United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1996 No. 9

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HOBSON].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 24, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAVID L. HOBSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Danny McCain, professor of Christian studies, University of Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Bible declares about governments, ''The authorities that exist have been established by God.'' We acknowledge Your supreme lordship over this Nation.

Because You are a merciful God, we repent for often ignoring and disobeying You in our personal and national lives.

We pray our Nation will be like a lighthouse beside the global seashore signaling out messages of hope and inspiration to those unfortunate nations still struggling in the darkness of ignorance, oppression, and injustice.

We pray that those in this Chamber will acknowledge Your divine sovereignty, that their words and decisions will be characterized by truth and humility, and that all Members of this House will be worthy to represent us by their moral and spiritual example.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

Mr. STEARNS. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GILLMOR led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This morning the Chair will recognize twenty 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle as agreed to by the leadership.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND DR. DANNY MCCAIN

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Danny McCain is the founder and international director at large of International Institute for Christian Studies [IICS]. This organization develops and enhances academic Christian studies programs in public universities in 10 countries including Nigeria, Russia, Ukraine, and China.

In university classrooms that just 5 years ago were devoted to the teaching of atheism, IICS professors have been invited to teach about the moral foundations of society which Christianity provides.

During the past year, Dr. McCain has taught over 300 West African teachers who daily teach religious and moral education in the public schools. At a recent seminar, the commissioner for education said, ''Our country is in trouble; most of our troubles are related to morals; morals are derived from religion. Moral and religious education is essential for our Nation's survival.'' I am sure we could learn much about the source of moral values from these developing nations.

Dr. McCain currently serves as a senior lecturer in the University of Jos, Nigeria, where he and his family have lived for the past 7 years.

It is a pleasure to have him as our guest chaplain today.

IN MEMORIAM: MIKE SYNAR

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, many of us have just returned this morning from a memorial service for our departed colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Michael Synar. It was a moving tribute to an extraordinary man and a courageous public servant.

Mike set the highest possible standards for himself and for this place, a

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

place which he dearly loved. He did his best to act on principle while being fully engaged in the arena. In this place where the line between legitimate compromise and expediency is so often fuzzed, Mike Synar knew the difference. He had a clear head and a moral compass that guided him, not always with perfect outcomes but always with a perfect sense of integrity. He knew that a seat in this House was simply not worth having if there were not some things that you were willing to risk losing it over.

What tribute can we give to this man? Perhaps to give back come of the love he showed for this wonderful institution of our democracy by treating each other better and respecting the principles that we all hold, principles that Mike was so true to in his own service here. Perhaps we can draw some inspiration from his life and service and do so in his name and memory.

STATE OF THE UNION

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the President said a lot of the right things last night. He says the era of big government is over. He says that he now understands that working families are overtaxed. And he even implies that he is now willing to sign the welfare reform, balanced budget, and tax cut measures that he has vetoed over the last few months. Good news, if he means it, very good news.

If the President now means it and he will support tax cuts for working families rather than demagoging about mythical tax cuts for the rich, that is very good news.

If the President now means it that people in Cincinnati should be able to keep more of their own money, rather than seeing it wasted by high flying bureaucrats like Hazel O'Leary, that is good news.

In short, Mr. Speaker, if the President now wants to work together for tax relief and for an end to big government ripoffs—then I am with him all the way. It is great to see that the President is now a fan of the Contract With America. I just hope that he realizes that we need action and not just talk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members they should refrain from references to demagoguery.

GOODBYE TO MIKE SYNAR

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this morning at St. John's Church there was a memorial service for our departed colleague from Oklahoma, Mike Synar. As I listened to the deserving tributes paid to this remarkable public servant, I realized that death sometimes robs us of our last chance to say goodbye. So to my friend and colleague Mike Synar, I want to say goodbye one last time.

I want to say, thank you, Mike, for reminding us what courage is all about. I want to say, thank you for reminding us that one person can make a difference. I want to say, thank you for reminding us that public service can be a noble calling. I want to say, thank you, Mike, for your genuine compassion and caring for your fellow human beings. And I want you to know that like the statue of your fellow Oklahoman, Will Rogers, which watches over this House just outside the doors of this Chamber, your spirit, the courageous spirit of Mike Synar, will forever hover over this House to remind each of us that courage and compassion and acting out of conscience are noble human traits.

Goodbye, my friend. We will miss you, but never forget you.

STATE OF CONFUSION

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

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, last night the American people did not hear the State of the Union but rather I suggest they heard a statement of confusion, albeit a statement of contradictions.

President Clinton spoke to the American people once again about balancing the budget, ending welfare as we know it, saving Medicare and providing middle-class tax relief. However when this Republican Congress sent him an honest balanced budget, he vetoed that. When the Congress sent him a welfare reform bill to end dependency, he vetoed that. When the Congress passed a measure to save Medicare, he once again vetoed that. And when we sent him legislation to provide the middle-class tax cut he referred to last night, he vetoed that.

This Congress has sent the President virtually everything he spoke about last evening. He just must be confused, in my opinion.

Mr. President, the American people are not confused. It is time to stop talking and start signing, not vetoing these bills. The American people have demanded these changes in 1992, in 1994 again, and the Congress has delivered more than just a speech.

LET US TELL THE TRUTH

(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, last night the President mentioned that we need to do welfare reform, and I agree with him. This morning the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, on one of the morning talk shows, when asked about welfare reform, said that the President had vetoed it twice, even though the Senate had passed it with 85 votes.

Well, Speaker GINGRICH, I wish you would tell the truth. That bill that the President vetoed, that welfare bill, got only 52 votes in the Senate. It did not get 85 votes, Speaker GINGRICH. Tell the truth; it got only 52. And two Republicans voted against it.

Now, the President wants to do welfare reform, but he does not want to do the radical one that was sent to him. I want to do welfare reform. I would much rather take the one that passed the Senate in September; not the one in December, the one in September, let us do that welfare reform.

Speaker GINGRICH, let us tell the truth.

STATE OF THE UNION

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I watched the President's speech last night. That speech and his State of the Union speech last year were the two longest I have heard in my lifetime.

A thought came to me while I was listening to that lengthy speech about how we could save money. Instead of shutting down the Government to save money, we could just suspend Government while the President talks. We would save millions.

Length is not important. Content is. The major themes of the President's speech were simply a rehash of the same promises he made 4 years ago, and on which he did not deliver.

During most of his Presidency he has had a Congress controlled by his own party.

He promised a balanced budget. He did not submit a credible one and vetoed the one Congress passed. He promised welfare reform. He did not submit a credible plan, and vetoed the welfare reform Congress passed.

The American people deserve better.

DEALS, DEALS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, what year is it? Is 1996 the 10th year of the 5-year Gramm-Rudman balance deal? Is 1996 the fifth year of the Bush 5-year deal? Is 1996 the third year of the Clinton 5-year deal or is 1996 the new 7-year deal?

Deals, deals. That is what we have. There are more deals here than Monty Hall has, folks, but one thing is for sure, 1996 is the year of denial.

The most important thing last night is what was not said by the President

or Senator DOLE. No mention of record trade deficits. No mention of those two turkeys, GATT and NAFTA. No mention of declining wages. No mention of livable-wage jobs leaving this country.

Mr. Speaker, I say if the economy is so great, why do American families need three jobs to pay their bills? We do not need any more deals, we need a little bit more common sense and maybe people should get out of this denial phase and take a look at the reality that is hitting people on the streets of America.

□ 1215

THE TWO CLINTONS: RHETORIC VERSUS REALITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the blizzard in Washington, DC, may be over. But last night the American people had to trudge through the Clinton reelection snow job. It is amazing what some people will say to hide what they do.

