust these guys? Can I really open myself up to these people and not be frightened that it might come back to haunt me? I found so many times with so many people, particularly with GEORGE O'BRIEN, that it was a personal friendship, a real friendship, that transcended party and transcended the issue of the day, and it meant so much.

I recall, and I think the gentleman from Illinois can also recall, the funeral ceremony we both attended in Joliet for GEORGE. It was a beautiful ceremony, and it brought in the people of his district and his friends from every walk of life. That is the way it should be for GEORGE O'BRIEN.

I recall one hymn that was sung there, and the lyrics and the song have been in my mind ever since. It is a Catholic hymn entitled, "Here I Am, Lord." I was thinking to myself as GEORGE O'BRIEN presented himself to heaven, that we sit here in mourning and in reflection, but our loss is truly heaven's gain. GEORGE O'BRIEN was an exceptional man, and I am proud to have counted him as a friend.

□ 2055

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for his participation and I too, recall the service in Peoria. It was ecumenical. While it was a Catholic service, there was a Jewish rabbi and a Protestant minister that also participated. Members from both sides of the aisle; exactly the way GEORGE treated all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is no secret; GEORGE O'BRIEN was my friend. The fact is, he was a friend of so many people in this Chamber. He was a special friend to everyone who knew him. This is not a place where it is easy to make close friends. We are all busy and distracted and we are people absorbed in our own agendas. But GEORGE really worked at it, as I think we have heard this evening.

He really made a special effort to break down the barriers that we build up around here, to get to know you and know you well. Once he knew you, he really nurtured that friendship. That is one of the things that has always struck me about GEORGE. He did nurture his friendships. He really cared about you; he cared about your family; your triumphs, your frustrations, your failures. If you had a success, GEORGE was the first to share your joy and he remembered it. If you were depressed, he could always, always ease the depression with a story, a joke or some upbeat counsel.

My day was always brighter when I could share a little of it with GEORGE O'BRIEN. He always called to me, "How are you doing, Billy C?" Fortunately, those days were many, especially after GEORGE became a member of the House Wednesday Group a few years ago. GEORGE and Mary Lou were regular, devoted attenders at all Wednesday Group activities, whether it was one of our annual retreats where we would go away for a weekend to study a particular issue and have a good time in the process or whether at dinner discussions we had or at social events. He was always the center of every group.

He was always the life of the party in the best sense of the word. As everybody has alluded here tonight, the special love that GEORGE and Mary Lou had I think was an inspiration to us all.

GEORGE was a distinctive and memorable human being, even in great pain, as he obviously was for much of the last year of his life. His spirit soared. His joy of life was unquenched. It was difficult for those of us who were his friends to see GEORGE then because he was so obviously in pain. But it was, I would say, an inspiration, because here was a man in the grip of a dred disease yet still hard at work representing his constituents and carrying out his heavy duties as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee.

Who can forget the eloquence with which he pleaded in his illness for the release of Father Jenko; his trip to Syria. Pleas that were answered, unfortunately, only days after his passing.

Dylan Thomas, the great Irish poet, once wrote a poem which ended with these lines:

Go not softly into the dark night;
Rage, rage, rage against the dying of the light.

In his own, uniquely gentle way, GEORGE raged against the dying of the light, but he did it with consummate grace, with unflagging good humor, working until the end and warming us all with the fire of his indomitable personality.

Mr. PORTER. I certainly thank the gentleman for his eloquent words about our colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has taken this time. I have listened to the remarks tonight; it could all be summed up on one sentence, and that is that GEORGE O'BRIEN was a person that was loved by his fellow man.

As we walk through the road of life, there are few that take a special place in our hearts. We call them "friend" with a heartfelt warmth. GEORGE O'BRIEN was one of those people. His caring for others gave special meaning to the word "friend." I know that Mary, my wife, and myself will always cherish the memory of our special Irishman.

GEORGE and I came to this body together. We have served together on the Appropriations Committee for many years, and I had the challenging privilege of serving under his leadership as our ranking member on the State-Justice-Commerce Committee. He always brought the leadership to that responsibility. To me, he was the epitome of a faithful servant of the people of this Nation and those that he represented.

I think his service was characterized by the words in the finest way, words of integrity, compassion, leadership, a keen intellect, a great sense of humor, humility, and love of his fellow man.

GEORGE was specially blessed with a wonderful partner in Mary Lou. Their love for each other was the crown jewel of his life. Likewise, in talking with GEORGE, you knew that he cared so much for his two daughters, Carol and Mary, and likewise his grandchildren, Brian, Brendon, and Anthony. When we would occasionally run into them in the dining room or around the Capitol, it was always with great pleasure and pride that he would introduce his family. To him his family was everything.

In the Bible in St. Mark, the Scribe said to Jesus: "Which is the first Commandment of all?", and He answered him by saying, "First of all, thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all

thy mind and with all thy strength." This is the First Commandment.

The Second is like, namely this: "Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself." There are no other Commandments greater than these. I would say that GEORGE O'BRIEN lived those two Commandments every day of his life. You could not be around GEORGE very long without knowing that he loved his Lord, loved his church, and that he loved his neighbor just as himself.

What a wonderful legacy he has left for his community, for his family, for this body.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for his wonderful words about our colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell the gentleman that I appreciate the gentleman taking this special order. GEORGE O'BRIEN was a very special individual and we all cared a great deal about him. Sometimes we become very cynical in this place. I have been here for almost 4 years and I have wondered many times if the patriotism that our forefathers showed when this country became free still exists.

There was one gentleman that comes to mind when I think of patriotism. His name was Caesar Rodney. Caesar Rodney was one of the members of the Continental Congress. He was a member of the three-member delegation from Delaware. When the battle for independence was joined in the Continental Congress, Caesar Rodney fell ill and he had to go home. He was deathly ill and they found out that he had cancer and he was terminally ill.

Caesar Rodney went back to Delware not ever expecting to come back to Philadelphia to vote on the critical issue of independence. But he received word that the Delaware delegation was split, one-to-one, and that John Hancock had decided that it had to be a unanimous vote if we were to have independence; if we were going to have a Declaration of Independence.

So they sent for Caesar Rodney, and Caesar Rodney who was on his deathbed, literally, got on a horse and rode for 2 days through wind and hail and rain to get back to Philadelphia to cast that tie-breaking vote that ended up giving us our independence.

I thought that kind of patriotism died with people like Caesar Rodney until just before GEORGE O'BRIEN died, he walked through that door because he was asked to do a patriotic thing for his country by casting a vote on a very, very critical issue. It reintroduced my feeling that patriotism still lives in this country. I was very, very proud that the kind of a gentleman still served in this body.

I was very proud of that day and to be a participant when GEORGE O'BRIEN received a standing ovation from all of us because we knew what he was going through when he came back to cast that vote.

I would just like to say that my condolences go out to Mary Lou and the rest of his family and I want you all to know it was a pleasure for me to have known such a fine gentleman.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for his words reminding us of GEORGE's love for his country, and his other kind words about our colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, there are many special Members, many men and women in this body that are memorable. Some just a little bit more than others because God has given them a quality of warmth that they just exude 24 hours a day.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was the only Member of this body that ever referred to me by the childhood derivative of my name, "BOBBY."

□ 2105

He had that way of speaking to you like you felt you knew him all your life when you were a freshman and joined this body. You had this Irish, big-brother feeling about him.

I can remember 8 years ago, he had his 60th birthday party down in the Speaker's dining room, just across from the restaurant. That was the first time I observed his love for Mary Lou and his children and what a wonderful family he had.

I thought at the time, what a job it must be to reach your 60th birthday, that birthday that is so special that in Asia they say it is when your life begins again. To see him reach his 60th birthday with his family around him, serving his country in this great Congress and to see all that love, I thought to myself what a joy to be here for the big 60.

I had a very special feeling for GEORGE after that because I had seen the love of his family for him and him for his family. I thought he pretty much had it all.

He just fell shy of that biblical three score and 10 which, at least in the United States, given our wonderful medicine, now does not seem all that old. It is really young to pass away at 68, particularly when you are young at heart like GEORGE and so big and robust, at least until we saw him that last night, just 17 days before God called him.

I think that, although we are tempted to say GEORGE had such a good, full life, when you see a man enjoying his family, his wife, his kids, and his grandchildren the way he did, you did feel that tremendous sense of loss.

When he spoke that night, I had no idea we would be in his beloved Joliet Cathedral where he sang in the choir for 12 years within such a few weeks.

That night, after he made that moving speech, and there were so many tears flowing down so many cheeks in this House, he went back and sat down in his wheelchair in that corner and then a whole procession of Members from both sides of the aisle went by to pay what they knew would be their last respects to GEORGE O'BRIEN.

With each person that passed, because GEORGE did look ill, and only when that beautiful voice of his came out of him, did some of the Members look up from the back of the Chamber and realize it was GEORGE O'BRIEN speaking to them. So when I went over, I knew he was in pain and I did not know how much he would want to say to each Member. I could not believe, as I stood there in line, how vital he was, that he had something special to say to each person.

I am sure, JOHN, that he said something special to you. I just know that without having been there when you went by.

The gentlewoman from California, BOBBI FIEDLER, came up to him. "Oh, BOBBI, I am so sorry you did not win your primary in California. I thought you were doing such a terrific job."

Then when I came up to him, he said, "BOBBY, you are going to Syria tonight." I said, "No, tomorrow night, GEORGE." "Well, I wanted to be with you so much."

Sure, it was his trip. I was going with him, not him with me. It was his inspiration. He gave me the little 7 that I wore in my lapel until Ben Weir was returned and made it 6, and then I felt bad about wearing it because the word came out that maybe Bill Buckley was dead. Then Peter Kilburn's body was thrown in an alley in Beirut and it was down to 4 possibly.

I just felt bad wearing a 7, but I wore that with GEORGE because he took it off his lapel and gave it to me and said, "I will get another one from the jeweler who made it up."

He said to me, "BOBBY, you tell Hafez Assad and Foreign Minister Shara," just had the names right like that, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], was standing right there; he will tell you this.

He had just congratulated JIM for going to the other body. He said, "You tell them that I am believing in their sincerity. I know they want to do something for our hostages and give them my best regards and tell them to keep trying."

A few days later, I passed on those very remarks of GEORGE to President Assad of Syria. I told President Assad that if GEORGE lived more than a few months, it would be a miracle. I had

no idea it would be 13 days before God would call him.

President Assad seemed very moved, and I said, "President Assad, GEORGE O'BRIEN is counting on you." He said, "All right, you tell Mr. O'BRIEN we are going to redouble our efforts."

When I found myself at Joliet in GEORGE's beloved church listening to Senator DIXON speak more eloquently than his colleagues said they had ever heard him in his career talking about how GEORGE could not turn down his leader to come to the House, so ill that June night, saying how GEORGE could never have turned down his country, his President and his leader.

It was the most natural thing in the world for him to show up here so ill. When I came out of the church at Joliet, there was Mary Lou, the first one at the door, as you recall. I gave her a hug and said, "Mary Lou, Father Jenco will probably be home within the week because while some of us work the problem down here, GEORGE has direct access and he is now working that problem in Heaven."

If I was being romantic or something, GEORGE got the job done in 96 hours, maybe a few hours less than that.

Then I came out of the church and turned to the Jenco family. There they were, Joe, the sisters and everybody. They called me over because I have here the effects. I am going to take it out and show it to Father Jenco tomorrow, the letter that is written by Father Jenco in his terrorist dungeon in Beirut, all in his handwriting and signed by the four of them, the three that remain alive, Peter Kilburn was held by some other group before they murdered him, and it was addressed to "Dear Congressmen GEORGE O'BRIEN and BOB DORNAN."

I turned to the Jencos and I said, "You know what I just told Mary Lou, that with GEORGE working this problem in Heaven, your brother is going to be back in a week."

Joe Jenco reminded me of that a few days ago.

They have asked me to fly back to Joliet with them Saturday and ride in that parade. I know that I will be sitting in GEORGE O'BRIEN's seat in that parade for Father Jenco.

So I promise GEORGE tonight that I will not forget that he was working for the seven. Three are left and he is working the problem in Heaven while we work it down here. We will probably have the other three out in a few weeks.

We are going to miss GEORGE O'BRIEN around here, not just you folks on appropriations, but all of us. In those eulogies for him the other day in the 1 minutes, one person forgot just one little thing in their show of affection for GEORGE. They said they were sorry that he was not here to witness the return of Father Jenco.

Father Jenco returned because GEORGE was there and not here. We sometimes forget that.

Until we all see him again, vaya con Dios, GEORGE. We will not forget you; do not forget us.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for not only the recollections of GEORGE's life as a Member of Congress, but also for letting all of us know what transpired and what brought about the release of Father Jenco and what an important role GEORGE played in that.

We are delighted that you are going to be representing us in that parade back home.

Mr. Speaker, I think the number of Members who have come to the Chamber late this evening, so many Members from both sides of the aisle, is indicative of the feeling that all of us have for GEORGE O'BRIEN.

□ 2115

We all loved GEORGE O'BRIEN and we will all miss him terribly. Kathryn and I share with Mary Lou her sense of loss. Indeed, every Member of the House and their families share that sense of loss in a very real and human way.

He was perhaps the most warm and caring and loving human being I personally have ever known.

You would not shake hands with GEORGE O'BRIEN without, somebody said, he would give you a hug. He would pat you on the back. He loved people and they loved him.

He was a great teller of stories, as many have said on the House floor tonight. Whether you would go downstairs and sit in the Members' dining room and sit at the table with him for lunch or whether you were out to dinner with him or other Members in a delegation meeting or whether he was with folks from back home, he would always regale everyone with wonderful, wonderful stories.

I can remember a trip that a number of us took to Illinois aboard Air Force One about 2 years ago with President Reagan. We went out to Chicago. HENRY HYDE and LYNN MARTIN and GEORGE and I were privileged to accompany the President on that trip. President Reagan came back about 20 minutes ago into the flight and began telling stories about his days as an announcer for the Chicago Cubs out in Des Moines on the ticker. When he began to get into those stories, HENRY HYDE and GEORGE O'BRIEN and LYNN all began trading with the President great Irish stories. They had so much fun that the President did the same thing on the way back and spent another 45 minutes or so on the flight trading stories with GEORGE and HENRY and LYNN. It was just a wonderful fun time.

GEORGE had just come back from a trip to Ireland at the time, and anybody that knew GEORGE knew how much he loved Ireland and if there was one thing that he would have loved to have achieved, but did not during his lifetime, that would have been to be our Ambassador to Ireland.

He told the story that HENRY HYDE told earlier in the evening, and I want to repeat it. It is a true story. He had gone to a cemetery there and had looked, as I did when I was in Ireland, at some of the gravestones. One he found said "Here lies the body of Brigadier General"—I think the name was Brian Muldoon. It said, "Killed accidentally by his manservant," and it listed the date of his death. That was at the top and then down in the middle were a number of flowers and cupids, and then at the bottom of the gravestone it said, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

He saw the humor in things. He saw the fun things in life. He was positive and optimistic and he saw the good in his fellow man.

I never heard him say an ill word about anybody during the entire time that I knew him.

He was also, as has been recounted so many times this evening, a man of commitment. Everyday he spoke on the House floor about Father Jenco. For month after month he got up and brought the case for the release of Father Jenco before the American people. He went to Syria, as has been recounted earlier in the evening.

When he died and Father Jenco had not yet been released, we sat down in our Illinois delegation meeting and said to ourselves that we, the Illinois delegation, are going to undertake on a bipartisan basis to carry on GEORGE's efforts in behalf of Father Jenco, and do you know that before we had done anything and as our colleague from California mentioned just a few moments ago, immediately thereafter Father Jenco was released and obviously it was a tribute to the commitment of GEORGE O'BRIEN and to his efforts in behalf of Father Jenco that his release was brought about.

It has also been said many times, and it is all so wonderfully true, that GEORGE was blessed with a beautiful and loving wife, Mary Lou, a wonderful family, and there was never a greater family man than GEORGE, his two daughters and three grandsons and Mary Lou. It was a wonderful family that was never closer I think than any I have ever known.

They knew that GEORGE loved life dearly. He lived it fully.

I discovered after his death and just a few days ago that he had suffered from cancer for a far longer time than any of us knew. It tells us a great deal

about GEORGE's character, the stuff he was made of, that none of us did know that. He carried on his obligations even while he was suffering from this dread disease. His work on behalf of others was carried out with the same conviction and courage and commitment that he had always shown. It was all at the same time that he was suffering.

So we have lost not only a colleague, a man who loved his country, his family, who loved his service to his country, the opportunity to serve in this wonderful body, we have lost a very, very dear friend.

I am sure that on entering Heaven, God would certainly have said to GEORGE, "Well done, good and faithful servant," and GEORGE probably would have said back to the Lord, "You know, that reminds me of a wonderful story."

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice as we say goodbye tonight to GEORGE O'BRIEN. I want to thank our colleague, Mr. MICHEL, for taking this special order which allows Members the opportunity to speak on behalf of a colleague of ours who really will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE and I were elected and came to Congress together in 1972. George has always been someone I enjoyed serving with. He was a hard working member of the Committee on Appropriations. His role as a moderate Member, who avoided extremes on all issues, enabled him to make a particularly useful contribution on that committee, were he brought bipartisan balance to difficult issues like the Federal Trade Commission and the Legal Services Corporation.

Outside the appropriations process, his most active commitment was on the issue of trade. He was an effective spokesman for the revitalization of American manufacturing capacity, and protecting U.S. workers from unfair foreign practices.

But all of us who consider ourselves GEORGE's friends will remember him more as a man than as a legislator. He was one of the kindest and most decent men who have ever stood in our midst. He had a gentle manner, and a warm smile. He was a sincere and loyal friend to us all, and we will miss him greatly.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to GEORGE's family.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add a few words to what has been said about our dearly departed colleague, the late GEORGE O'BRIEN.

Before I start, however, I'd like to congratulate my colleagues, BOB MICHEL and PHIL CRANE for organizing this special order. I also extend my condolences to his family and friends.

I had the pleasure of serving with GEORGE on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Appropriations Committee. We have a congenial and cooperative environment on the subcommittee due in large part to the demeanor of our esteemed Chairman BILL NATCHER.

It's also due, however, to members like GEORGE. That subcommittee is only as good as the sum of its parts.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was an intergal part of the subcommittee. I had the pleasure of serving with GEORGE for 3 years. In those 3 years I came to know GEORGE as a very caring man. I never heard him say a bad thing about anyone. Though his questions of witnesses you could always tell that his primary concern was for people. As the chairman is fond of saying, the Labor, HHS, Education bill is the people's bill. It was clear that GEORGE believed that it is.

GEORGE has left us now but his caring spirit has not. It's up to us, his friends and colleagues to keep that spirit alive.

I'd like to end with a quote by Angelo Parti:

In one sense there is no death. The life of a soul on earth lasts beyond his departure. You will always feel that life touching yours, that voice speaking to you, that spirit looking out of other eyes, talking to you in the familiar things he touched, worked with, lived as familar friends. He lives on in your life and in the lives of all others that knew him.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE O'BRIEN was one of the true gentlemen of this House and a very good friend of mine. I liked GEORGE from the day I met him and I am deeply saddened by his loss.

There was a spirit of decency, compassion and thoroughgoing civility about GEORGE that won him a host of friends and made him a particularly effective member of the House. I served with GEORGE on the Appropriations Committee for many years and I was always impressed with what he was able to accomplish with his unique blend of friendly persuasion and well-reasoned argument. GEORGE had a keen intelligence and he worked very hard for his district and the people of this country. I will remember him for his many kindnesses and for the quality of statesmanship and legislative talent that he brought to the House.

I would like also to say that there is a provision in the Interior appropriations bill, which the House passed earlier today, that names the new visitor center for the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor for GEORGE. He was, of course, instrumental in the creation of this very significant project and I was pleased that we were able to honor him in this way.

All of us will miss GEORGE O'BRIEN and I extend my most sincere sympathy to his wife Mary Lou and all his family.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with the distinguished minority leader, Congressman BOB MICHEL, and my colleagues in the House of Representatives, in paying tribute to Congressman GEORGE M. O'BRIEN, whose untimely death on July 17, was a tremendous loss to the people of this Nation.

GEORGE became my good friend during the period we served in Congress together, and I am proud to have had the honor to work with him in the House of Representatives.

Serving our country with distinction during World War II, GEORGE O'BRIEN obtained the rank of lieutenant colonel. He received his law degree from Yale Law School, and practiced law in Joliet, IL. Before coming to the House of Representatives, he ably served as assistant supervisor of Joliet township from 1956 to 1964, and was a State Representative for the 41st District of Illinois from 1971 to 1972.

Elected to the 93d Congress in 1972, GEORGE O'BRIEN compiled an outstanding record of achievement as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary of the House Appropriations Committee. Most recently, he worked tirelessly for the release of Father Lawrence Martin Jenco, of Joliet, visiting Syria and speaking to the Syrian President on behalf of the Americans being held hostage in Lebanon. Sadly GEORGE did not live to see Father Jenco released. However, his courage, compassion, and hard work toward achieving this objective will be long remembered.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a fine legislator, and his dedication to the highest standards was an inspiration to his friends and his fellow citizens. He will be sorely missed by all those he served, and all who had the privilege to know him as a friend.

Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife Mary Lou, his two daughters, and the other members of his family who survive him.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE O'BRIEN was special in many ways and he will be missed by all of us. He was a big man who gave of himself to his country, his constituents and his family. America has lost a great public servant, the people of his district have lost a dedicated represenative, and GEORGE's family has lost a loving husband and father. We in the Chamber have lost a dear and wise colleague.

GEORGE loved his work and did it well. He labored diligently on the House Armed Services Committee. He also served ably as ranking Republican on the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Being an man of great compassion, he organized and then served as chairman of the House Republican Task Force on the Handicapped.

He was particularly active in the North Atlantic Assembly and was a member of the House delegation to the Assembly where he served with distinction.

I clearly remember GEORGE's last appearance in Congress. On June 25, he left his sickbed and entered the House Chamber in a wheelchair. He was determined to cast his vote in support of President Reagan's request for aid to the Contra rebels in Nicaragua. His final vote in this Chamber was done with the determination and commitment that characterized GEORGE's service here in the House.

GEORGE was a statesman, not a politician. He tried to look at issues apart from partisan politics. He constantly looked at what was good for the country and voted that way regardless of the party line. He clearly knew where partisanship gave way to cooperation.

GEORGE never forgot who sent him to Washington and whose votes kept him in the House. He deeply believed in taking care of the people in his district and ensured that every last letter was answered. Concern for his Fourth District constituents was paramount and never-ending. He was justifiably proud of

his interest in and service to the common people back home.

He worked long and hard to improve the economy in his district. He played a major role in creating the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage corridor, obtained funds for the Joliet Job Corps Center, and revitalized the Joliet Army ammunition plant.

While he often took a back seat on national and international issues, GEORGE won deserved praise when he traveled to Damascus, Syria, and met with President Hafez Al-Assad about the release of his constituent, Father Lawrence Jenco of Joliet, IL. The Syrian President pledged to work for the release of the captives.

During the time that Father Jenco was in captivity, GEORGE maintained close contact with the Jenco family and kept them current on the hostage situation.

The other day, when Father Jenco was given his freedom, I thought of GEORGE and how his great efforts had contributed to the release of that humble priest. Given GEORGE's big heart and compassionate ways, I am sure he is looking down on Father Jenco today with a sense of real accomplishment.

GEORGE will be missed most of all by his loving family. He and his wife, Mary Lou, enjoyed a long and warm marriage that has been described by their friends as a model husband and wife team. GEORGE was a dedicated husband and father who gave much of himself and received much love in return from his wonderfully family.

As a friend and colleague, GEORGE will be missed by all of us in this Chamber. I remember him well throughout the many years we served together in this body. He as a good human being. I remember most of all his kindness and humanity. He had a great intellect and a wonderful sense of humor. He as admired and trusted by his colleagues in the House and he displayed great personal loyalty to all of his devoted friends. His infectious smile and selfish ways revealed his Irish background. He was an amiable man who was highly respected by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. All of us will sorely miss GEORGE, and America will have lost a superb public servant.

My heart goes out to his family and friends. I know that I can speak for all of us in this Chamber when I say that an eagle has fallen. All of us are better men for having known and worked with GEORGE O'BRIEN.

Mr. LOEFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of our departed colleague, Representative GEORGE O'BRIEN.

I have had the privilege of working with GEORGE O'BRIEN in two capacities. As legislative liaison for President Ford, I spent many hours here working with Members of Congress, including the gentleman from Illinois.

In that capacity, one learns very soon whose word can be relied upon in this process of negotiation and accommodation. One thing I will always remember about the gentleman from Illinois is that his word was his bond.

Another quality which impressed me about GEORGE O'BRIEN was his genuine warmth. From the day he met me, he always knew me as TOMMY, and that meant a great deal to me, especially during my first years on the Hill with the White House. Later, when I became a Member of Congress, GEORGE O'BRIEN's honesty and sincerity remained as genuine as when I first had the privilege of meeting and working with him. His reputation for hard work in the service of his constituents is also well-known.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE O'BRIEN was a beloved friend and colleague of us all, and he will be sorely missed here in this Chamber. I would like to express my sincere sympathies to his family and my deep regret at the passing of our compatriot.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, all of us who knew GEORGE O'BRIEN feel a keen sense of loss, but I have some special memories because we came to Congress together in the class elected in 1972. We learned the ways of this institution together and found occassion to consult each other on a variety of matters over the years.

GEORGE was a very good person with a generous nature. His warmth enabled him to make friends easily, and we remember him with fondness. We were fortunate to have known him. Duncan and I will pray for Mary Lou and his family.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I truly considered it a privilege and a pleasure to serve in Congress with GEORGE O'BRIEN.

In particular, I will always remember the thoughtful concern and the diligent attention GEORGE brought to problems both national in scope and within the area he represented so ably for years.

I worked particularly closely with GEORGE on the House steel caucus. He served as our treasurer. He served as an active executive committee member. He served as a key part of our debates, our stability, and our success. The steel caucus works very hard to operate on a bipartisan basis so the needs of the steelworkers, steel communities, and steel companies are always our primary focus—GEORGE was constantly willing to join in taking that long-range view, in stressing progress and cooperation over partisanship and dissent.

I was also pleased to join with the members of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee in designating the visitor center for the Illinois and Michigan National Heritage Corridor to be located at the Fitzpatrick House in Lockport, IL, the "George M. O'Brien Visitor Center.

As our report notes, "This action recognizes the leadership and contributions of Representative GEORGE M. O'BRIEN with respect to the creation and establishment of the Illinois and Michigan National Heritage Corridor.

I close with a couple personal reflections: I will remember his Irish wit; I will miss his good humor and smile; I will continue to respect his deep religious commitment; and I will suffer from no longer having his counsel and experience.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the distinguished gentlemen from Illinois, Congressmen ROBERT MICHEL and PHIL CRANE for calling this special order honoring our esteemed colleague, the late Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN.

Representative O'BRIEN had a long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives. For over 14 years, he served his Illinois constituents and his country admirably and to the best of his ability. He was an outstanding public servant who believed that his most important responsibility was to the people he represented in Congress.

GEORGE was admired and respected by his fellow colleagues, both Republican and Democrat. As a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, he'd earned a reputation as a hard-working, effective legislator.

Sadly, the Nation has lost one of its finest statesmen, and he will be missed. I'd like to extend my deepest sympathies to Congressman O'BRIEN's family and loved ones in their time of sorrow.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, in properly paying tribute to our colleague, GEORGE O'BRIEN, we must recognize the type of man that he was.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was an affable man with an unending concern for the constituents that he represented for nearly 14 years. His efforts were directed at improving his district which had been severely hurt by recession and helping those less fortunate. He prided himself on answering each piece of mail that came across his desk, and was truly a man of the people. Negotiating for the release of Reverend Jenco and other hostages in Lebanon, as well as being instrumental in the declaring of Joliet as a separate statistical area, are merely two examples of his dedication to the Fourth District of Illinois.