The same President who pledged to balance the budget in 5 years, but vetoed the first balanced budget in 26 years, again poses as fiscally prudent.

The same President who promised to end welfare as we know it, but vetoed welfare reform, again masquerades as a welfare reformer. The same President who tried to socialize medicine, and today blocks efforts to save Medicare, disguises himself as protector of health benefits.

And the same President who pledged a middle class tax cut only to pass the largest tax increase in history but vetoed real family and small business tax cuts, again pretends to champion tax relief.

Promises are made to be kept, not ignored after the election's over. Words should have some correlation to actions. This President's promises and words about the future are directly contradicted by his policies of the past and the present.

WHY WE DO NOT HAVE A BUDGET DEAL

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented a balanced budget: Seven years with CBO scoring. So why do we not have a budget deal? I will tell you why, because the Republicans insist that they want to give tax breaks to the rich. The President made prudent budget cuts, but he protected the beneficiaries of Medicare and Medicaid.

Medicare guarantees hospital care for seniors. Medicaid guarantees nursing home care for seniors and for the disabled. But the Republicans want to cut these programs. They want to cut $270 billion out of Medicare, they want to cut $163 billion out of Medicaid, and they want to give a tax break of $245 billion largely to the rich. According to the Treasury Department, half of the tax breaks go to people making over $100,000 a year, and that is wrong.

There is a difference. The Republicans believe in an America that says every man or woman for himself. The President and the Democrats believe we are a caring society and the standard of that society is we take care of our seniors, our disabled people, and our young people. We have a balanced budget. The problem is they want to give tax breaks to the rich.

CLINTON SEES THE LIGHT—FINALLY AGREES TO LESS GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri who is in the back here was incorrect when he alleged the Speaker, speaking about the welfare bill this morning, did not have the vote count right. It was 87 to 12 that the welfare bill passed out of the Senate, and it was 52 to 47 on the conference report. The gentleman was confusing the conference report with the original welfare bill in the Senate which passed overwhelmingly. The Speaker was correct.

So with that, last evening the President gave his State of the Union. As I listened, I said to myself, it sounds like the Republican agenda. It is like the President has had a Damascus experience. He was reborn again. Sometimes he is reborn every 3 months.

Republicans should feel very satisfied because we have overturned the Democrats' control here in Congress, made a balanced budget a national priority, bipartisan priority, ended the idea that entitlement spending is holy, and started the debate on the complete rethinking of the Tax Code.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA JORDAN

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, last week this Nation lost an American hero. Former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan died on Wednesday, January 17, 1996. Funeral services were held on January 20, 1996. Joining us in Houston were President Bill Clinton, Cabinet members, her former colleagues, and current Members of Congress.

Congresswoman Barbara Jordan was a great American and an outstanding public servant. She was an inspiration to us all. Tonight I invite my colleagues to join me in a special order tribute to the Honorable Barbara Jordan, an American who cherished the Constitution and lived its values.

OUR ARMED FORCES SHOULD NOT BE PLACED UNDER CONTROL OF FOREIGN COMMANDERS

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the conference report on S. 1124, the 1996 Department of Defense authorization bill. I will vote for this bill because it contains so many good things: COLA equity for our military retirees, a needed pay raise for our Armed Forces, money to repair substandard family housing, and funds to protect this Nation from a deadly missile attack.

This bill does many good things, but, Mr. Speaker, S. 1124 has been changed to permit the men and women of our armed services to be placed under control of foreign commanders. This is wrong. I object to this provision.

In the future, the United States will certainly take part in international disputes. But when American volunteers volunteer to serve this Nation in armed conflict, they deserve to be led by Americans and not by foreign commanders.

I will vote for S. 1124 this time. As is so often the case, I must accept some good with the bad.

NUCLEAR TESTING IN SOUTH PACIFIC

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share with my colleagues and the American public an article that appeared in today's Washington Post. The article cites the French Government's admission that radioactive materials have leaked into the sea from its nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, while the French Government now tells the world it is just a small amount and it should be no problem, this radioactive material that has leaked into the Pacific Ocean from the Mururoa Atoll is iodine 131. Iodine 131 is produced only as a result of nuclear explosions.

Mr. Speaker, President Chirac of France has already exploded five nuclear bombs on the Mururoa Atoll; let alone the fact that on the same atoll total, the French Government has exploded some 177 nuclear bombs, and that the contamination now on this atoll is worth several Chernobyls.

Yet our Government is going to honor this man next week in Washington? Mr. Speaker, a defense secret report reveals that in 1979, the French Government detonated a 150-kiloton nuclear bomb only 1,300 feet below the surface of this atoll.

Shame on you, France, for doing this terrible thing to the people of the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I present the article by William Drozdiak entitled ''France Acknowledges Radioactive Leakage in South Pacific Nuclear Tests.''

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1996]

FRANCE ACKNOWLEDGES RADIOACTIVE LEAKAGE IN SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR TESTS

(By William Drozdiak)

PARIS, January 23.—France acknowledged today that radioactive materials have leaked into the sea from its nuclear tests in the South Pacific but insisted that the quantities were so minimal that they posed no threat to the environment.

The confirmation that radioactive elements such as iodine-131 have seeped into the lagoon near the Mururoa test site seemed likely to revive the storm of protests that followed President Jacques Chirac's decision to conduct a final series of underground nuclear explosions before signing a global test-ban treaty.

Japanese Foreign Minister Yukihiko Ikeda said he will demand a full explanation from France about the nature of the leaks. Other countries in the Pacific region, notably Australia and New Zealand, are expected to follow suit, French officials said.

Defying international criticism, France has carried out five nuclear tests since September to verify a new warhead and to perfect simulation technology that will be used to monitor reliability of its nuclear weapons. A final test will take place next month before the test site is shut down permanently, French officials said.

But the latest accounts of radioactive leakage at the Mururoa test site have raised questions about the credibility of the French government's arguments that the nuclear explosions present no environmental menace.

''There is no way to assess whether there is a coverup because the French do not allow independent verification,'' said Tom Cochran, a nuclear-test specialist at the Natural Resources Defense Council in Washington. ''What makes people suspicious about whether they are hearing the truth is the fact that these tests were really unnecessary in the first place.''

France has always contended that its underground nuclear blasts inflict no damage on the fragile ecology of the Mururoa coral atoll, 750 miles southeast of Tahiti, which serves as its principal test site. Explosive devices are bored deep within the basalt foundation of the atoll, and French scientists say the intense heat from the blast vitrifies the rock and traps all radioactivity before it can escape.

But Alain Barthoux, director of nuclear tests at France's Atomic Energy Commission, acknowledged that traces of radioactive material are usually ''vented'' into the lagoon when scientists drill down into the rock to obtain samples after every blast.

Barthoux claimed, however, that such leaks involve ''insignificant amounts'' of radioactive substances, such as cesium, tritium or iodine, that vanish quickly in the environment. Quantities of iodine-131, for example, which can cause cancer when ingested by humans, shrink by half within eight days and disappear entirely within 80 days, he said.

Barthoux denied a report in the Japan's Yomiuri Shimbun newspaper that small amounts of radioactive iodine were continuing to leak into the water as a result of the latest round of nuclear tests. The paper quoted sources at the Geneva disarmament conference, where the global test-ban treaty is being negotiated, as saying a French nuclear expert disclosed the radiation leakage at a meeting in Washington last November.

The French specialist was quoted as saying the information was ''extremely confidential.''

France first acknowledged the release of radioactivity from its nuclear tests when oceanographer Jacques Cousteau visited the Mururoa site in 1987 and was allowed to conduct independent tests of the water in the lagoon. He found the presence of radioactive iodine, cesium, cobalt and europium, but in quantities that were not considered dangerous.