Achieving the rank of lieutenant colonel in the 8th and 12th Air Force during World War II, GEORGE O'BRIEN served his country well. He continued this service upon entering into public office. After being elected to the Will County Board of Supervisors and the Illinois General Assembly, he came to the 93d Congress in 1972. As a respected member of several committees, as well as chairman of the House Republican task force on the handicapped, he always fought for what he believed to be right. Coming from his sickbed to vote on the controversial Contra aid bill, GEORGE once again took a stand for that in which he believed. Even those who did not agree with GEORGE'S views were compelled to admire his perseverance and spirit.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I had the opportunity of working closely with GEORGE, particularly on health-related issues. He shared my commitment to improving the quality of health care in the United States, and I know he commanded the respect of experts in this area. The congenial personality that GEORGE O'BRIEN possessed brought respect from both political parties. He was loved as a colleague, and most importantly as a friend. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join with my colleagues today in honoring the memory of GEORGE O'BRIEN, whose valiant but unsuccessful struggle with cancer ended 2 weeks ago.

Having served with GEORGE on the Appropriations Committee, I can say that the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District in Illinois have lost a most effective legislator, one who could balance the particular needs of his constituents with those of the rest of the Nation. As the ranking minority member of the

Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, State, Justice and the Judiciary, he annually worked with the chairman to craft a carefully constructed bill which would adequately fund worthwhile programs without wasting precious taxpayer dollars.

GEORGE's career in public service was capped posthumously by the release last week of Father Lawrence Jenco, a priest who had been held hostage in Lebanon for 18 months. Countless times over the last year and a half, GEORGE took to the well to ensure that the Congress, the President, and the American people did not forget about his constituent, Father Jenco, who was being held prisoner in a land far away. While the entire Nation was rejoicing in the release of Father Jenco, our joy in this body was tinged with sadness—sadness that our colleague had passed away barely 1 week before, without witnessing the fruits of his labors over these many months.

When GEORGE came to the floor of the House late last month to cast his vote on the question of providing aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, it took a tremendous amount of courage to do so. Weakened though he was by illness, he felt that his country needed him to be there when a close vote was expected on a crucial foreign policy question, and he was there, despite his personal suffering.

We shall all miss GEORGE O'BRIEN. His passing has left a major void in this body. My deepest sympathies go out to his wife, Mary Lou, and to his two daughters, Caryl and Mary.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to join with my colleagues in this special order to remember our friend, GEORGE O'BRIEN. He was one of the most popular and capable Members of this Chamber. In the years I have served here, I can't recall the first negative remark made about our late colleague from the State of Illinois.

GEORGE handled appropriations on the floor of this House in a very reasonable and thoughtful manner, yet he was always firm in his convictions. We need more people like GEORGE O'BRIEN in Congress. He was a great American and a very effective legislator. He will be missed, but certainly not forgotten.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 17 I lost a personal friend and colleague, and the House of Representatives lost a valuable Member. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN, who for 14 years dedicated his services to the people of the Fourth District of Illinois, passed away after a battle with cancer. It is truly sad to see a person with his strength, his dedication, so weakened—and finally taken from us—by cancer. It is my hope that this personal brush with cancer will spur us all on to find ways to win the difficult battle with this deadly disease.

While few outside of the beltway or his district knew of GEORGE, those of us on Capitol Hill were acutely aware of the major roles he played during his tenure on the Appropriations Committee. He was highly respected by Republicans and Democrats alike, and his conscientious efforts toward dealing with the smaller details gave him respect among his colleagues that was unequaled.

In addition to this Chamber, I had the honor of serving with GEORGE on the North Atlantic Assembly, representing the United States in meetings with parliamentarians from our NATO allies. I was always impressed by his dedication and willingness to sacrifice of himself for others.

During our trips to Europe, he flew to Rome and elsewhere in his efforts to secure the release of the Reverend Lawrence Martin Jenco, who grew up in GEORGE's district. It is sadly ironic that Reverend Jenco was released just days after GEORGE's untimely passing.

My wife Nancy and I have known GEORGE and his lovely wife Mary Lou on a personal basis for a very long time. We want to extend our sympathies to Mary Lou and the O'Brien family.

Congress lost a giant on July 17, and I lost a very dear friend. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in their tributes to Representative GEORGE O'BRIEN and would like to extend my sympathies to his wife and family.

I will remember Mr. O'BRIEN as fair and just, a man whose convictions often transcended the lines drawn by these aisles. He consistently acted upon those values that he deemed good and right. And he occasionally pricked our conscience. That virtue will be missed.

His leadership was indeed clearly witnessed as he came before us tirelessly, urging each of us to be vigilant in our efforts on behalf of the hostages in Lebanon. His vision of their safe return was focussed on, but not restricted to the release of his friend and constituent, Father Martin Jenco. And he pursued all possible courses of resolution in that effort.

Tomorrow, Father Jenco will return to the United States. We deeply regret that GEORGE will not be here to share in that happy moment.

I also remember the last words that Representative O'BRIEN left with us. He spoke of this body and the very special sense of family and friendship that he felt here. It was a personal and moving statement. He is missed by his many friends in the House.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE O'BRIEN was a friend of mine. As one passes through life there are those who stand out because of genuine warmth and friendship. Congressman O'BRIEN was such a person. Our belonging to the same college fraternity, Sigma Chi, made our friendship all the more meaningful. He was a credit to this country and an inspiration to all who knew him. I was proud to call him my friend.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to express my sympathy to the family and friends of my good friend and colleague GEORGE O'BRIEN.

The Fourth District has truly lost a dedicated public servant and a fine human being. GEORGE's distinguished service as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations gained him much respect among his colleagues.

My good friend, GEORGE was always willing to lend advice and listen patiently to others' views. His wisdom and presence will be dearly missed by all his colleagues and his constituents.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week our colleague and our friend, GEORGE O'BRIEN, passed away. GEORGE's absence will be felt by all, of course by his family and friends, but also by the State of Illinois, Congress, and the Nation.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a sincere and dedicated individual with a purpose and drive unsurpassed by many as evidenced most recently when he came to the House floor from his hospital bed in order to cast his vote in favor of aid to the freedom fighters. A living example of GEORGE's dedication to his fellow man is Father Lawrence Jenco, a native of the Fourth District of Illinois who was just freed from captivity in Lebanon, in part due to GEORGE's valiant efforts.

A fine example for us all, GEORGE's legacy will live on as a reminder to us to strive for what we believe in as he did all of his life.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad task we are performing in saying goodbye to our dear friend and colleague, Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN, who left us on July 18. A dedicated representative of the people of suburban Chicago, he won the respect and admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle for his effective work on the House Committee on Appropriations.

I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL and Congressman PHIL CRANE for calling this special order to honor GEORGE's memory. They have given us an opportunity to focus our attention on a lifetime of achievement and public service which merits our highest accolades and commands our deepest respect.

GEORGE O'BRIEN always knew what it took to be a good representative—fairness, compassion, integrity, intelligence, and a deep-seated love of country. He possessed each of these qualities and they served him and more importantly, the American people, well. GEORGE O'BRIEN was truly a people's representative. He came from the people, and he continued to earn the love and respect of the people who elected him and had the privilege to work with him. Friend, colleague, respected legislator, GEORGE O'BRIEN lived a distinguished life of service to our great Nation. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deepest sympathy to the family of Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN, who proudly represented the fourth district of Illinois for 14 years.

From his service in the Air Force during World War II, to his unselfish work in the House, Congressman O'BRIEN always worked to preserve liberty and freedom for our Nation. GEORGE was a true patriot who served his constituency well. He was a powerful force accomplishing what needed to be done.

However, GEORGE was much more to be than a deeply admired colleague. GEORGE was of great assistance to me as a new Congressman when I was first elected. He was a true Christian man who was greatly admired by his fellow colleagues in Congress.

I offer my sincerest condolences to Mary Lou and GEORGE's two daughters, Caryl and Mary. My prayers and best wishes are with them in this difficult time, and I only hope that they can find some comfort in the knowledge that GEORGE will always be remembered by his friends, colleagues, and many admirers as a shining example to all Americans.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late GEORGE M. O'BRIEN of Illinois, who died on July 17. GEORGE was a good friend and trusted colleague. He will be deeply missed by this House, where in his career, he served honorably and with dignity.

Born in Chicago in June 1917, GEORGE was a 8-year veteran of the Will County Board of Supervisors. In between his service to the community at the local level and his service to his county, State and Nation here in Congress, GEORGE practiced law in Joliet.

Throughout his career in the House, which spanned some 14 years, GEORGE was not a flamboyant politician. Instead, he was a skilled behind-the-scenes legislator and diligent representative of his district. As the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary, GEORGE was a strong supporter of funding for the handicapped. During his service on the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education, his efforts in the 98th Congress led to higher visibility for the nursing profession and a $5 million appropriation for a nursing research facility, GEORGE also fought for the maintenance of the Legal Services Corporation and Juvenile Justice Programs.

Mr. Speaker, it was through the House Wednesday Group that I really got to know GEORGE. I found it a pleasure to work with him in that capacity. As an Irishman, I will certainly miss his Irish humor. It will leave me destitute.

GEORGE M. O'Brien served this House and his Illinois constituents admirably during his 14 years in Congress. He will be deeply missed.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a dedicated Congressman with the passing of Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN. He was a man of great personal integrity and I am proud that he was my friend as well as my colleague. I will miss him.

GEORGE was someone you knew would be there when you needed him. Ask for help and he, without a moment's hesitation, would take the time to hear you out and help in any way he could. I especially appreciated this willingness on his part to work with even a "younger" member like myself, and even though we were in different political parties. It says a lot about the man and his values. He was here to be a Congressman. And indeed he was a Representative in every sense of word. He was hard-working, he remembered the constituents back home, he was committed to doing what was best for our Nation.

GEORGE will not be forgotten. He's left his mark on the Congress and on this country. I'm going to always remember that easy going manner, his honesty, his personal courage and the enjoyable talks we had as well as the work we did together on projects for the third and fourth districts in Illinois. I'm going to remember the honor it was to know him and work with him.

Today I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him and in expressing my condolences to his family. He was a fine man and we share in their loss.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join in extending my sympathy to Mary Lou O'Brien on the death of her husband, our colleague GEORGE O'BRIEN. GEORGE and I were both elected to Congress in 1972, and during the nearly 14 years we spent together in Washington we became good friends. He was a very capable, dedicated and courageous legislator who has left his mark on Capitol Hill. One memory I will always have of GEORGE is the grit he showed in getting out of a sick bed late last month to come to the House floor in a wheelchair for the critical vote on the Contra aid issue. So impressed were we with that exhibition of devotion to duty that we gave him a 5-minute ovation. He deserved it.

During his seven terms, GEORGE brought to the deliberations of the House a strong sense of personal conviction, integrity, and legislative ability. In establishing an impressive record of public service, he contributed creatively and constructively to legislation advancing the welfare of the Nation. His dedication and his love of his district, State, and country had a positive influence on all of us who knew and worked with him. He was a good friend, a conscientious legislator, and we are going to miss him.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, today we are setting aside time and the press of business to pay tribute and last respects to our departed colleague, the Honorable GEORGE O'BRIEN. GEORGE was a strong, thoughful legislator who compiled a remarkable record of achievement in Congress.

GEORGE'S legal education and broad background in the law stood him well in his position as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary. These four areas of Government have an enormous range and effect on American life. GEORGE'S careful and precise approach to the subcommittee's work greatly influenced the quality and productivity of the three departments and our judicial system. The appropriations process was GEORGE'S forte and he worked diligently each year in determining spending priorities and supporting programs to improve the workings of a significant portion of the Federal Government.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a kind and considerate man with humanitarian concerns and an abiding respect for life and liberty. In the noted case of Father Lawrence M. Jenco, a native of Joliet, IL, GEORGE pressed unrelentingly and used every avenue possible to try to secure Father Jenco's freedom. I know we owe Father Jenco's recent release in large measure to the fact that GEORGE O'BRIEN would not give up on his efforts to bring his constituent and fellow American back from the abyss of terror. It is very sad that GEORGE'S passing occurred only days before his prayers and yearlong appeal were answered.

GEORGE will be deeply missed in the U.S. Congress. In a speech in this Chamber not long ago, he spoke poignantly of brotherhood and goodwill. Truly, no other among us stood better for these ideals. I know I join with all my colleagues in feeling the loss of a good and respected friend and in expressing deepest sympathy to Mary Lou O'Brien and her family.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues here today in honoring the memory of our splendid colleague—GEORGE O'BRIEN.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a conscientious legislator who was more interested in the integrity of the congressional process than in obtaining headlines in the media.

Those of us in the House who knew GEORGE remember him as an honorable public servant who put the good of the Nation before partisanship, and beyond that a thoroughly fine, decent human being who enjoyed the warm friendship and deep respect of Members from every point of the congressional spectrum. GEORGE was a kind and delightfully amiable guy.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee and the ranking member of its Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, GEORGE O'BRIEN gained the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle for his diligent work on that panel.

GEORGE O'BRIEN is best remembered by his colleagues for his support for programs to aid the handicapped and his efforts to preserve the Legal Services Corporation.

He will also be remembered for being the first Member of Congress to meet with Syrian President Hafez Assad about Americans held captive in Lebanon.

The Reverend Lawrence Jenco—one of the American hostages—grew up in GEORGE O'BRIEN's congressional district.

Ironically, only days after GEORGE's death, Reverend Jenco was released from captivity.

He favored cooperation over confrontation—and his word was like gold. I, for one, will miss GEORGE O'BRIEN's presence in this body.

He represented the best of Congress—someone who put the interests of his Nation and his constituents first and foremost.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to share in a tribute to my friend, GEORGE O'BRIEN. We came to the Congress the same year. We served in the same party and, more often than not, we held the same views on issues.

GEORGE was a quiet man. He was not one quoted day after day in the national news, but he served his constituents effectively. He was a man of strength who stood firmly for what he believed. That was evidenced time after time while he served the people of Illinois' Fourth District here in the Congress, but never more clearly than on a recent evening when he came in a wheelchair, too weak from his illness to walk, to cast his vote for a principle he believed in. He demonstrated daily a commitment to duty and responsibility that led him to great successes in many areas.

GEORGE was a gentle man. He was a man with many friends from all walks of life. He always had kind words to say about others. He cheered up whatever room he walked into with his big smile and happy stories.

One of the most outstanding things about GEORGE was his strong faith in his God and his strong faith in his country. He practiced that faith consistently and by his very life encouraged others to strengthen their own faith in both God and country.

And then, there was GEORGE's love for his family. He and Mary Lou were good friends and loved doing things together. They shared a great love for, and pride in their two daugh-

ters. It was the kind of life that illustrates the very best things about being part of a family.

We miss GEORGE O'BRIEN and shall continue to miss him. But our lives are richer because he shared them for a time.

Mrs. Moorhead joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mary Lou and the girls. We pray that God will bless them especially during this time when they are learning to go on with their lives without GEORGE.

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the late GEORGE O'BRIEN, a man who distinguished himself as a Member of this House, and as a caring citizen.

GEORGE befriended me when I was a newly elected freshman, something I am not likely ever to forget. He was a warm, likeable man who made it a point to learn the interests of others, and he went out of his way to discuss them with obvious concern. He provided guidance and leadership, knowledge and experience, and a fine example of the committed, responsibile legislator.

GEORGE O'BRIEN cared deeply about the people of his district, his State and the Nation. To the very end, he was outspoken and courageous in his positions. I doubt that the memory of his last appearance in this Chamber will ever dim for any of us who were privileged to share it. No matter what his own personal sacrifice, he was here defending that in which he believed, and making every possible effort to convince others of the rightness of the cause. It was an emotional moment but, more importantly, it served to remind us all of the serious mandate we have been given.

GEORGE O'BRIEN left a deep mark on the Congress he served with ability, and with affection. He will long be remembered. I extend my most sincere condolences to his family, and I am indeed grateful for having had the privilege to know and work with him.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a dedicated and distinguished former colleague, GEORGE O'BRIEN.

GEORGE was an outstanding individual who dedicated his life to our country. A veteran of World War II, GEORGE's political career demonstrated his devotion to his fellow Americans. Since his election to the House in 1972, GEORGE served as a diligent member of the Appropriations Committee and as the ranking GOP member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary. He fought for programs that advanced humanity and truly believed that his position as Representative of the people was of paramount importance in his personal quest to create a stronger nation.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was one of the warmest, gentlest, and kindest human beings I have ever met. We will miss this great man. I am saddened by our loss, but I know that his spirit will always remain.

I wish to express my heartfelt sympathy to the family of Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to honor a true man of the people, GEORGE O'BRIEN. GEORGE was a highly esteemed colleague who will be missed greatly by the people of the Fourth District of Illinois, and his friends in the House of Representatives.

I believe the entire membership of the House recognizes and appreciates GEORGE's hard work on the Appropriations Committee. During his 14 years of service, he served the commmittee and the Republican Party in a most commendable manner. His family and friends can be proud of his accomplishments and his service to the people in his district.

Throughout his tenure he tried to protect the interests of the underdogs, by supporting and promoting funding for programs designed to serve low-income families and the handicapped.

I consider it an honor to express my respect and admiration for GEORGE. Like you all, I will miss him greatly.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, like our colleagues, I was greatly saddened by the death of our colleague, GEORGE O'BRIEN. He served this Nation with great dignity and distinction during his time in the House of Representatives. More importantly, GEORGE brought a special sense of obligation to his fellow human beings that set him apart from the average person.

I, for example, didn't serve on any committees with GEORGE O'BRIEN and since we were on opposite sides of the political aisle we didn't have occasion to work together on projects of mutual interest. But GEORGE went out of his way to befriend me and get to know who I was and what kind of person I am. Most importantly, his warm, outgoing, and compassionate manner gave me an opportunity to know him and gain an immense amount of respect for him.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a good man. All of us who had the privilege of serving with him in this Chamber are better people for having known him. Our Nation was blessed with having him serve here. I want to extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy at this time of their great loss.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a few moments with my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend, GEORGE O'BRIEN. My remarks will be brief, but they are sincere, for I loved GEORGE O'BRIEN, and his death has left a void that cannot be filled.

GEORGE's service in the Congress began before mine, but for him it was just the continuation of a life of service to his neighbors, to his State and his Nation.

His service was selfless and effective. He worked hard and long, and if we had not seen before, we all were in awe as we watched GEORGE's tireless, continuing and personal efforts in behalf of his friend, former hostage Lawrence Jenco. How very much GEORGE must have enjoyed Father Jenco's homecoming.

Ours is the finest deliberative body in the world, and we each hold a great trust from our constituency. No one fulfilled his stewardship better than GEORGE. He represented the best we have to offer, and the command and dignity with which he performed his representative duties is an inspiration.

Nancy and I extend our sympathies to GEORGE's family. We know your loss and your grief. But we've also found great comfort in the many warm memories we will always have of GEORGE, and feel blessed to have shared his friendship.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I join with House Members today in honoring the memory of our late colleague GEORGE M. O'BRIEN.

I feel honored to have had the opportunity to serve in the Congress with GEORGE O'BRIEN and especially to have had the chance to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. He was a diligent Member who represented the Fourth District of Illinois for nearly 14 years with a gentlemanly and effective style.

I think I will remember most his courage and his compassion.

I will never forget that dramatic evening when this body was voting on the question of aid to the Nicaragua Contras and GEORGE, fighting so bravely against cancer, came courageously to this floor to cast his vote for an issue he believed was so important to our Nation.

I will also remember GEORGE's work on the Appropriations Committee where he mixed a sense of fiscal responsibility with a sense of compassion and fought hard for money for the handicapped and juvenile justice.

He also was a staunch supporter of the National Institutes of Health and convinced us of the need to establish a National Institute of Nursing at NIH to provide a nursing research arm to improve disease prevention and cut medical costs. He was so concerned about providing effective nursing services at NIH and justly compensating the nurses who work there that he joined in cosponsoring my legislation on the need for special pay rates in the civil service for categories of employees such as nurses who are in hard-to-fill professional positions.

GEORGE O'BRIEN leaves a proud record of public service and involvement in Republican politics in Illinois and a distinguished career as a Member of Congress. We feel his loss very deeply and express our sincere sympathy to his wife Mary Lou and their two children.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of our colleague, GEORGE M. O'BRIEN.

The Fourth District of Illinois, the Congress, and our Nation have benefited greatly from the presence of Mr. O'BRIEN in the Halls of Congress. He brought to us a deep devotion to his work, a profound dedication to serving his district, and a lasting commitment to the well-being of our Nation.

It has been a particular honor to serve under his leadership on the Appropriations Committee. I have seen on a firsthand basis, day by day, his untiring efforts to serve his constituents and his country.

But perhaps the incident which best illustrates GEORGE O'BRIEN's stature of service to our Nation occurred several weeks ago during the critical vote on aid to Nicaragua. The vote count was extremely close and the implications for the future of democracy in the Western Hemisphere were enormous. GEORGE O'BRIEN got up from his sickbed, putting his own serious problems to one side, and came here to the Capitol. He arose from his wheelchair and cast his vote with the President, helping us to victory.

In looking at his own selfless courage and unremitting efforts, I could only reflect whether the rest of us are willing to devote similar

effort for the sake of democracy and freedom. And I have no doubt that this action and his lifelong record of dedication to the highest principles of our Nation will inspire a new generation to follow in his worthy footsteps.

I extend my deep condolences to GEORGE's wife, Mary Lou, and to their daughters. We join in your mourning and deep and lasting regard for one of our Nation's great men.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE O'BRIEN was not only a dedicated and capable Member of Congress, but a man whose friendship I greatly valued. Last summer, GEORGE, his wife, Mary Lou, and my wife and I traveled to Europe together. That's when I became closest to GEORGE, and when I began to admire what a truly wonderful person he was. During the trip, GEORGE broke away from the group and journeyed to Syria in hopes of winning the release of the Reverend Father Lawrence Jenco, a native of Joliet, ILL, in GEORGE'S district.

GEORGE was absolutely tireless in his efforts to free Father Jenco.

Despite an illness that would grow more serious by the day, GEORGE O'BRIEN never gave up. This was truly a quest about which he felt strongly. In honor of GEORGE'S unfailing diligence, I have remembered him in my weekly editorial column. The complete text of the column follows:

We may never know exactly why Father Lawrence Jenco was released last month after being held captive for more than 500 days by terrorists in Lebanon. But the seeds of Father Jenco's freedom were planted, and then nurtured for nearly a full year, by Congressman GEORGE O'BRIEN of Illinois.

Like many heroes, Congressman O'BRIEN did not live to witness the fruits of his labor. He died last month of cancer, 9 days before Rev. Jenco was freed.

Mr. O'BRIEN was the first Member of Congress to go to Syria on Father Jenco's behalf. He met not only with Syrian President Hafez Assad and other high-ranking Syrian Government officials, but with representatives of the Vatican, Britain, Egypt, France, Iran, Israel, Turkey, and the United Nations.

Back in Washington, Congressman O'BRIEN worked with the State Department, the White House, the CIA, and other Government agencies to help win Father Jenco's release. When his health permitted, he made speeches on the floor of the House so that Congress would not forget the plight of Father Jenco and the other hostages. Congressman O'BRIEN even scheduled a return trip to Syria, but his illness prevented him from going.

In other words, he did not leave a stone unturned.

Two days before Mr. O'BRIEN passed away, when he must have known that death was near, the Congressman told his wife that he regretted not living to see Father Jenco freed.

When the news of Father Jenco's release reached Washington, the reaction of those close to Congressman O'BRIEN was, understandably, bittersweet. They were elated that Father Jenco could finally return home, but saddened that Congressman O'BRIEN would not be there to welcome him.

Thinking of Mr. O'BRIEN'S "never quit" attitude toward winning Father Jenco's release, a friend of the Congressman remarked: "When Mr. O'BRIEN died, I knew he would talk to God about Father Jenco. This just proves there is no bureaucracy in Heaven."

The release of Father Jenco has prompted emotional pleas for the Reagan administration to win the release of the remaining hostages by meeting the demands of their terrorist captors. But the official Reagan Administration policy remains not to negotiate with terrorists, and Congressman O'BRIEN understood this. He recognized the difference between quiet diplomacy and knuckling under to terrorists' demands.

The issue is not merely how to gain the release of the remaining U.S. hostages in Lebanon, but how to do so without rewarding terrorism, undermining our national interests and jeopardizing the future safety of all U.S. citizens.

After all, terrorists do not kidnap Americans simply for the sake of holding Americans hostage. They do it with the hope of holding American foreign policy hostage.

The Reagan administration—indeed, any President's administration—cannot afford to permit its sympathy for innocent hostages to outweigh its determination to conduct a foreign policy free from blackmail. While it has an obligation to seek release of hostages, the administration has an obligation to millions of potential hostages to deter future kidnappings by convincing terrorists that they gain nothing when they seize U.S. citizens.

President Reagan has instructed the State Department to make no concessions that reward terrorism. Although we do not know all of the reasons why Father Jenco was freed, his release is evidence that President Reagan's approach is working.

And I would like to think that, somewhere, GEORGE O'BRIEN is resting happily, a job well done.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL and Mr. CRANE, are to be commended for requesting this time today to honor our colleague and good friend GEORGE O'BRIEN.

I had the distinct pleasure to serve with GEORGE on the Appropriations Committee where he played an important role as ranking minority member on the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee. GEORGE also was particularly active in the area of medical research as a member of the Health Appropriations Subcommittee, on which we served together.

During the past year, GEORGE worked diligently with the members of the subcommittee to provide adequate resources to improve our Nation's ability to understand and treat kidney disease, the ultimate cause of GEORGE'S untimely death. The subcommittee included in the fiscal year 1987 appropriations bill, which appropriately passed the House earlier today before this special order, funding to establish six new kidney research centers within the National Institutes of Health. Because of GEORGE'S special interest in this area of medical research, the Appropriations Committee has directed that these new centers be named the GEORGE O'BRIEN Centers in honor of his service and work in this area.

Perhaps my lasting memory of GEORGE will be his special effort last month to cast a critical vote to release funding for the Contra forces in Nicaragua. Despite suffering from a terrible illness the past few months, GEORGE was courageous enough to be here the evening of June 25 because he knew his vote was important to the national security of our nation.

In the midst of a heated foreign policy debate, the Members of the House stopped to greet GEORGE when he entered the Chamber. The warm expression of friendship and concern for our colleague is testimony to the high regard and esteem we held for GEORGE O'BRIEN.

We would do well to remember GEORGE'S words that evening, for they sum up what is so great about this body, our Government, and our Nation. GEORGE said:

"I note that there is a certain sense of fraternity irrespective of views, irrespective of party, that transcends all the other differences we have."

Those words are true, Mr. Speaker, because our Nation protects our freedoms and liberties. Our Government gives us the right to freely debate the issues of the day. We may disagree at times on policy matters, but we all would agree that ours is the greatest Nation in the world.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a distinguished American who played an important role during his 14 years of service here in preserving the freedoms we cherish. His ideals and standards are those that our current and future colleagues would do well to emulate.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, my friend GEORGE M. O'BRIEN was not only an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, but was one of the best members we have ever had on the Committee on Appropriations.

During his service in the House of Representatives, he established an ouststanding record—one that his people can be proud of and one that will always be remembered by those who served with him in the House. Words are inadequate to fully appraise GEORGE O'BRIEN'S tremendous capacity for loyalty and love of his country. In every position he held, either private or public, he achieved distinction. His service in all of his assignments was marked by a high sense of conscience and duty. His character, his achievements and his faithful service will be an inspiration to generations yet to come.

His life exemplifies those virtues that make a great Congressman and those are fairness, generosity and an unyielding devotion to all matters which were for the best interests of our country. He left his mark on Congress, not necessarily through legislation which he succeeded in having enacted, but instead through his character itself, he was always a gentleman.

It was a distinct honor and privilege to serve on the committee that appropriates the money for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Service, and Education with my friend GEORGE O'BRIEN. I have lost a true friend and this country has lost a great statesman. To his lovely wife and family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it seems like only yesterday that I met a new Member of the incoming class of the 93d Congress whom I had previously known by name only. His district, the Fourth of Illinois, is

just across the State line and I had observed the oustanding campaign he had waged from media reports. That new Member was jovial, happy, intelligent, self-assured, outgoing, and was GEORGE O'BRIEN. At first meeting, I felt like I had known him all my life.