But he warned that Mururoa's coral crown was deeply cracked and could pose a problem if testing continued. He said risks grew that higher levels of radioactive residue could seep into the lagoon.

French Defense Minister Charles Millon denounced reports from last year of widening fissures in the atoll as ''unreliable.'' Foreign Minister Herve de Charette told the National Assembly that ''never have any cracks of any kind been spotted.''

But a confidential Defense Ministry report acknowledged the government has been aware, at least since 1979, that Mururoa's underwater basalt foundation is fractured several places.

The report described the effects of an accident in 1979 in which the French detonated a 150-kiloton weapon only 1,300 feet below the surface of the lagoon. The blast was supposed to occur at 2,600 feet, but the bomb got stuck halfway down the test shaft and the French detonated it there rather than risk trying to move it.

The explosion blasted loose more than 130 million cubic yards of rock and coral, causing a tidal wave that injured several French scientists and guards. The document also described underwater avalanches that followed three tests as proof the growing number of tests was posing serious environmental risks to the Mururoa atoll.

The fragile state of the site after repeated tests persuaded France to stage its biggest blasts on nearby Fangataufa atoll, where, in October, it exploded a 100-kiloton warhead, designed for submarine launch.

PRESIDENT'S ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last night our President spoke to all Americans about the challenges facing us. The President challenged Congress to help him produce a smaller, less bureaucratic government in Washington. The President told Americans that the era of big government is over. The President challenged Congress to balance the budget, reform welfare, reduce teen pregnancy, to provide a tax credit for children, and to preserve Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the President's actions speak louder than his words. I am reminded of a colloquialism, ''Been there, done that.'' Congress already passed legislation to balance the budget, reform welfare, reduce teen pregnancy, provide a tax credit for children, and preserve Medicare.

The President's response? He vetoed them, all of them. This President will say anything, but he obviously has trouble performing.

FUEL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IMPORTANT FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, in the United States of America millions of our citizens should not be forced into worrying about how they are going to heat their homes in this record breaking cold weather winter.

In Vermont and throughout this country we have had nights of 20 below zero, 30 below zero, and even 40 below zero.

The LIHEAP Fuel Assistance Program has provided over 24,000 Vermont households, and 6 million low-income households nationally, including many senior citizens, with the fuel assistance they need to survive the freezing weather. Three-quarters of the households on LIHEAP have incomes of less than $8,000 a year.

Today, I am sending Appropriations Committee Chairman ROBERT LIVINGSTON a letter with over 115 congressional signatures, Democrats and Republicans, asking him to make certain that the continuing resolution that is passed by Friday contains full funding for LIHEAP—and that the remaining $200 million that was appropriated is released.

This is America, and 80-year-old senior citizens should not be forced to go cold in the winter.

THE CHINA HOLOCAUST

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, every Member should read the editorial in the Washington Post called ''Holocaust: The China Parallel.'' It is by Walter Reich, the director of the Holocaust Museum and the chairman of the American Psychiatric Association's Committee on Human Rights.

What does he say?

According to the reports provided by Human Rights Watch, the starved children in the Chinese orphanages look very much like the starved children in the German ''Children's Specialty Institutions''; the Chinese institutions, too, administer sedatives to some children selected for death; they, too, use false diagnoses as coverups; they too, cremate the remains of starved children; and they, too, employ physicians, many of whom probably tell themselves that the children dying under their care would have died anyway, and in any case are useless eaters in a country challenged by scarce resources.

The parallels between the Chinese orphanages and the Nazi programs to kill disabled children are alarming. These parallels remind us that human beings, including physicians and other caregivers, are extraordinarily vulnerable to inhuman acts and extraordinarily capable of justifying their behavior on what they see as rational grounds. And they remind us that countries in which democratic institutions are forcibly forbidden and human rights systematically quashed are ones in which human life becomes, quite simply, expendable.

Finally, somebody has said something about the similarities between the Holocaust and the activities of the Chinese Government.

Now, I know the Clinton administration will not do anything. But will the Congress do anything? This Congress has done nothing. The business of this Congress is business. You have watched priests put in jail in China; you have watched bishops be put in jail in China; you have watched Harry Wu's enslavement. Now you watch 60 Minutes and orphans being killed, and we know the Clinton administration has done nothing, but this Congress, this Congress, where we all have the right to speak out, we have done nothing.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO WORK TOGETHER

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, neither political party has a monopoly on truth. We need to work together, as President Clinton urged last night, to find some common ground about the problems that this Nation faces.

There is not any good reason why we cannot put the fanaticism of this Gingrich-led Congress behind us. Enough of the temper tantrums; enough of the Government shutdowns that waste taxpayer money; enough of the threats to reject the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

The time to start anew is today, working together, to address this question of the adjustment of the debt limit. We cannot afford to have the first default in the next month in the history of this Nation. Six former Treasury Secretaries, Republicans and Democrats alike, have come together to urge us to address this debt limit issue. We ought to do it today. It is the same kind of bipartisan support we need from our House colleagues to address this very serious matter.

Every single American who has got a credit card loan balance, who has a variable mortgage, who might ever want to take out a loan, had a stake in our protecting the credit of this country.

MOVE TOGETHER TO ATTACK DEFICIT

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, again I come to the well and listen with great interest to my good friend from Texas, even as he decries fanaticism, launch into his own special brand of name calling. And that is fine; good people can disagree.

But it is precisely because we need to maintain the full faith and credit of the United States of America that we must move together to attack this egregious deficit and this huge debt in the trillions of dollars, and the best way to do that is to truly put aside name calling and work together, work together to end runaway spending.

The President came last night and he said the days of big Government are over, and yet the budget plan he endorses calls for an additional $350 billion in spending and additional $200 billion in taxes.

Friends, let us work together. But the same old formula of tax-and-spend is not the prescription for America's future. It is time to truly say the days of big Government are over, and a limited and effective Government should be the mission of the United States of America.

MAINTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the President challenged the Congress last night not to turn the clock back on environmental protection. Unfortunately, that is what has been happening in this House. Whether it is Superfund or enforcement within the EPA, in each case over the last year we have seen significant threats and efforts to turn back the clock on environmental protection.

Right now the Superfund Program is in shambles. Enforcement within the Environmental Protection Agency has been suggested, and pursuant to the CR that we passed, cut back by 25 percent. Lobbyists and special interests, as the President has said, the polluters, are now in the room writing the environmental bills and trying to weaken environmental laws.

We need to heed the President's call. In this year in Congress we have to make sure there is adequate funding for Superfund and for environmental protection. This was always a bipartisan issue. As the President mentioned, much of the environmental laws were passed when President Nixon was President and the Democrats controlled Congress.

The President also looked at the future and he said we can expand the economy; we can create jobs at the same time we protect the environment. He had a vision for the future in this country which is proenvironment, and this Congress should heed his call.

□ 1230

TALK IS CHEAP

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

Mr. FRISA. Mr. Speaker, once again the President gave a sterling speech last night. So good, in fact, that I would say he has a silver tongue. Unfortunately, he expects Americans to pay for the polish.

So, we have heard enough slick talk from Bill Clinton, because his talk does not come cheap. We pay the price. Let us do the real work of the American people and cut the size and cost of Government and leave more money in people's paychecks so that we can spend our own money how we see fit. When we accomplish that, our work truly will have been done.

HOLDING DEBT CEILING DECISION HOSTAGE IS BAD POLITICS

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the message from the President last night was simple. He wants a centrist and bipartisan agreement, a balanced budget in 7 years. The President reached out his hand. It would be a shame if NEWT GINGRICH and the Republican freshmen slapped it. But already we hear plans from the extreme Republicans to add this bangle to the spending bill and that dangle to the debt ceiling.

Mr. Speaker, last month the Republicans hostages were Government employees. This month it seems it will be the debt ceiling and America's credit rating. Holding the debt ceiling hostage will raise mortgage rates for homeowners, credit interest rates for consumers, college loan interest rates for students.

Last month, Republicans learned that holding Federal employees hostage was wrong and bad politics and they had to retreat with their tail between their legs. Now, amazingly, the Republicans are attempting to play this hostage game again, this time with the full faith and credit of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I say to my Republican colleagues, when are you guys going to learn? Enough already.

PRESIDENT ATTEMPTS TO BASK IN HEROES' HONOR

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, my father, Harry Joseph Dornan, who is the hero of my life, died 21 years ago today. He would be tormented today, as I am, by the lack of character and integrity at the highest level of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, he took me and my brothers into the Oval Office in 1941, and he held the White House and its occupant in a certain awe and respect. Even liberal writers say that the White House has been dragged down to the street level over the last 3 years.

Last night, amidst that snow job, Mr. Clinton did it again. He put heroes in the gallery trying to reflect in their honor and glory, and that is not possible when Paula Corbin Jones is going to get her day in court. And then he put a hero in this front row who, like

my dad, he was wounded three times fighting for freedom, Barry McCaffrey, the general who was told in the White House 2 years and 10 months ago, ''We don't talk to people in uniform here.''

Barry McCaffrey will be a superb drug czar, but when Clinton pointed out that he had three Purple Hearts and two Silver Stars, he could not gag out the word ''Vietnam.'' He could not say he won those honors in Vietnam.

IS THIS ANY WAY TO TREAT AN AMERICAN HERO?

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Nation was introduced to Richard Dean, a true American hero. An employee with the Social Security Administration, Mr. Dean was at work in the Murrah Federal Building last April when a terrorist's bomb tore a hole through that structure, killing 168 people. Mr. Dean went back into the building four times, saving three other lives.

Mr. Dean was a hero on that day in April. But, Mr. Dean and Federal employees like him are heroes everyday. They help our elderly in their retirement, help our families find affordable housing, help our communities stricken by natural disasters. Yet, in November, Mr. Dean and thousands of Federal employees like him were forced to work without pay, because of the Gingrich Government shutdown. These hard-working men and women should not be used as pawns in an inside-the-beltway political game. So, let me join the President today to ask my Republican colleagues: Please don't shut down the Government for a third time. Think about Richard Dean. And, ask yourself, is this any way to treat an American hero?

PROSPERITY AND FUTURE OF AMERICA'S YOUNG PEOPLE

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the majority of this Congress passed a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget. Our plan will zero out deficit spending by the year 2002. But, Mr. Speaker, at the end of those 7 years our accumulated debt will be over $6 trillion. If Congress reduces that $6 trillion debt by $200 billion per year beginning in the year 2003, it will then take 30 years to pay off the principal; 30 years, Mr. Speaker, at $200 billion per year for 30 years. Even at that rate, it will be the year 2033 before we pay off the $6 trillion debt.

Mr. Speaker, the next two generations of working taxpayers will pay the bill. We must end wasteful spending now. And, Mr. Speaker, is the fight to retain power in Washington important enough to risk the prosperity and future of our young people? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not.

PRESIDENT PRESENTS CHALLENGES FOR THE NATION

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Clinton on a magnificent State of the Union Address. More than anything else last night, I think the President talked about family in a way that I have not heard around here for a very long time. He made it very clear in a very poignant statement that the primary duty of parents today is to raise our children. I think we all realize that our problems, crime, gang violence, education, breakdown in community values, would not happen if we had stronger parents and stronger families.

Washington does not have all the answers. But there are certainly things that we can do to help these families, like giving parents a $10,000 tax cut for college expenses, increasing the minimum wage, protecting pensions, protecting Medicare and Medicaid, and passing the V-chip legislation that will help parents control some of the garbage that is flowing into homes today.

Mr. Speaker, the President did a good job laying out those challenges that the Nation faces and I hope each of us on both sides of the aisle will pick up the challenge and move this country forward.

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton gave challenges to Congress last night. He challenged us to cherish our children and strengthen the family. Congress sent the President legislation containing a family, per-child tax credit, but he vetoed it.

The President challenged us to help every American achieve economic security. Yet he vetoed the first balanced budget in a generation.

The President challenged us to provide Americans with educational opportunities. Yet he vetoed legislation that would have lowered the cost of the average student loan by $216 a year.

The President challenged us to make our environment safe and clean. Yet he vetoed the appropriations bill that funds the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the American people doubt the President's sincerity. He talks a good talk, but his actions speak louder than his words. I challenge the President to start walking the walk he talks.

WAKE UP, REPUBLICANS

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the President challenged us on many things yesterday, and he challenged us to come together to work for a balanced budget that would hold up the principle that has made this Nation great. The President also challenged us to be responsible as far as our liability and our bills.

Mr. Speaker, now the Republican majority is threatening to hold the full faith and credit of the United States hostage, if they do not get their way on the budget.

They have said that they will refuse to raise the debt limit, thereby causing our Government to be unable to pay its bills.

This threat is no small matter, and its consequences are very serious.

Already, the two biggest rating agencies in the United States have said that our Government may lose its high credit rating.

If we lose our high credit rating, we will have to pay more for the money we borrow. That is self defeating.

Worse, interest rates, even with the threat of a default, will begin to rise. Citizens will then pay more for mortgages, automobiles, and other consumer goods.

Even the wealthy who they want to help with their big tax cut, will be hurt if America cannot meet its obligations.

Wake up Republicans. The gain you hope to get with this risky maneuver, is not worth the loss you will cause.

PRESIDENT SHOULD PUT HIS PEN WHERE HIS MOUTH IS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, last night the President's speech was somewhat like the swimsuit edition of Sports Illustrated; thrilling, exciting, but full of dreams and fantasy. It was a golden oldies collection of Bill Clinton's greatest hits, lines, and slogans from 1992. Welfare reform, a middle-class tax cut, and, of course, balancing the budget. In fact, I thought he was running in the New Hampshire primary, but facts deal harshly with fiction.

The rhetoric of the candidate has dissolved into the reality of a President. We sent him welfare reform; he vetoed it. We sent him a middle-class tax cut; he vetoed it. We sent him a balanced budget, and he vetoed that. The hot air from last night's speech explained why even 3 feet of snow quickly melts in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President: Mr. President, put your pen where your mouth is. Sign some of the legislation that you talked about last night, and then let us get this country moving again.

PRESIDENT TRIES TO BRING NATION TOGETHER

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last night President Clinton reached out to the Republican leadership, asking them to join him in balancing the budget, and to leave the policy fights until the election.

However, the GOP is so obsessed with giving a tax cut to their wealthy contributors that they cannot agree with the President's proposal to balance the budget in 7 years using CBO numbers.

Mr. Speaker, this just proves that the Republican budget is just the vehicle by which they deliver their tax breaks to Wall Street. The President has kept his side of the bargain by introducing a budget which balances in 7 years using CBO numbers. Where is the Republican commitment to protecting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment?

Unfortunately for the American people, it is just not there. Thank you, President Clinton, for trying to bring our Nation together.

MATCHING WORDS WITH ACTIONS?

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, that speech last night was just like other speeches that this President has given. He is a great public speaker, but unfortunately, after the State of the Union is over, and he has had a chance to act, Willie's actions never match his words.