GEORGE was one of the most capable people to ever serve in this House. In his straightforward manner, he always accepted responsibility with determination that the task was going to be done and done right.

My wife, Carol, and I had the opportunity to travel on several occasions with his wife, Mary Lou, and him on Appropriations Committee investigations. He was the first to get to the meetings and the last to leave. He always put himself completely into everything he undertook. In meeting international groups, he was a leader in greeting and extending the U.S. friendship. He was a most active ambassador of good will.

We remember GEORGE for a great many things during his career here in the House, but certainly one of his deep felt feelings was for the hostages held in Lebanon. He spoke many times about his good friend from his home town of Joliet, Father Jenco. His hard work here and his personal trips to the Middle East to seek their release were rewarded, but too late for us to thank him. I believe that GEORGE did have a hand in Father Jenco's release which came within days after his death. For that, we all say, "Thanks GEORGE."

We are going to miss that robust laugh, the slap on the back, the hug, and the spirit that GEORGE always added.

The people of Joliet, the Fourth District of Illinois, his State of Illinois, and our Nation are truly fortunate to have had GEORGE O'BRIEN serve these 14 years in the House of Representatives. We thank the good people of Illinois for sharing GEORGE with us.

Carol and I extend our sympathy to Mary Lou, their daughters and grandsons. Our prayers are with you.

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to pay tribute to our esteemed colleague, the Congressman from Illinois, GEORGE M. O'BRIEN. We are all saddened by his death. He was a dedicated American and an inspiring figure to all of us in this Chamber.

I could tell you a good deal about his myriad contributions in public service. But I think as I honor GEORGE O'BRIEN for the man he was, and for the warmth and humor he shared with us all, it will explain why he was a truly great servant of the people.

It is especially gratifying to hear my colleagues mention GEORGE's wit and his particular ability to make the difficult situations easy. That was GEORGE's charm: He never had a mean thing to say, was always quick with a joke, and was dedicated to a purpose. He was always able to achieve positive results through his command of fact coupled with his warm personal approach. GEORGE worked through reason and cooperation rather than by confrontation. And he achieved results.

And now, we have still another reminder of his contributions to his country. As many of my colleagues have said, Father Jenco, a hostage of terrorists for nearly 2 years, was released just days after GEORGE's passing. It certainly would have made him proud, and it makes me proud as it stands as a tribute to GEORGE's tireless efforts and dedication to the cause of human rights for all human beings.

GEORGE O'BRIEN was a man of courage and dedication. His presence on the floor late last month was, and will be, an inspiration to his colleagues. GEORGE came, despite the pain, to cast a crucial vote on aid to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters. That's the way he was, always willing to help out and to do what he could to pull us together. I greatly admire his dedication to this body, a true and honest legislator, a wonderful and effective representative of the people of Illinois.

Let me conclude by extending my sympathy to Mary Lou, and all of the O'Brien family. We will all miss GEORGE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sadness that I learned of the passing of our dear friend and colleague, GEORGE O'BRIEN. It won't seem the same around here without GEORGE. His quick Irish wit; his kind and gracious manner; his astuteness on the issues, his dedication to the tasks at hand, were the hallmark of his long and distinguished career in the Congress.

As one who was a colleague of GEORGE not only in the House as a whole, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I saw first hand the many good deeds GEORGE O'BRIEN accomplished for the people of Illinois' Fourth District, and for the people of his State and Nation.

GEORGE was a legislator's legislator. He performed his job in a most professional, able, and dedicated manner. He was a doer and it will be hard to do without him in these Chambers. To his lovely wife Mary Lou, and to his family, my wife Helen and I would like to express our deepest sympathies.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, GEORGE O'BRIEN was a friend of mine. I am truly sorry about his passing away, as he was such a unique and warn person. Our friendship began when we learned about our belonging to the same college fraternity, Sigma Chi, and it continued through the years we served together. His last appearance in the House of Represenatatives occurred just as I was beginning my speech on an amendment relating to the Communist threat in Central America. Although he was quite ill, he returned to the House and was given a long ovation for his efforts in being there. I express my sincere sympathy to Mrs. O'Brien and the members of his family. GEORGE O'BRIEN will be truly missed in the House of Representatives.

DISRESPECT FOR THE RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE O'BRIEN

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for the special order that he has just taken on behalf of GEORGE O'BRIEN. I would like to spend just a minute of my time on the subject of GEORGE O'BRIEN.

I did not know GEORGE that well, but I do know that the sensitivity that Members have expressed this evening says everything about the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. O'BRIEN. He was indeed someone that people in this body would do well to emulate and follow in terms of their personal relationships. He was a very special person.

I think the stories that were related by both Democrats and Republicans here tonight indicate the warmth in which he was held by this institution and by the Members who serve it.

One story that does come to mind was during the last week before the final vote on the Central American issue. I had heard as I was whipping this issue on our side of the aisle that GEORGE would be brought here to cast his vote and I knew GEORGE was very ill and was in the hospital. Upon hearing that, I relayed that to another friend of mine, who really seemed quite dismayed by the fact that they would ask GEORGE to come here and he frankly said he thought it was rather a sick idea.

I did not know how I felt about it personally at that time, but I do remember, though, seeing GEORGE come into the Chamber and I knew immediately that it was obviously the right thing to do, because GEORGE was coming home and he was saying goodbye to his friends for the last time. That was just so very, very important to him and to the people he had served with so well for so many years.

DISRESPECT FOR THE RULE OF LAW

I would like to take some of my time this evening to talk about what I think is something that I think has been missing in the media with regard to the Nicaraguan issue, and that is basically the disrespect for law, both domestic and international.

On June 27, the World Court found the administration guilty of violating international law because of its aid to the Contras. "By training, arming, equipping, financing, and supplying the Contra forces or otherwise encouraging, supporting, and aiding military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua," according to the Court, the United States is "in breach of its obligation under customary international law not to intervene in the affairs of another state."

Thus, the highest judicial body on this planet, an institution that the United States helped to create, has historically supported, and has turned to time and time again—most notably during the Iranian hostage crisis—has ruled that current U.S. policy is outside the bounds of law.

The United Nations charter forbids "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state." The charter of the Organization of American States says that "No state * * * has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for

71-059 O-87-18 (Pt. 13)

any reason whatever, in the external or internal affairs of any other state."

The United States is a signatory to both these treaties. We demand that other nations abide by these principles. We should require no less of ourselves.

There are some people who will argue that the World Court, and the principles of the U.N. and OAS charters are just high sounding ideals. The administration has argued that the World Court is "not equipped" to judge complex international military issues. Others will say that it is naive to believe that the rule of law can be applied problems of war and peace.

But I say, the United States, the most powerful nation on the Earth, the proud leader of the free world, the nation founded on the principle of liberty and justice for all, has a special responsibility to abide by the rule of law.

This is not just an abstract ideal, it is a principle to be observed in the interest of our own national security.

We cannot violate the rule of law without implicitly encouraging others to do the same.

We cannot brandish a foreign policy of secret wars, terrorist attacks, and disdain for the rights of other nations without threatening peace in the world.

We cannot engage in such acts and maintain our credibility when it comes to condemning these actions in others.

We cannot place ourselves above the law without endangering the future of this planet in a nuclear age.

The World Court ruling did not come as a surprise to many of us who have watched the administration's policy unfold over the last 5 years. In early 1981, shortly after this administration took office, we learned that counterrevolutionaries, whose avowed purpose was to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua, were training in camps in Florida and California. This, and the entire Contra war, was a violation of our own neutrality act and our criminal statutes prohibiting support for terrorist activities, as well as the OAS Convention on Terrorism.

Then, the CIA became involved. It began to fund, arm, and provide logistical support as these forces moved into Honduras and on to Nicaragua promising a "bloodbath from the border to Managua." The administration told Congress then that the purpose of this program was purely to interdict arms flowing from Nicaragua to El Salvador. But as the Contras' brutal attacks on innocent civilians inside Nicaragua multiplied, as we learned more about commanders called "Suicide," commanders who had served in dictator Anastasio Somoza's hand-picked national guard, it became clear that the administration had embarked on a "secret war" that it hoped to hide from the American people.

In early 1984, the CIA directed the mining of Nicaragua's harbors, violating our duty to protect the freedom of the seas, endangering the ships of our allies, and arousing world opinion in protest.

In order to improve the effectiveness of the Contras, the CIA disseminated its special manual on guerrilla operations, telling how to carry out assassinations against specific targets in Nicaragua, and, this violating President Reagan's own Executive order prohibiting CIA involvement in assassinations.

Each time Congress has tried to exercise oversight over the Contra Program, the administration has stonewalled. And time and time again, since the Contra war became public, the administration has deliberately violated the expressed will of Congress.

The Boland amendment which was in force from October 1984 until September 1985 strictly prohibited all U.S. involvement with the Contras, both direct and indirect. Yet, during this time, the administration orchestrated a private network of aid to the Contras. Responsibility for this action—which was a clear violation of the law—can be traced directly to the White House.

In a plot that is reminiscent of the chilling days of Watergate, the President personally approved a plan to get around the Boland amendment. Lt. Col. Oliver North, a deputy director of the National Security Council, located in the White House itself, coordinated dozens of groups who gave money, supplies and training to the Contras after Congress expressly prohibited such U.S. involvement.

Now, in the face a congressional resolution of inquiry, requiring the administration to turn over all documents relating to these violations of the Boland amendment, the NSC has refused to provide the information.

The administration first tried to hide the Contra war from the American public. Then it tried to hide the purpose of the war. Today, the administration knows that the American people do not support its Contra war. Its only recourse is to try to hide the extent of the war, to try to cover its tracks, and disguise the costs.

The administration has told us that it needs $100 million in aid for the Contras this year. Yet, it has not told the American people that the Contra war has already cost the American taxpayer over $1 billion.

It has asked for funds for bases and maneuvers in Honduras. But, the GAO has reported that much of this funding has been diverted in violation of the law. And the administration refuses to give a full accounting of how this money has been spent on preparing Honduras for its role in the Contra war.

When Congress voted $27 million to aid the Contras last year, we enacted strict limitations on how the money was to be spent, and charged the President to establish special procedures to ensure that the money was not diverted.

The GAO found that the State Department does not have sufficient procedures and controls to ensure that these funds are being used for the purpose intended by law. This, in itself, is a violation of law. The U.S. Treasury placed $14.1 million of U.S. taxpayers' money in Miami bank accounts and kept no record of where the money went.

When the GAO examined the subpoenaed bank accounts, it found that of the $4.4 million paid by the U.S. Treasury into these accounts, only $780,000 had been sent to Central America, and only $185,000 was paid to identified suppliers of the Contras. In addition, nearly $1.5 million was ended up in the bank account of the Honduran military.

The story of Contra corruption is just beginning to unfold—and it is a horror story. The administration wants us to close our eyes and pretend it is not happening. Just as they have asked us to close our eyes to the evidence of Contra atrocities—the rape, the kidnaping, and murder of innocent civilians. In the weeks to come, as the evidence unfolds, the administration will expect us again to overlook the involvement of the Contras in running drugs.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has told us—through its actions and its words—that it will not be bound by the rule of law in its determination to escalate the Contra war. It will violate international law, it will violate domestic law. It will violate specific prohibitions on the CIA. It will violate limits on how U.S. tax dollars are to be spent. And it will look away while the Contras smuggle drugs, run guns, and murder innocent civilians. The American people deserve to know—where will it end?

The answer, I regret to say, may be a long time coming. An administration that will not respect the law will lose sight of its limits. It will lose sight of the principles that generations of Americans have sacrificed to establish and hold as a beacon for all nations to follow. If this administration will not be guided by the law, by the principle of justice, then we will be caught in an endless cycle of violence.

Camus once said, "I should like to be able to love my country and still love justice." The great tragedy of this administration's policy in Nicaragua is that it is driving a wedge between these two values. We, in Congress, must find a way to ensure that this administration respects the rule of law, so that future generations of Ameri-

cans will not have to make that terrible choice.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 5283: A BILL TO COMPEL THE LTV CORPORATION TO CONTINUE LIFE AND MEDICAL INSURANCE COVERAGE TO RETIREES

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1986, the LTV Corp., the Nation's second largest domestic steel manufacturer, filed for protection from its creditors under chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. On that same day, LTV notified its retirees that it had terminated their life and medical insurance coverage, leaving 78,500 senior citizens and their dependents without coverage for serious illness.

On Tuesday, July 29, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5283, along with 25 original cosponsors. That bill would compel LTV to continue paying medical and life insurance coverage to its retirees until a bankruptcy court ordered the cessation of such benefits. Late last night, bankruptcy court Judge Burton R. Lifland ruled that LTV could spend $70 million over the next 6 months to cover all its company paid benefits, including health and life insurance premiums.

Judge Lifland's quick and decisive action, taken after several hours' discussion among representatives of the company, union, banks, and major creditors, provided immediate relief to retirees. Many of these people were in the midst of receiving life-sustaining treatment. They were given virtually no notice that their benefits were to be terminated. Although Judge Lifland's ruling provides immediate relief, it is a temporary solution to a long term problem. LTV retirees will need medical and life insurance coverage for the rest of their lives—not just 6 months. Therefore, for the following reasons, I am compelled to continue all efforts to have this legislation passed by the House of Representatives.

First, it is absolutely essential that we protect the interests of LTV retirees. Our Nation's retirees labored during their working years so that we as a Nation might be introduced to a better standard of living. Their work has not gone unnoticed as every day we benefit from their past work and contribution to technology. We cannot now turn our backs on these retirees and leave them to fend for themselves. They have given LTV some of the best years of their lives and it is because of their tireless efforts that the LTV Corp. is today our Nation's second largest domestic steel manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, LTV's callous, insensitive and illegal action threatens the very existence of a large group of senior citizens who labored for many long years in a dangerous, dirty, and backbreaking job. Daniel Brown, a 28-year-old hot-metal worker at LTV's Cleveland facility said: "Sure, we get paid a lot, but we're here on Christmas, at Midnight and in the summer when its so hot it's miserable." I have been informed that temperatures in the steel mill sometimes reach as high as 120 degrees or higher, and due to the dangerous nature of the job, many workers must wear a heavy metal shield over their clothes. And naturally, accidents are a constant threat. Dan Brown has been a witness. He said "just the other day, a guy got killed when a turning machine amputated both his legs and he bled to death. I had to help pull him out of that thing."