He talked about a secure future, yet he this very week is demanding that Congress raise the debt limit and increase the burden on our children. He talks about the importance of educating our children, yet he continually relies on bureaucrats in Washington to dictate how we educate our kids. Just like the last three State of the Union addresses, the delivery was great, but that is about it. He is a liberal who is ferociously fighting for big government, higher taxes and Washington control over every part of our lives. It is still the same old Bill Clinton. Our Republican ideal is for a better America for our kids: lower taxes, less government, and power back to the people. Our prayer is that the President holds our same views.

COMMON GROUND FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you can tell how big Texas is. My colleague is from Dallas and Plano, and I am from Houston, and we do have a difference of opinion once in a while.

Mr. Speaker, the President last night reminded us that we are all Americans and Americans are the best when we work together. On the balanced budget, both parties have put forth plans that achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002. Right now we have enough cuts that we agree on to give the public the balanced budget they want. We can make meaningful reforms in health care so that our citizens can change jobs and not lose their insurance, and we can also protect Medicare and education funding without tax cuts to have that balanced budget.

The President was right on mark when he warned us not to play politics with the full faith and credit of the United States. The public wants us to address the issues of lost jobs, conditions in our schools and the kind of country we leave for our children, and as the President said, we have to do it together. It is time we find that common ground for all of us Americans.

FEMA'S RESPONSE TO PENNSYLVANIA'S NATURAL DISASTERS

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, just as Pennsylvania was emerging from a series of natural disasters that lasted over a period of 10 days, snow and then more snow and then rain, and then flood, the Governor of the Commonwealth, our former colleague, Tom Ridge, decried the slow response of FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. He did so because FEMA seemed to not be able to make the connection between flood and rain and snow and all the tragedies that occurred all at one time.

□ 1245

Then, of course, the Governor received a nasty rebuttal from the White House, and nothing was then accomplished in trying to address the problems of the disaster. Since that time the Governor convened a meeting in Harrisburg of the FEMA officials, Secretary Peña and others. We were able to resolve the methodology by which the Federal Emergency Management Agency will respond in the future. In the meantime, I aim to bring to the committee process an examination of the FEMA procedures.

POSSIBLE DEFAULT

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one day the House leadership says it will not force the United States into default. The next day the House leadership says it might force the United States into default. The majority leader says yes; the budget chairman says no.

Mr. Speaker, nothing good can come from holding America's credit rating hostage to ideological extremism. The cost of credit to American business is at risk by reckless statements about forcing the United States into default. Threatening to force the United States into default is reckless and irresponsible. It makes it impossible for businesses throughout the country to plan for their needs in the credit market.

We hear a lot of talk these days about our children's future on the floor of this House. Mr. Speaker, threatening to force the United States into default risks our children's future because it jeopardizes the gold-plated creditworthiness of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, please do not hold the Government hostage again to ideological extremism. And, Mr. Speaker, please do not force the Government into default because of this extremism.

AN END TO BIG GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great day to be a conservative Republican because last night the President came over to our side. He even declared an end to big government.

Last night the President gave a ringing endorsement of the Republican revolution. He wants tax relief for working Americans. He wants a balanced budget. He wants to save Medicare from bankruptcy. He spoke of the importance of the family. He even advocated a get-tough policy on illegal immigration.

Now that the President has come over, I now extend an invitation to my Democrat colleagues here in the House to join the cause of lower taxes and less government.

Just in case my colleagues cannot wait, I brought along a change of party form that I am sure will be quite useful.

Again, I welcome the President to the party of real balanced budgets, real welfare reform and lower taxes.

HOLDING THE NATION HOSTAGE

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thought the most interesting thing the President had to say last night was his point No. 7. It was a very serious thing. I certainly hear this as I travel around this country. I have never heard a President in the State of the Union do this.

He said, now that we have talked about all the agendas that we come together in this great American community and try to work on together, let me tell you what the American community thinks of this body. He virtually said, grow up.

He is absolutely right. Do not take the full faith and credit of this Nation hostage for ideological wars. This is absolutely ridiculous. It has never been done in the history of this Republic. I think the people are fed up with our, A, shutting down the Government and, B, now talking about that as not enough, we will push the credit off the cliff.

That would not be tolerated by our forefathers and foremothers, and the American people have run out of their toleration with it. I hope this body listened last night.

REFLECTION ON THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I too was gratified by much of what I heard last night. But as I looked around the Chamber, I saw several of my colleagues look much younger. It was the same speech that we heard throughout the 1992 campaign: Ending welfare as we know it; balancing the budget; reducing the size and scope of Government.

The fascinating thing for us to do was to juxtapose the speech in 1992 that was given by the President through his campaign and then look at the State of the Union Messages that we have gotten before. In 1993, we heard about the importance of increasing taxes on the middle class. We got that in 1993, the largest tax increase ever.

Then I will never forget seeing the President deliver his State of the Union Message in this Chamber, and he held up a card. That card was going to be designed to ensure that every American was part of a national health care system, a program that would usurp one-seventh of our entire economy into a package like that.

The speech last night got back to the basis of that 1992 campaign. I hope very much that during this 2d session of the 104th Congress, we will be able to govern just the way he talked.

A GREAT STATE OF THE UNION

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last night, in his State of the Union Address, President Clinton spoke about the ''age of possibility.'' He focused on the real issues affecting our Nation's families. Perhaps most importantly, the President extended his hand to the Republican majority and asked them to work with him, to lay down partisanship, to build a better America.

Yes, President Clinton's budget has created almost 8 million new jobs in the last 3 years and the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation rate since the 1960's. Yes, the Clinton budget has cut the deficit in half. And yes, the crime rate, the poverty rate, and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. But, President Clinton knows there is still more to be done.

President Clinton has offered a balanced budget which protects the Democratic priorities of Medicare and Medicaid, education, and the environment.

Last night, President Clinton asked the Republicans to join him to help build a better America. I hope they will heed his call.

NO DEFAULT

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last evening President Clinton held out an olive branch to all of the people of this country to say it is time to heal the fractures which have divided us as Americans.

I reached out some years ago to Republicans to say that we ought to have a balanced budget in this country. I was delighted to see that we got to a point where Democrats and Republicans agree on the fact that we need to balance the budget.

We have very different ideas about how to get that budget in balance. But that does not mean that either party has the right to drive this country for the first time not only into debt but to drive it to a point where we default on our obligations that have been made by generations before us.

I ask the Republicans and Democrats to come up here to this desk and to sign a discharge petition to make certain that we have a clean debt ceiling provided for the people of this country. People have fought and died for the United States of America, for our Bill of Rights, for what this country stands for. Let us not think we are so important that we have the right to turn our backs on what this country has stood for for 250 years. Let us sign a clean discharge petition.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1124, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 340 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 340

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 340 is a rule providing for the consideration of the conference reports to accompany S. 1124, the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization bill.

The rule waives points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and was reported out of the Committee on Rules by a unanimous voice vote.

As Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, the previous Defense authorization bill was vetoed by the President. In his veto message the President cited a handful of objections. We believe they have been accommodated in this legislation and, thus, it is hoped that the President will, therefore, now sign this bill.

It would be ultimately shortsighted and inexcusably reckless, Mr. Speaker, to underestimate the national security dangers that face the United States. Yes, the Soviet Union collapsed, but Russia remains engaged in serious internal struggles that will decide its future course of behavior in the world community. China is acquiring wealth at an extraordinary rate. Some project that it may surpass the United States in gross domestic product by early in the next century. And with wealth inevitably comes vast military power.

North Korea. Though the Clinton administration is providing massive amounts of oil and technical assistance to North Korea, that regime remains an enemy of the United States. The regime in Tehran is a deadly enemy of the United States, Mr. Speaker, with enormous oil reserves. And there remain many other enemies of this great Nation throughout the world.