Almost every steelworker could probably tell a similar story. Because these people realize the danger they place themselves in every day on their jobs, health and life insurance coverage is an essential part of all contractual negotiations. These steel workers seek the same protection for themselves and their families as any other American worker.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that health care for retired steelworkers is not a luxury, a benefit they could easily do without. It is a vital lifeline that for many, represents the difference between self-sufficiency and an existence in total destitution.

This is no exaggeration. This past Monday at a special Senate Judiciary hearing held in Cleveland by Senator HOWARD METZENBAUM, LTV retirees and their families told heart-rending stories of severe hardships endured by retirees burdened by illness and barely ekeing out a meager existence.

Mary Hunt, testified before the panel of Congressmen and Senators, of which I was part, and described life without medical benefits. Her 74-year-old husband, Eddie, suffers from arthritis and is bedridden. Mrs. Hunt, who also suffers from arthritis, must diaper and change her husband, who is totally disabled. Despite the incredible burden she must bear, Mrs. Hunt declared: "We've been married for 51 years and there's no way I'm going to put him in a home—to die there." But she also admitted that she does "a lot of crying."

There are many other LTV retirees throughout the Nation reduced to tears over the prospect of losing their benefits. These senior citizens, already faced with overwhelming obstacles due to caring for loved ones in poor health, have been literally traumatized by the possibility of being left alone to meet medical expenses. Already many have been denied medical treatment and others have been denied burial with dignity after life insurance benefits were cut off. This is an inhumane way for people to be treated.

We, as a society, have a moral obligation to care for our elderly—those who built this Nation; those whose sweat and hard work made it possible for this Nation to thrive and grow. It is absolutely shameful that this situation is before us at this time. We cannot allow LTV to wring a lifetime of labor from its workers and then discard them with absolutely no regard for their future.

Life after retirement is frequently referred to as the "golden years," at which time the elderly can enjoy the fruits of a lifetime of labor. The truth, however, is that precious few of America's elderly can enjoy retirement years. They are constantly trying to make ends meet, find enough food to eat, keep their tired bodies in working order. America's senior citizens already have a tough enough time living on a fixed income. If they lose their health care benefits, many would be financially devastated by even a minor ailment, let alone the major medical problems that occur naturally with advanced age.

LTV retired these individuals with assurances that their life and health insurance needs would be taken care of. This corporation's attempt to abandon this most essential responsibility is an intolerable dereliction of duty and their offer to replace the canceled benefits with a new health plan that would cost beneficiaries up to $132 a month is downright insulting. It is unrealistic to believe that senior citizens on a fixed income would have money to cover an expense that was unplanned, unexpected and was already paid for during their working years.

Mr. Speaker, the second reason that I am continuing to seek support for this legislation is to establish that LTV's cancellation of health and life insurance benefits to retirees constitutes illegal breach of contract. Federal law mandates that LTV must honor all commitments made under collective bargaining agreements. Therefore, all agreements negotiated by the union are protected against unilateral abrogation. On Monday, at the special Senate Judiciary hearings in Cleveland, Prof. Vern Countryman of Harvard University, America's foremost bankruptcy expert, testified in favor of the legislation which I introduced in the House. Professor Countryman stated unequivocally that the action of LTV Steel in canceling retirees health and life insurance benefits was in violation of law.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, LTV is contractually obligated to provide health care and life insurance benefits to these retirees. Congress unambiguously addressed this subject in 1984 in passing the Bankruptcy Reform Act.

That law encourages the collective bargaining process and requires that a company first make a proposal to the union and provide all relevant information and bargain with it in good faith. Only after complying with these steps can it seek court approval to reject its collective bargaining contract obligations.

LTV made no attempt whatsoever to discuss with the union its plan to terminate life and medical benefits to retirees. Beneficiaries received notice of the cancellation of benefits in a letter mailed to retirees on July 17, the same day the company filed for bankruptcy. It is unfair and unreasonable to expect LTV employees to comply with the terms of a properly negotiated contract and subsequently allow LTV to unilaterally abandon its responsibility to those employees.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn of the action taken last night as a result of the collective action of representatives of the company, union, banks, and major creditors who sought and received permission from the bankruptcy court to fulfill its obligation to its retirees for 6 months. However, this action is not enough. Yesterday's ruling merely sets the stage for a similar scenario to be acted out 6 months from now. While LTV retirees have gained a temporary reprieve from being stripped of this essential coverage, the clock continues to tick away, and 6 months is not a terribly long period of time. Those severely or chronically ill retirees can only wait anxiously to see if their benefits will be permanently reinstated or if they will be left hanging. It is unlikely that the court will hand down a final ruling on whether LTV will be compelled to pay the benefits before 6 months is up. This legislation would therefore at least protect the retirees until the court issues such a ruling.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would also provide LTV with a significant opportunity to work out a compromise with the United Steel Workers and United Mine Workers of America to preserve the benefits of their retired members.

In closing, I would like to commend Lynn Williams, international president of the United Steelworkers of America; Richard Trumka, president of the United Mineworkers Union and John J. Sheehan, legislative director of the United Steelworkers of America for their hard work on behalf of their union membership and the support given Senator METZENBAUM and me on legislation both in the other body and in the House of Representatives.

I also want to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee Mr. RODINO, who today assured me that it is his intention to hold hearings on my legislation next week.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed by LTV's attempt unilaterally to cancel health insurance benefits of retired workers. These retirees, who devoted years of their lives to LTV, found themselves overnight without any health protection.

Only 2 years ago, I introduced legislation, which we enacted, to make such action unlawful. The bankruptcy law was amended to prohibit companies—unilaterally and without court permission—from stopping benefits covered under collective bargaining agreements when they filed bankruptcy.

To the extent that the health benefits of LTV's retired workers are covered by these collective bargaining agreements—and I understand they are covered—the retirees are fully protected under current law. Their unions need only go to court to enforce their rights. I am happy to hear that the company—as of yesterday—will continue to pay retirees health benefits thourgh January 1987, and a court order was entered yesterday to that effect.

The Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law will hold a hearing next week on Thursday, August 7 to explore LTV's actions. We will also study the current bankruptcy law to determine if there are any loopholes that require corrective action.

□ 2140

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me and compliment him on taking this special order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with the retirees of LTV Steel Corp. and hope that my colleagues will do likewise by lending their support to H.R. 5283, legislation that would compel LTV to continue paying health care and life insurance benefits that were promised these people. It is indeed a shame that the Congress must resort to measures that force LTV to provide for the very people who made the company our Nation's second-largest steel producer.

There are those who might think that with the recent settlement between the United Steelworkers and the LTV management, all has been resolved. But this couldn't be farther from the truth. Pending a ruling by a U.S. bankruptcy court, the corporation has promised to restore benefits to retirees for a period of 6 months—but what will happen after these 6 months? Given the complexities of the case and the time it will take to sort things out, the proceedings will probably take even longer than this. The sad reality is that these people run the risk of losing everything that they had counted on and planned for. Mr. Speaker, when you consider that 40 percent of these steelworkers are under the age of 65 and not eligible for Medicare, the outlook becomes even darker. There is no way they can afford to pay health insurance premiums of $132 a month and there is no reason why they should have to.

It's not as if the steelworkers have not sacrificed for LTV. Twice in the recent past, workers have given up some wage and benefit concessions in order to make the corporation more profitable. Yet, LTV has refused to help those that are in need the most and has denied the claim that the workers should take precedence. In the eyes of the company, management, creditors, stockholders get first priority while the workers are left with the little or nothing that remains. Only when the union threatened to strike LTV's Cleveland works, its largest facility, did the management finally agree to restore the benefits. I am sure that consideration and compassion for the retirees was not much of a factor in that decision. The fact is that in the face of an imminent strike against the USX Corp., the largest steel producer in the country, LTV wants to avoid a work stoppage at all costs. No wonder they have settled so quickly. It makes sense for the company to want to take advantage of the USX strike. The fate of the retiree, however, still hangs in the balance.

I believe that if a large corporation, like LTV, can unilaterally abrogate a labor contract and cut off 78,000 people from their rightful benefits, then something needs to be done to strengthen the position of retirees under bankruptcy law. Under section 113, title 11 of the bankruptcy laws, the union is supposed to be protected against such unilateral action and yet LTV's recent action has shown just how fragile this protection can be. These retirees have no recourse to expensive lawyers and long, drawn-out legal proceedings. After working hard all their lives, they are confused, frightened and understandably angry at being deprived of their benefits—benefits that were guaranteed them for life.

I realize the state of the domestic steel industry is in disarray. Foreign imports and fierce competition have forced steel companies to tighten their belts and become more efficient. This is not at issue. The right of retirees to live out their lives in dignity and sufficient comfort is what is at stake here. We must make certain that no linkage exists between economic efficiency and reducing or doing away with sorely needed retiree benefits. We must further make certain that we re-

alize it is people we are dealing with and not just abstract payments and costs. Mr. Speaker, I am heartened by the interest and decisive action of the other body with regard to this matter and hope that there will be as much support and concern for these people in 6 months' time.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern about the LTV Corp.'s recent decision to terminate the life and medical insurance coverage of about 78,500 of its retirees and their dependents.

On July 17, the LTV Corp., the Nation's second largest domestic steel manufacturer, filed for protection from its creditors under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code and on that same day notified retirees of its decision to cancel benefits. Many of these retirees are on fixed incomes and are dependent on this insurance coverage, and the cancellation of these benefits will have a devastating impact.

More importantly, the LTV Corp. is contractually obligated to provide this coverage and the retirees have relied on LTV's promise to provide these insurance benefits. LTV should not be permitted to abandon its responsibility by its unprecedented action of terminating this important coverage.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I have added my name as a cosponsor to H.R. 5283, a bill to compel the LTV Corp. to continue life and medical insurance coverage until a court with jurisdiction on this issue renders a final decision on the LTV bankruptcy petition, and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support for this effort to protect LTV retirees.

When LTV Corp., filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy on July 17, literally thousands of retirees lost the medical insurance coverage they vitally need. Individuals who had devoted their productive work years for that company had their benefits indefinitely canceled with no advance warning and no opportunity to prepare.

We quickly learned of the sad and terrible consequences of this action. In many cases, retirees not only couldn't afford to buy individual coveraged but could not obtain insurance at any price.

One gentleman, Mr. Joseph Utley, who retired from the LTV aerospace plant in my district is a perfect example of the type of hardship created by the loss of retiree health insurance coverage. Mr. Utley, who I have known for many years, has a serious heart condition and in need of frequent medical care. In addition, he has a dependent 19-year-old daughter who has been retarded since birth and is plagued with a host of physical ailments. Without their LTV coverage, it is simply impossible for this gentleman and his family to obtain any type of adequate medical coverage.

Last night, as a result of pressure already provided by Congress and the labor unions representing LTV employees, the company reversed its original position and agreed to continue providing retiree coverage for 6 months.

I am pleased by the company's decision and am glad they have recognized the hardship caused by abruptly terminating the health plans of their retirees. However, it is very unlikely that LTV's bankruptcy case will be resolved in only 6 months and, without further action from Congress, retirees will again find themselves without coverage next January.

For this reason, the House should act quickly to approve the legislation offered today. It has already been approved by the other body, and very simply requires that LTV continue providing health and life insurance benefits to its retirees until this matter is completely resolved by the bankruptcy court whether it takes 6 months, 12 months, 18 months or longer.

As the situation now stands, LTV retirees are left in limbo, watching the clock tick down on benefits they worked for and have been promised. It is entirely appropriate that the House act quickly and joint with the other body to protect the health coverage LTV retirees and their dependents so desperately need. We should not leave them in a state of uncertainty and confusion over their ability to obtain needed health care for themselves and their families.

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my colleagues that despite the bankruptcy court's recent ruling allowing LTV to continue company paid health and life insurance benefits for 6 months to its retirees, the necessity for legislative action such as that contemplated in H.R. 5283 remains unaffected.

We have the most advanced medical technology on this earth, elaborately equipped medical schools, regional cancer centers that are the envy of capitals of the civilized world, an abundance of superb specialists and hospitals.

Over the 10 years preceding 1984, total hospital charges have increased at an average annual rate of nearly 15 percent. From 1965 to 1984, the cost of care has increased 10 times, from an average of $41 for each hospital day to $432; it is projected to reach $800 per day by 1990. The price of an average stay, now almost $3,000, could easily top $5,000 in 1990.

If the soaring cost of health care threatens to deny even the affluent access to the medical miracles we have come to expect, what is to happen to the thousands of retirees left without medical insurance as a result of a chapter 11 filing? What will happen to the LTV retirees in 6 months' time when their benefits are stopped but adjudication of the bankruptcy proceedings is ongoing? Without this proposed legislation we will be back at square one.

Millions of retirees are able to meet their living expenses today only because employer-sponsored health insurance plans supplement their Medicare and pension payments. Tens of millions of future retirees are already counting on being provided retirement health insurance. Health insurance, along with life insurance and pension plans, has grown to become a major element of employee compensation—yet, without this legislation, merely by filing for bankruptcy, many companies could leave the very population most in need of health care, the elderly on fixed income, without adequate resources and without adequate redress.

I believe that we cannot, in good conscience, allow companies to unilaterally abrogate their responsibilities to former employees by discontinuing medical benefits to retirees before a ruling is rendered by a court of competent jurisdiction. That would be putting the horse before the cart. Rather, like my colleagues, I contend that equity mandates the continuance of these benefits until such time as the court rules otherwise.

I do not believe that the bankruptcy laws were intended to shield companies and allow them to breach their legal duties to individuals in this manner. Social policy dictates that these former loyal employees should not be treated like "any other vendor," but should be afforded special treatment.