There are many who would love to see the United States on its knees, our youth destroyed by drugs, our economy shattered by debt. Here in this hemisphere the regime in Havana, Mr. Speaker, is one such implacable enemy of the American people, though many in this city and even in this House do not see it that way.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] by the way, for supporting consistently strong sanctions against that regime, like we are now in this Congress trying to do against the regime in Tehran as well.

The Cuban dictator has a network of terrorists and drug traffickers at his command throughout this hemisphere, in Colombia, in Peru and Bolivia, in

Guatemala. In Mexico, we all know the subcommander Marcos in Chiapas in Mexico, he is subcommander so as to not offend his commander, Castro. In Venezuela the Cuban regime maintains very close ties with Colonel Chavez who attempted a coup d'etat in recent years and remains intent on doing so again. There is no doubt nevertheless that the Cuban dictator at this point is bankrupt. But if he survives, Mr. Speaker, 2 or 3 more years, the pendulum toward the neoliberal or conservative governments throughout this hemisphere that has characterized the last decade, that pendulum may very well swing the other direction toward statism. And if that happens and if the Cuban dictator is able to obtain the international credits that he is so desperately seeking and that some in this House are supporting, he would no longer be a bankrupt tyrant with a network of terrorists and drug traffickers throughout this hemisphere but, rather, a tyrant with economic means and a network of terrorists and drug traffickers throughout this hemisphere.

That would constitute a major threat not only to all the governments of this hemisphere that are now curiously enough appeasing that dictator in the hope that he will be nice to them but also a major threat even to the national security of the United States.

I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that this administration would be capable of seeing that reality instead of opposing sanctions against Castro and sending emissaries to meet with the dictator to work out a little secret deal with him. But irrespective of that, Mr. Speaker, we need a strong national defense. And this bill, despite the changes that we have had to make to it, I believe is a necessary ingredient in a strong posture for the United States of America.

I would like to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], ranking member, along with the dedicated staff of the entire Committee on National Security and its membership for their efforts in bringing forth this second defense authorization.

This renegotiated conference report achieves many important goals, including improving the quality of life for military personnel and reforming the Federal procurement system.

Mr. Speaker, I support both this rule and the conference report. I would urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the conference report.

Every Member understands that it is necessary that the House consider this conference report because the first DOD conference report was vetoed by the President and the Congress was unable to override.

I commend the Committee on National Security for coming forward with this new conference agreement which addresses several of the President's strongest objections. While there are still provisions of the agreement which are objectionable to the administration, I believe the removal of three provisions, language relating to the establishment of a national missile defense system, the President's ability to deploy U.S. troops in peacekeeping operations and the requirement that the President submit supplemental funding requests for contingency operations will allow the President to sign this bill into law.

I congratulate the conferees for their spirit of compromise and their willingness to do what is necessary to ensure that the other critical programs and projects in this bill become law.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference agreement because it like its predecessor makes available funding for the B–2 stealth bomber. The B–2 is an important component of our overall defense system and I commend the conferees for their continued steadfast support of this program.

In addition, I am especially gratified that the conference agreement contains initiatives to accelerate high priority quality-of-life projects for the men and women of our armed forces and their families.

□ 1300

These projects are every bit as important to our defense system as are the many weapons systems found in the bill. And the conference report also ensures that readiness remains a top funding priority. Again the conferees have provided us with an excellent bill, and I urge every Member to support it.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, is a noncontroversial rule. It provides for the expedited consideration of this conference report in a manner that is accepted practice and custom in the House of Representatives. However, I am very concerned that my Republican colleagues have begun a new practice that is contrary to the accepted practice and custom of the House. That new practice, which we have seen in other rules brought to the floor in recent weeks, has the effect of denying the minority the rights they are assured by the rules of this body.

My Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Rules protested this new practice earlier this month when we met to consider three continuing appropriations, and the Republican majority reported rules which not only closed the continuing resolutions to amendment but also denied the minority their guaranteed right to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I include a letter signed by the four Democrats on the Committee on Rules to Chairman SOLOMON at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, DC, January 23, 1996.

Hon. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While in the minority, you and your Republican colleagues staunchly defended the minority's right to offer a motion to recommit. On the first day of the 104th Congress, the Republican majority made good on its promise to expand that right. But it seems we've come a long way since those days.

Exactly one year and a day after adopting the opening day rules change to guarantee the minority's right to offer an expanded motion, the Republican majority found a way to break its commitment to protect even the simple motion to recommit.

On Friday, January 5, 1996, the Republican majority used a transparent parliamentary ploy—not once, not twice, but three times—to circumvent the rule assuring the minority a motion to recommit. Clause 4(b) of rule XI, first adopted in 1909, prohibits the Rules Committee from reporting a resolution that prevents the minority from offering a motion to recommit. Specifically, clause 4(b) prohibits the Rules Committee from reporting a rule that ''would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 4 of rule XVI'' and clause 4 of rule XVI states that the motion to recommit will be in order ''after the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution.''

On that day, the Republican majority in the House approved three extraordinarily restrictive rules providing for initial consideration of three new approaches to continuing appropriations. Ordinarily, a new bill or joint resolution would be introduced providing continuing appropriations. Instead, the House considered House amendments to Senate amendments to unrelated House bills. In one particularly egregious case, the rule hijacked a Senate amendment to a House bill dealing with the National Marine Fisheries Service lab to attach a continuing appropriation. The obvious and intended effect in all three cases was to circumvent the prohibition against the Committee on Rules reporting a rule that prevents a motion to recommit on initial consideration of a new idea.

We are writing to protest the manner in which these items were considered. We are writing to protest the outrageous and arrogant stifling of debate and alternative approaches.

The first rule, House Resolution 334, provided for consideration in the House of an unusual continuing appropriation amendment to a Senate clean and simple CR amendment to an unrelated bill, H.R. 1643, extending most-favored-nation duty status for products from Bulgaria. Before this Congress, the House would have ignored the Senate amendment to H.R. 1643. The Senate amendment initiated continuing appropriations. The House—until this time—has guarded its prerogative to initiate appropriations, blueslipping Senate appropriation bills and simply not taking up Senate amendments to House bills where such amendments initiated appropriation measures. By taking up H.R. 1643 with the Senate amendment, the House has now signaled its acceptance of the Senate infringement on the custom and privilege of the House to initiate spending.

The next two rules, House Resolutions 336 and 338, went a step further. Not satisfied with blocking all amendments including the motion to recommit, the GOP majority denied any separate debate on the House amendment. Adoption of the rule constituted adoption of the House amendment. Once the

House passed the rule, the whole matter was automatically sent to the Senate without further debate or votes.

Making the vote on the rule also the vote on the policy precludes any serious discussion of the process. The seriousness of the issues involved—continuing appropriations and the threat of another costly government shutdown—overwhelmed any debate about the motion to recommit. If any fair-minded Republicans wanted to protest this rule (and its repudiation of the Republican expansion of the motion to recommit) they could not do so without fear of contradicting the Speaker's policy on continuing appropriations. The Republican freshmen have learned the Speaker's vengeance on such matters will be swift and direct.

We were surprised that you would agree to a procedure that diminishes the traditions and prerogatives of the House and tramples on the minority rights you championed for so long when you were in the minority. We are deeply disappointed that the Rules Committee under your chairmanship would participate in this unseemly circumvention of clause 4(b) of rule XI and we hope that such actions will not be repeated.

Sincerely,

JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY.
MARTIN FROST.
ANTHONY BEILENSON.
TONY HALL.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, in this letter my colleagues and I protest what we consider to be outrageous and arrogant stifling of debate and express our hope that these actions will not be repeated. I believe our position is meritorious and supports the best interests of the House of Representatives as a constitutional institution. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this letter should be made a part of the permanent record.