The profit motive cannot be permitted to shortchange the quality of care or curtail access to needed medical services. Special precautions, like H.R. 5283, are needed to ensure the continuance of these benefits to those who have already experienced a loss of wages, and who are unable to supplement their incomes.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague and dean of the Ohio congressional delegation, LOU STOKES, for sponsoring this special order to address an urgent concern of tens of thousands of our constituents.

However, this bankruptcy case has an even dimmer side. LTV, upon filing for bankruptcy, announced that its retirees, of which there are over 80,000 nationwide and 32,000 in our State alone, would no longer receive the health and life insurance coverage which they had been promised. Instead, these retirees would have to begin paying for their own coverage. Unfortunately, many of them could not afford to begin paying hundreds of dollars for this coverage. I wish to applaud my colleague, Mr. STOKES, for introducing legislation, H.R. 5283, which I have cosponsored, to protect those who have been adversely affected.

Such action is intolerable. Most of these retirees have contributed to this corporation for most or all of their working lives. To then discover that the most basic of necessities, which they had been guaranteed, was stripped from them in one fell swoop.

I have consistently supported the revitalization of our domestic steel industry. Without a steel industry at home, our national security is at risk as are other vital industries. The Senate and the House are currently in conference to resolve differences in tax reform legislation. The Senate tax bill contains provisions to provide special relief to our steel industry. I wholeheartedly support such a provision. However, I recently wrote to the House conferees to question whether such a provision was appropriate for companies, such as LTV, which declare bankruptcy and renege on their commitments to their employees, both current and former.

It is most unfortunate that an event of this magnitude has occurred. However, we must take the appropriate steps, such as enacting the House-passed trade bill, to ensure the future of our steel industry and the health and welfare of employees and retirees is secure.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, As a cosponsor of H.R. 5283—the bill to provide LTV retirees life and health insurance until a court settlement on bankruptcy is decided—I am pleased to join my colleagues in this special

order to focus for a moment on the plight of LTV steel.

Last week many in Congress were shocked to hear the announcement by LTV Corp., that it had filed for protection under the chapter 11 bankruptcy laws. However, those of us from the areas of the country where steel once was the cornerstone of the economy were not as surprised, for we knew that though some areas like the coastal cities and the Sun Belt were showing signs of recovery, steel and other heavy industries were still in decline.

Some experts and economists dismiss this as an inevitability of an aging industry. What these experts overlook is that for a century or more steel has been the foundation of a way of life for thousands of people. In many of the communities in western Pennsylvania, generation after generation has worked in the mills. When in time of war the men were called away to fight, the women of the community filled right in and continued to pump out steel for tanks and shell casings. The children of the communities followed their parents into the mills, each new wave succeeding one whose time had passed. It was a hard life but not without rewards. The pay was good so they could maintain a standard of living that was comfortable. They bought homes and cars and had stability to their life. These communities embodied the spirit of the good old days our Nation is now trying hard to recapture.

In the past 6 years, all that once was the foundation of these pleasant communities, has been torn apart at the seams. The collapse for these people was swift and very painful. The first wave saw many cutbacks in the work force. Anyone who could went into early retirement expecting that to protect them from the future cuts. No one denied the fact that change had to come. Rather, the unions agreed to the first cutbacks in the history of steel labor to help the companies. But it did little to stem the flood of lay offs and plant closings.

With announcement of bankruptcy by LTV the unions braced for another painful round of cutbacks. Even before the courts had a chance to open the petition, the company cancelled the health coverage for its 78,000 retirees. This was a low blow to those who gave their lives for the company; on fixed incomes, they are in no position to secure some other form of health insurance.

I was pleased to hear today that through the efforts of a resilient union and the pressure of the bankruptcy judge, LTV has agreed to restore the health coverage to thousands of retirees while negotiations work out a plan to provide permanent coverage. I am glad that LTV rethought its position. We have a special debt to those who were a part of the steel industry at its prime. They were a part of the economy that made our Nation the strongest in the world. We must guard against the tendency that would cause us to panic and throw away those that embody the moral decency, family traditions and work ethic that lie at the heart of our Nation.

These hard working people earned their retirement and with increased health needs and fixed incomes they cannot be expected to be able to change in midstream. I am glad to see that their union did not forget them, I hope they realize that we in Congress remember them as well.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the more than 70,000 retirees of LTV Corp., many of whom live in my district.

On July 17, 1986, when LTV filed a bankruptcy claim, the company also notified its retirees that it has terminated their life and medical insurance coverage. This was catastrophic news.

Thousands of retirees and their families were left stranded without medical coverage for hospital bills and without life insurance following a death in the family. In one case in my district, a person going to the hospital for open heart surgery learned the insurance was cancelled the same day the surgery was scheduled.

This was so unfair to those hardworking people who gave so many years to the company to be left without this necessary coverage.

That's why I have cosponsored H.R. 5283, a bill to force LTV Corp., to continue paying all life and medical insurance benefits to its retirees until a bankruptcy court decides the issue.

I know that LTV has petitioned the court to be allowed to resume payment of benefits for 6 months. I am pleased that the company took some action on this matter.

However, I would like to point out that this whole situation could have been avoided if LTV had recognized that the retirees' benefits are covered by section 1113 F of the bankruptcy law. That part of the law was designed to prevent workers from being cut off in midair and I believe that applies to wages as well as benefits.

In spite of LTV's action to restore the payment of benefits, I believe this bill is still very much needed.

It is quite possible that this case could drag on past 6 months. I do not want to see the LTV retirees back in the same spot after 6 months.

These people should not be left hanging. They need the assurance that they have coverage for health and life insurance. I think that LTV should be made to pay the full coverage until the court decides the issues in this case.

I will do all I can to see that this temporary measure requiring the payment of benefits is enacted into law.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity this evening to discuss with my colleagues the urgent need to enact legislation such as H.R 5283 to provide relief for those affected by the LTV Company's recent bankruptcy filing and subsequent attempt to deny basic benefits for it is retirees.

Although last night a bankruptcy court ordered LTV to continue paying health benefits to its retirees, the order only stipulates that benefits be paid for 6 months. It is highly unlikely that the financial situation of LTV will be resolved within 6 months, at which time, under this order, these entitled benefits would again be in jeopardy. I believe we should follow the lead of the other body and move quickly Ito address this potential problem with legislation which will ensure that LTV continues to pay all medical and life insurance benefits to its retirees until a court with appropriate jurisdiction orders otherwise.

Although I am concerned about all retirees who may be affected by LTV's calculated, callous actions, I am especially sympathetic to the plight of the some 1,500 mine workers who may suffer under the current court ruling. LTV is legally responsible for providing health care and other nonpension benefits to these coal miners who retired under the 1974 pension trust. Among these are over 100 UMWA members who live in my district, primarily in Logan County, who retired from LTV after 1976.

It is unthinkable that, after years of toiling in a dangerous and dirty job, during their hard-earned and well-deserved years of retirement, some of this Nation's coal miners must now be confronted with the possibility of losing their health and life insurance benefits. These are people who can ill afford to pay for benefits on their own. These are benefits to which they are clearly and undeniably entitled.

How can we, in good conscience, not enact legislation which would ensure that LTV lives up to its commitment to those workers who have labored long and hard, during the prime years of their lives, for the profit of the company? I say this is a responsibility to the workers of America that we cannot shirk. This country's workers have been battered ceaselessly in recent years as our industrial base has eroded. They have been forced to make one concession after another. This is one concession that we, as decent human beings, cannot expect our workers to accept. If LTV is allowed to renege on its obligation to its retired workers, the future of many of America's retirees will be thrown into question. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5283 and to work toward its immediate passage. We owe it to the retired workers of this country to do so.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support of the 78,500 retirees who have been abandoned by the LTV Corp.

On July 17, 1986, the LTV Corp. filed for protection from its creditors under chapter 11 of the Federal bankruptcy laws. Then, on its own authority, LTV in an unprecedented action cancelled medical and life insurance coverage to its retirees.

LTV has abandoned its responsibilities to the retirees, claiming that they are merely one group of many creditor groups. It is my intention to show that the retirees are not only a group of creditors, but a group unlike the others.

Unlike most other creditors, many retirees personal well-being are dependent upon their receiving medical insurance. Senior citizens, with modest pensions, do not have the financial means to pay excessive medical expenses. Are these people supposed to abandon their spouses and dependents, just as they themselves were abandoned, when paying for their doctor and hospital fees? Certainly not. But, given the potential situations, many may be forced to make a choice—a choice they have worked much of their adult lives in effort to avoid.

The retirees personal financial need is but one characteristic which separates them from other creditors. It is a characteristic which should ethically compel LTV to choose their ex-workers above the rest.

But let us not make a supposition which would get us in trouble. Let's not assume that LTV would be ethically compelled to do anything.

We must, therefore, approach this issue from an exclusively logical standpoint as well.

The retirees differ from other creditors in their initial assumptions about the risk of being creditors.

There are those creditors who entered into contractual agreements with LTV with the understanding that a certain degree of risk exists. For example, when a bank loans money, risk is duly compensated through interest paid on the loan—the riskier the bank perceives the borrower's ability to pay back the loan, the higher interest payments it will demand. Likewise, when a stock holder invests in a company, he understands that the stock may lose or gain value. The risk is completely understood and accepted.

However, there are those creditors who enter into contractual agreements with the understanding that there is no risk involved. The retirees are such creditors. They are commonly known as risk averse and don't take chances because they cannot afford to take a loss.

I submit that LTV is primarily responsible to its retirees, as those creditors who invested their time and labor under the assumption that they were guaranteed medical and life insurance, and as those creditors whose personal well-being depends on the receipt of what is owed to them.

This problem has a larger scope than I have yet discussed. The greater, ongoing hazard is the precedent that LTV's action will establish. Countless corporations filing for bankruptcy will unethically deny their employees similar coverages. We are not only dealing with 78,500 retirees; we are potentially dealing with hundreds of thousands—possibly millions.

Might I remind my esteemed colleagues that the second largest domestic steel manufacturer has disclaimed its responsibilities to its retirees—to the same people who were largely responsible for the LTV's success in the past. Help me fight for the rights to retirement and good health of those who have dedicated their lifetime to labor. Please join me in support of H.R. 5283.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement by LTV Corp. that they were seeking chapter 11 protection took many by surprise, yet for some, the worst was yet to come.

The decision by LTV to cancel, under the guise of chapter 11, the insurance and health benefits of some 78,000 retirees companywide is reprehensible and a disgrace to the workers who have given so much to keep LTV alive.

With assets of over $6 billion and a very profitable aerospace subsidiary, LTV is the largest industrial company ever to seek bankruptcy court protection.

For any company, concerned about its economic future, chapter 11 should be treated as a last resort. LTV seems to see chapter 11 as a vacation resort available to help shed its excess baggage, caring little for who or what gets in the way.

Chapter 11 should be a time to reorganize, not a time to renege on contracts that so deeply touch the lives of the workers and effect their morale.

If, as industry sources belive, that the recent filings of LTV and Wheeling-Pitt will make additional filings by other steel producers almost certain, then it is time for Congress to reestablish the rules by which this game should be played.

Legislation introduced today by Mr. STOKES of Ohio will help protect LTV retirees caught in the chapter 11 process.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill and I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PORTER, today, for 60 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOEHLERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, on August 5.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, on August 12.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on August 14.

Mr. SWINDALL, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUNDINE, for 15 minutes, on August 5.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PORTER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for 60 minutes, on August 7.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. STOKES) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for 60 minutes, on August 7.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. WEISS, and to include extraneous matter, on H.R. 5233, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. CONTE, after Yates amendment on H.R. 5234, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. STALLINGS, on H.R. 5234, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

Mr. HOYER, on H.R. 5234, in the Committee of the Whole, today.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. KINDNESS in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. DREIER of California.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mr. PORTER.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio.

Mr. MOODY.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. WOLPE.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. WIRTH in two instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. FAUNTROY.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. TALLON.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 356. Joint resolution to recognize and support the efforts of the U.S. Committee for the Battle of Normandy Museum to encourage American awareness and participation in development of a memorial to the Battle of Normandy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4434. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs"; and

H.R. 1904. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds appropriated in satisfaction of judgments awarded to the Chippewas of the Mississippi in Docket Numbered 18-S before the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 1, 1986, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the second quarter of calendar year 1986 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1986

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Donald M. Baker	6/12	6/26	Switzerland	2,872.30	1,573.00		1,812.00				3,385.00
Daniel V. Yager	6/12	6/23	Switzerland	1,988.50	1,089.00		1,297.00				2,445.00
							[3] 59.00				
Committee total					2,662.00		3,168.00				5,830.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Mr. Yager traveled by rail enroute to Switzerland from Paris to Geneva.

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Chairman, July 20, 1986.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1986

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Oberstar, Cong. James L.	4/21	4/25	France		444.00		1,557.90		12.85		2,014.75
Committee total					444.00		1,557.90		12.85		2,014.75

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

JAMES J. HOWARD, Chairman, July 14, 1986.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1986

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Rep. Steny H. Hoyer	5/23	5/24	Sweden		187.00		[3] 6,213.92				6,400.92
	5/24	5/27	Switzerland		420.00						420.00
Michael R. Hathaway	5/23	5/24	Sweden		187.00		[3] 6,213.92				6,400.92
	5/24	5/27	Switzerland		420.00						420.00
Mary Sue Hafner	5/23	5/24	Sweden		187.00		[3] 6,213.92				6,400.92
	5/24	5/27	Switzerland		420.00						420.00
Deborah M. Burns	5/23	5/24	Sweden		187.00		[3] 6,213.92				6,400.92
	5/24	5/27	Switzerland		420.00						420.00
Ronald McNamara	5/23	5/24	Sweden		187.00		[3] 6,213.92				6,400.92
	5/24	5/27	Switzerland		420.00						420.00
Judith Ingram	5/23	5/24	Sweden		187.00		[3] 6,213.92				6,400.92
	5/24	5/27	Switzerland		420.00						420.00
Rep. John Porter	5/23	5/24	Sweden		187.00		[4] 3,106.96				3,293.96
Miscellaneous codel expenses:											
Luxembourg									801.98		801.98
Sweden									3,710.15		3,710.15
Committee total					3,829.00		40,390.48		4,512.13		48,731.61

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Round-trip military transportation.
[4] One way military transportation.