Mr. Speaker, I found it quite interesting that no Republican Member defended the minority's right to offer the motion to recommit earlier this month. I found it very sad that a party that has so strongly and so correctly defended the rights of the minority now practices a brand of political gamesmanship that stifles all debate and dissent.

I bring this subject to the attention of the House because the Committee on Rules is scheduled to meet today to consider another continuing resolution. I hope that my Republican colleagues will not perpetuate this practice and will allow the House an opportunity to debate the issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule. I support this rule because it is fair and because it provide for the consideration of important programs of the Department of Defense. But I hope that when we meet in the future to consider rules reported by the Republican majority of the Committee on Rules that the rights of the minority are protected and assured.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my chairman and leader of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would rise in support of this rule. I would urge its adoption so that we can get on with the debate and passage of this long-awaited essential legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD my response to my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, DC, January 24, 1996.

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on Rules, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOE: Thank you for your letter of January 23rd cosigned by your minority committee colleagues expressing concerns over three recent rules providing for the disposition of Senate amendments to House bills and the fact that these rules denied the minority a motion to recommit.

As you know, the guarantee of a motion to recommit with instructions was one of the House Rules reforms that we adopted on the opening day of this Congress because it was something we felt strongly about when it was denied to us on numerous occasions when we were in the minority. However, as you are also aware, the guarantee only applies to rules that provide for the consideration of bills and joint resolutions, and does not apply to simple or concurrent resolutions, or to motions to dispose of amendments.

The three rules to which you refer all involved emergency spending measures that were considered just prior to our recess earlier this month. All three measures enjoyed widespread, bipartisan support given the need to reopen the government.

However, I fully understand your concern that this procedure could be abused in the future as a way to deny the minority a motion to recommit with instructions. As probably the leading champion of that right when we were in the minority I can assure you that I will continue to safeguard that right, just as I insisted that we enshrine this guarantee in our House Rules when we came into the majority. I have therefore transmitted a copy of your letter to the Majority Leader and other members of our leadership, together with my views that the procedure for disposing of Senate amendments should only be used where circumstances clearly warrant it.

Sincerely,

GERALD B. SOLOMON,
Chairman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I do believe the gentleman protests too much. No rules of the House have been waived. We have followed procedure, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the gentleman sitting next to me that is managing this rule, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Miami, FL, he and his family have for so many years been a bulwark of defense against the spread of international, deadly, atheistic communism throughout the world but especially in the Western Hemisphere, in Cuba and Central America. I want to commend him for his outstanding effort on behalf of himself and his family.

Once again, I would like to commend Chairman SPENCE and his outstanding staff for the tireless work they have put in on this bill, especially during the very long conference period. Chairman SPENCE and his very, very able staff are among the very best in this entire House. They put in yeoman hours on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this legislation today and the President must sign this bill into law. This authorization bill is the first step in restoring our defenses to the level that should be in place for the world's only superpower today. We all know that the defense budget has endured 10 years of cuts, 10 years in a row. This must stop and this bill stops it dead in its tracks. That is why I support the legislation.

Furthermore, the bill helps to improve the lives of our men and women that serve in the armed forces of the United States, with increases in pay, with basic housing allowance increases, with health care provisions, and many other items that help make a better life for these young men and women and their families that serve in the military today.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important bill in our annual process than the defense authorization bill. After all, that is why we have a republic of States. It is for the primary purpose of providing for a national defense for these States of ours, and this year's bill is critical if America is to maintain its leadership role in the world, as I think it should. And as our young men and women serve in Bosnia, we must give them all the support we can even though many of us oppose the policy that put them there. This bill is a start towards that.

Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the President would sign this bill, many of us have had to compromise over several important issues. But in Ronald Reagan's words, he used to say to me, ''JERRY, politics is the art of compromise. You cannot always have it your own way.'' And certainly this is a proof positive that we are bending over backwards to try to cooperate.

The reason I am supporting this bill is because we have a level of funding that is going to help restore the defenses of this Nation, and that is the only reason, because I really do object to several of the provisions that have been compromised in it. But I would urge every Member to come over here today, to vote for this rule and then vote for this very vital piece of legislation.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], for his generosity and courtesy in yielding me the time. I rise very much in support of this rule. After careful consideration and looking at the legislation, I support that as well.

I think it is important in the spirit of cooperation, unity, and togetherness when we have the opportunity to move forward, that we do that, and I think this fills that role. This is a very important piece of legislation.

There are three issues that are at stake today. One is the question of our missile defense national security; that is a subject we are going to give considerable more attention to. The other is the question of the U.N. chain of command; that is in the newspapers today. That is a subject we are going to be hearing more about and talking about on the floor.

Another is the cost of peacekeeping that the President alluded to last night. That is an area we have to focus great attention on, because adventures, or perhaps misadventures as we have had in places like Haiti, have an extraordinary cost to them. We are up in the range of about $3 billion now on that, and we do not have any way to really address those kinds of issues—$3 billion here, $3 billion there for what is loosely called ''peacekeeping'' or ''peacemaking'' suddenly adds up to some serious money and is a big issue in the question of how we do our national defense and our national security.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, who was wounded and imprisoned by enemies of this Nation while he fought to defend our Nation and our people.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our Armed Forces.

Although there are many good things in this bill, changes made in this latest version are not in our Nation's best interests. The most egregious omission is that it now allows the President to put American troops under U.N. command.

Under U.N. control the world's best fighting force would be put into the hands of an irresponsible, incompetent organization that is fraught with unnecessary bureaucracy and fiscal crises.

The United Nations record is a disgrace. Peacekeeping missions continue to grow in number, while success declines and its purposes and goals are ill-defined at best. There is no leadership.

Our service men and women put their lives on the line to protect freedom and serve our Nation. It is our responsibility to ensure their safety. We would be shirking that responsibility by allowing someone from the United Nations—who knows nothing about the U.S. military—to assume control of our troops.

Once again I find myself wondering why this administration and those on the other side of the aisle have fought so hard against any effort to protect our troops from being placed under U.N. control.

How can any American really be committed to any questionable organization such as the United Nations. I am amazed that any administration could have such little concern for our Nation's military. I would hope that the decision to take this important provision out of this bill will be reconsidered in the future. The safety and future of our Armed Forces depend upon it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], a great American patriot who we are honored to have serve in this Chamber.

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, this cannot be a happy day for big-taxing and big-spending politicians. Here is the New York Times. It says, ''Clinton Offers Challenge to Nation, Declaring Era of Big Government Is Over.'' That on the Gray Lady, America's so-called paper of record, is amazing.

Here is the great Washington Times, ''Clinton Concedes End of Big Government Era.''

And here is the Washington Post, the alleged paper of record inside the beltway. ''Clinton Embraces GOP Themes in Setting Agenda.'' The era of big Government is over.

As I said in a 1-minute speech this morning, Mr. Clinton did what he did in all of the State of the Union speeches, tearing pages from Ronald Reagan's book, put heroes in the gallery, military heroes, a year-ago Medal of Honor winners who, one gentleman won a Medal of Honor 7 days after his 17th birthday on the sands and ground-up lava of Iwo Jima. Last night he had sitting in the front row here, General Barry McCaffrey, who when he was a lieutenant and a young captain in Vietnam, Clinton could not gag out the word ''Vietnam,'' won three Purple Hearts.

He was the general who in the White House 2 years and 10 months ago was told, ''We don't speak to people in uniform here.'' They did not know he was the commander of the 24th Infantry Division Mechanized, the point of the spear, the Hail-Mary left hook that broke through into Iraq and around Kuwait and liberated that poor besieged nation.