STENY H. HOYER, Cochairman, July 30, 1986.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3986. A letter from the General Counsel, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the operations of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for fiscal year 1985, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635g(a); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3987. A letter from Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report on political contributions by David L. Mack, of Oregon, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Unted Arab Emirates, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3988. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report on political contributions by Dennis Kux, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Ivory Coast, Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3989. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled "Finance Audit—

Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation's 1985 Financial Statements," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mrs. BURTON of California: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 521. Resolution waiving certain points of order against consideration of H.R. 5294, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-726). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 5300. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2 of the concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1987 (Rept. 99-727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4333. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve veterans' benefits for former prisoners of war (Rept. 99-728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4623. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve readjustment counseling for Vietnam-era veterans; with amendment(s) (Rept. 99-729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 5299. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 2-percent increase in the rates of compensation and of dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] paid by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLAND: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5313. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 523. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 4428, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-732). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Omitted from the Record of July 30, 1986]

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of Rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4759. The Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4759; H.R. 4759 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4430. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the appropriate minimum altitude for aircraft flying over national park system units; with an amendment. Referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for a period ending not later than August 8, 1986, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(p), rule X (Rept. 99-725, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 5297. A bill to provide grants through the Department of Education for drug and alcohol abuse prevention, early intervention, and rehabilitation demonstration partnerships based in elementary, junior high, high school, and college settings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 5298. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to prevent the rejection of executory contracts that provide hospitalization and health benefits to current or former employees of the debtor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SMITH, of New Jersey, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HENDON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 5299. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 2-percent increase in the rates of compensation and of dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] paid by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5300. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1987.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. TALLON):

H.R. 5301. A bill to provide tax deductions to those who provide contributions of agricultural property for victims of natural disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUNDERSON:

H.R. 5302. A bill to permit trapping in the Saint Croix National Scenic Riverway; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 5303. A bill to require certain individuals who performs abortions to obtain informed consent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINDNESS:

H.R. 5304. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to allow private parties to sue for equitable relief and damages for injury caused by unfair foreign competition; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MRAZEK:

H.R. 5305. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants for demonstration projects for networks for services relating to acquired immune deficiency syndrome, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 5306. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay to members of the Armed Forces proficient in foreign languages; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5307. A bill to require the Attorney General of the United States to make grants to local governments to increase the number of police officers in geographical areas where large quantities of narcotic drugs are seized; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5308. A bill to make the Customs Forfeiture Fund available to improve seizure and forfeiture activities of the Customs Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5309. A bill to make the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund available to assist State drug abuse education and prevention programs; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. STARK, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 5310. A bill to facilitate the enforcement of the Customs laws against illegal drug traffic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 5311. A bill to implement the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriologi-

cal (biological) and toxin weapons and their destruction, by prohibiting certain conduct relating to biological weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 5312. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a program of research, development and demonstration, technical assistance to States, and dissemination of information to the public relating to environmental and public health problems posed by indoor accumulation of radon; jointly, to the Committees on Science and Technology, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 5313. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DORNAN of California (for himself, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DREIER of California, and Mr. SHUMWAY):

H.J. Res. 690. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.J. Res. 691. Joint resolution to prohibit the importation of textile fiber products from the Republic of South Africa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H. Res. 520. Resolution welcoming Father Lawrence Jenco back to United States after 18 months in captivity, encouraging further Syrian help in securing the release of the remaining hostages in Lebanon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAUKE:

H. Res. 522. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to limit the outside earned income of officers and employees of the House fo 30 percent of their salary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRANKLIN:

H.R. 5314. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain property located in Vicksburg, MS; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 5315. A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Newman; 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. 1052: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1946: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.R. 2871: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DYSON, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 3040: Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 3465: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3549: Mr. HILLIS.

H.R. 3644: Mr. IRELAND.

H.R. 3806: Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 3827: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 3895: Mr. COURTER.

H.R. 3980: Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 4304: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 4333: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. FIELDS.

H.R. 4337: Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 4365: Mr. HILLIS.

H.R. 4567: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 4623: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HENDON, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 4633: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 4682: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 4714: Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 4738: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4787: Mr. MCEWEN.

H.R. 4838: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 4898: Mr. BARNES.

H.R. 4913: Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 4922: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 4990: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. YATES, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 5000: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. BYRON, and Mr. PASHAYAN.

H.R. 5035: Mr. PARRIS and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 5056: Mr. LUKEN.

H.R. 5066: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 5145: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. PENNY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LELAND, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUDD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H.R. 5189: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WEBER, Mr. ROE, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH.

H.R. 5202: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 5248: Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. COBEY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. HENDON, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 5278: Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 5284: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 5288: Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. DYSON, and Mr. ANTHONY.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. BORSKI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.J. Res. 438: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HUTTO.

H.J. Res. 511: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COELHO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. FUQUA, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. GALLO, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. WYLIE.

H.J. Res. 514: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MACK, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SABO, Mr. WYLIE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. ARCHER.

H.J. Res. 594: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. STOKES.

H.J. Res. 617: Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. FISH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MINETA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. OLIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LELAND, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MACKAY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BATES, Mr. DYSON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. OWENS.

H.J. Res. 620: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. STRANG, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MONSON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SABO, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr.

OBERSTAR, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOEFFLER, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.J. Res. 663: Mr. BOULTER.

H.J. Res. 667: Mr. RITTER and Mr. DELAY.

H.J. Res. 670: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 678: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. BORSKI.

H. Res. 373: Mr. PANETTA.

H. Res. 430: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KOLTER, and Mrs. BOXER.

H. Res. 469: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WEISS.

H. Res. 476: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. RITTER.

H. Res. 498: Mr. LELAND, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Res. 509: Mr. HORTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. HOLT, and Mr. ROE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

446. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the delegate assembly of Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., Bethesda, MD, relative to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

447. Also, petition of the delegate assembly of Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., Bethesda, MD, relative to nonprofit rehabilitation facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

448. Also, petition of the delegate assembly of Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., Bethesda, MD, relative to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

449. Also, petition of the delegate assembly of Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., Bethesda, MD, relative to the rehabilitation needs of Social Security beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 4428

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

[7]—Page 34, line 4, strike out "$7,678,728,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,078,782,000".

Page 43, line 10, strike out "$3,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,800,000,000".

[8]—Page 34, line 4, strike out "$7,678,782,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,078,782,000".

Page 43, after line 6, insert the following:

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide that the Conventional Defense Initiatives program shall be administered through the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization of the Department of Defense.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on how funds made available for the Conventional Defense Initiatives program have been spent and are planned to be spent.

Page 43, line 10, strike out "$3,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,800,000,000".

[9]—Page 43, after line 6, insert the following:

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide that the Conventional Defense Initiatives program shall be administered through the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization of the Department of Defense.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on how funds made available for the Conventional Defense Initiatives program have been spent and are planned to be spent.

[10]—Page 129, line 12, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 129, after after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding subsection accordingly):

"(e) The amount of a contract for the overhaul, repair, or maintenance of a naval vessel may not exceed the Secretary of the Navy's estimate of cost of the contract by more than 10 percent unless the Secretary of Defense determines national security reasons for approving the contract. After such a contract has been entered into, the Secretary of the Navy shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives of any cost overrun of more than 14 percent of the contract and shall wait 30 days before agreeing to continue the contract.".

(b) CONTRACTS FOR ONLY FOUR SHIPS.—During fiscal year 1987, the Secretary of the Navy may not enter into contracts with private shipyards for the overhaul, repair, or maintenance of more than four naval vessels.

[11]—Page 129, line 12, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 129, after after line 12, insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding subsection accordingly):

(b) CONTRACTS FOR ONLY FOUR SHIPS.—During fiscal year 1987, the Secretary of the Navy may not enter into contarcts with private shipyards for the overhaul, repair, or maintenance of more than four naval vessels.

H.R. 4428

By Mr. ENGLISH:

[12]—At the end of title X of division A (page 239, after line 5), add the following new section:

SEC. 1033. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ENHANCED DRUG ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1987 for enhancement of authorized drug enforcement assistance activities of the Department as follows:

(1) For procurement of aircraft for the Army, $40,000,000, to be available for procurement of Blackhawk Helicopters.

(2) For procurement of aircraft for the Navy, $83,000,000, to be available for modification of four P-3 or C-130 aircraft by the addition of APS-138 radar.

(3) For procurement for the Air Force, $214,400,000, of which—

(A) $75,000,000 is for procurement of six radar aerostats;

(B) $60,000,000 is for procurement of C-130 tanker aircraft with APG-63 radar;

(C) $79,400,000 is for modification of specially equipped C-130 aircraft to be assigned to the Southern Command.

(4) For operation and maintenance for the Air Force, $15,000,000, to be available for the transfer of the 302nd Special Operations Squadron from Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona.

(5) For the drug interdiction program of the National Guard, $61,400,000.

(6) For the Secretary of Defense, $12,000,000 for enhanced intelligence collection activities concerning illegal importation into the United States of drugs originating in South America.

(b) LOANS TO CUSTOMS SERVICE.—The Secretary of Defense shall make available the aircraft procured or modified using funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) to the United States Customs Service in accordance with chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) AMOUNTS IN ADDITION TO OTHER AMOUNTS.—The amounts authorized by subsection (a) are in addition to any other amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1987 by this or any other Act.

SEC. 1034. FUNDING OF COAST GUARD DRUG-INTERDICTION PERSONNEL.

Of the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Navy for fiscal year 1987, the sum of $15,000,000 shall be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation and shall be available only for members of the Coast Guard assigned to duty as provided in section 1421(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 750).

H.R. 4428

By Mr. RAHALL:

[13]—Page 141, strike lines 6 through page 142, line 8.

H.R. 4428

By Mr. SAVAGE

[14]—Page 237, strike out line 15 and all that follows through page 239, line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 1032. CONTRACT SET-ASIDE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) SET-ASIDE REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (d), not less than 10

percent of each amount described in subsection (b) shall be obligated during any fiscal year for contracts entered into with—

(1) small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (as defined by section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) and regulations issued under such section);

(2) historically Black colleges and universities; or

(3) minority institutions (as defined by the Secretary of Education pursuant to the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.).

(b) AMOUNT TO BE SET-ASIDE.—The requirements of subsection (a) for any fiscal year apply to each of the following amounts:

(1) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for such fiscal year for procurement.

(2) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for such fiscal year for research, development, test, and evaluation.

(3) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for such fiscal year for military construction.

(4) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for technical assistance to potential contractors described in subsection (a). Such technical assistance shall include information about the set-aside program, advice about Department of Defense procurement procedures, assistance in preparation of proposals, and such other assistance as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) does not apply—

(1) to the extent to which the Secretary of Defense determines that compelling national security considerations require otherwise; and

(2) if the Secretary making such a determination notifies Congress of such determination and the reasons for such determination.

(e) COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES AND ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—In carrying our the requirements of subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) solicit bids or competitive proposals in a manner designed to achieve full and open competition for the procurement, and

(2) to the extent practicable and when necessary to facilitate achievement of the 10 percent set-aside requirement described in subsection (a), make advance payments under section 2307 of title 10, United States Code, to contractors described in subsection (a).

(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than May 1 of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the compliance of the Secretary with the requirements of subsection (a) during the proceding fiscal year. Each such report shall include—

(A) a full explanation of any failure to comply with such requirements; and

(B) a plan to remedy such failure.

(2) The first report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than May 1, 1987.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies to each of fiscal years 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991.

H.R. 4428

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

[15]—At the end of part B of title VIII of division A (page 158, after line 13) insert the following new section:

SEC. 814. WAIVER OF CHAMPUS COPAYMENT FOR CERTAIN BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) The Secretary of Defense shall, in the case of a hospital that provides free medical care to all patients and that otherwise fulfills eligibility requirements established by the Secretary for hospitals under plans covered by subsection (a), waive any payment required under subsection (b) or (e) with respect to treatment received in such hospital by persons covered by this section.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1079(1) of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall apply with respect to medical care received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 4428

By Mr. SOLOMON:

[16]—At the appropriate place in title VIII of the bill (General Provisions) insert the following new section:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH CONTRACTORS THAT EMPLOY PERSONS WHO FAIL TO REGISTER UNDER THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2408. Contracts: Employment by Contractors of Selective Service Nonregistrants

"(a) The Secretary of Defense, to the extent practicable, shall ensure that funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense are not used to satisfy obligations of the United States under a contract with a contractor or subcontractor during a period during which a selective service nonregistrant is employed by the contractor or subcontractor.

"(b) In this section, the term 'selective service nonregistrant' means a person who—

"(1) was born after December 31, 1959;

"(2) is required to register under section 3(a) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 453(a)); and

"(3) has not so registered.".

"(c) The Secretary may waive the application of this section with respect to a contract when the Secretary determines such a waiver is necessary in the interests of national security.".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"2408. Contracts: employment by contractors of selective service nonregistrants."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2408 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall apply to contracts entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act and only with respect to individuals hired by contractors or subcontractors after such date.

[17]—At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4005. AMENDMENT OF MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS TO CERTAIN PERSONS WHO FAIL TO REGISTER.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—Section 12 of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 462) (relating to penalties) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Any person" in subsection (f)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (g), any person"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) Any person discharged under honorable conditions from the armed forces may not be denied any right, privilege, or benefit under Federal law by reason of his failure to present himself for and submit to registration under section 3.".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply—

(1) to a person discharged under honorable conditions before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) to rights, benefits, and privileges to which such person would have been entitled had such subsection been in effect at the time of such discharge.

H.R. 5294

By Mr. COBEY:

—Page 59, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 623. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Federal Election Commission may be used for purposes of issuing or enforcing any rule, regulation, order, or advisory opinion that does not comply with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Chicago Teachers Union* v. *Hudson*, 106 S. Ct. 1066 (1986) or the decision of such Court in *Ellis* v. *Railway Clerks*, 466 U.S. 435 (1984).

H.R. 5294

By Mr. JACOBS:

—Page 32, line 11, strike out "$1,234,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$278,600".