Pointing to heroes and then taking away their pay raises and their benefits is not going to work with the American people.

As I look at my Clinton countdown watch today, I see it is 362 days to the inauguration of the 43d President of the United States, a brandnew one; and subtracting the 76 days from the election to the inauguration, that means in 286 days, Mr. Clinton is going to be asked to account for the two things that he demanded be removed from this excellent defense authorization bill. He said, we are not going to defend the American homeland from any nuclear, biological, or chemical missile attack. If it comes from a rogue nation like Iran, where 8 days ago today, 200 of their congressmen, whatever they call them, in their national assembly came to their feet and chanted and screamed, ''Death to America''; and every analyst will tell you that 5 years in the short term and 10 years at the maximum, they will have a nuclear weapon, as CBS and PBS in documentaries on Desert Storm reported that Iraq was within a year of nuclear weapons.

We simply must hold Mr. Clinton to account for making us take up national missile defense and for making him take out our provisions not to put U.S. troops under foreign or U.N. command.

Vote for this rule and support the authorization bill.

For immediate release, January 23, 1996.

DORNAN ''RELUCTANTLY'' SUPPORTS NEW DEFENSE CONFERENCE REPORT

''I am very disappointed that we have been unable to retain two very important provisions in the fiscal year 1996 Defense Authorization Conference Report due to objections from the Clinton administration. Provisions dealing with U.N. foreign command of U.S. troops and deploying a national ballistic missile defense have been removed from the new conference report despite the clearly demonstrated importance of these provisions. If it were not for the other important provisions of the report, specifically financial benefits for soldiers deploying to Bosnia, I would not hesitate voting against this new bill. However, unlike the President, I am unwilling to put politics ahead of the welfare of our troops and their families and will support this conference report when it comes to the House floor for a vote,'' commented Congressman Robert K. Dornan (R-Garden Grove), Chairman of the House National Security Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Dornan, one of the original authors of the U.N./foreign command provision after introducing H.R. 3334 in response to the loss of 19 U.S. soldiers in Somalia in 1993, still believes that there is great danger of another command disaster under this administration. ''We must preserve an American chain of command and chain of responsibility for American troops and their families. If we never act on this issue, we may again face another Mogadishu in Bosnia, Haiti, or elsewhere.''

Dornan was also very disappointed at the lack of a clear commitment to deploying multiple missile defense sites by 2003 to protect the continental United States from attack by ballistic missiles. ''Fortunately, despite lack of language, we still did increase funding for vital missile defense programs such as Navy upper tier which will provide our forward deployed forces and allies a near term/low cost defense against attack. Without this funding, debate over deployment dates and the ABM Treaty might become meaningless.''

''These changes represent the wide gap between this administration and the American public on national security issues. I sincerely hope the American people remember these critical differences on November 5th 1996!''

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

□ 1315

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, in this body not a day goes by that we do not deify the military. Yet in this bill is a provision that would leave a woman

stranded, while serving her country, without medical care, if the medical care she happens to need is a legal abortion. A compromise had been reached whereby she would have to pay 100 percent of the cost. Instead, in this bill, she would be left alone to go off base, perhaps in a foreign country and not speaking the language, to find that medical care.

It is always wrong, Mr. Speaker, and it is always against the American tradition, to interfere with a fundamental right to privacy. It is particularly wrong to toss a member of the military to the winds in need of medical care, particularly when she may be in a foreign country.

This is a fundamental right; it is not going to be withdrawn. So the strategy to humiliate people and make it difficult for them to be able to exercise the right is the prevailing strategy of this session.

The exercise of this right is understandably painful to many who oppose the right. It is painful to me to see someone exercise their first amendment free speech rights when they are speaking words that I find painful. But in this country, we do not try to extinguish constitutional rights by making them difficult or impossible to exercise. We particularly must not operate that way when dealing with women who serve their country in the U.S. military.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, may I respond respectfully to my friend, the prior speaker.

As the author of the amendment cutting off abortions in military hospitals, an offer to pay for part of it does not take care of all of the hospital costs and all of the attendant costs to someone using a facility to stop human life.

I would just like to make part of the debate the following statement: Not a single doctor, female or male, or nurse in the U.S. military wrote to me not to cut this off. Quite to the contrary, all of the doctors in Europe, every one of them and every anesthesiologist and all of the doctors in the Pacific, said: Chairman DORNAN, cut off this killing. We do not want to do it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on National Security who has worked hard all year on this bill, today is a very difficult day for me. It is with great sadness that I rise with great concern for this rule and this conference report.

The conference report we will vote on today is very similar to the one vetoed by President Clinton in late December with some notable exceptions. Several controversial sections have been removed. Although I disagree, I might have supported this report without the missile defense language and funding for the President's peacekeeping misadventures, and we might have argued those another day.

However, the conference agreed to drop a section of the bill that restricted the President's ability to place American troops under U.N. command. How ironic that today we will vote on this bill when just this morning a military court in Germany court-martialed Army Specialist Michael New, an American hero who refused to wear a uniform that signified allegiance to a foreign government, and dishonorably discharged him. Had this section been included in last year's bill, Michael New would be a decorated soldier today who would be proudly serving his country.

We have overwhelmingly voted this in the past. I hope this rule is defeated and we have a bill that America can be proud of and we can vote for.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the revised conference report on the Department of Defense Authorization Act. While I preferred the conference report that a majority of Members supported last month, I support adoption of this measure and urge the President to sign it into law.

This legislation deserves our strong endorsement. The bill before us will result in substantial Federal acquisition reform, which will eliminate paperwork and procedural hurdles and will save the Defense Department and taxpayer's billions of dollars. The bill also authorizes a full pay raise for active duty military personnel and provides equity in cost of living payments for our military retirees.

Chairman SPENCE and the leadership of the National Security Committee have also addressed shortfalls in military construction and basic equipment such as trucks, jeeps and ammunition. We also provide additional F–15 and F–16 fighters, which will meet a critical Air Force need. In addition, the production base for the B–2 Stealth Bomber is maintained, which will enable additional aircraft to be manufactured and will allow older bombers, which are prohibitively expensive to operate and support, to be retired.

This is sound legislation and I ask for a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the conference report.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with some reservation to support this bill, reservations which have been adequately expressed by previous speakers.

Mr. Speaker, it shouldn't have had to come to this. We shouldn't have to be revisiting the same issue over and over again. And yet, here we are 6 weeks after spending United States troops to Bosnia voting again on whether we should properly support American service men and women—men and women who are repeatedly sent to the far corners of the world to settle other people's conflicts.

In my home district, I have the honor of representing the fine men and women who serve at Fort Dix and McGuire Air Force Base and Lakehurst Naval War Center. In the tradition of those who served before them, these dedicated individuals responded within hours to the President's decision to deploy troops to Bosnia. Guard and Reserve soldiers were readied at Fort Dix; supplies were flown out of and through McGuire; air crews were sent to Europe and the Balkans to ensure our forces were well equipped and supported. While many of these service members have personal misgivings about the mission, they put aside those doubts, saluted smartly, and got on with the business at hand.

With little or no notice, these men and women left their homes and families to an extremely uncertain situation. They mobilized just as Christmas celebrations were beginning, leaving behind sons and daughters, spouses, and mothers and fathers to carry on as best they could. These men and women deserve our support. They deserve the full pay raise which we promised; they deserve the increase in the basic allowance benefit; and they deserve the COLA equity fix contained in this bill. Let's do the right thing.

Let's pass the rule and pass this Defense authorization bill. We are dutybound to do no less.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very good bill, especially as my colleagues had mentioned for the Reserve components. I ask my colleagues, do they know that one-third of the military forces that we have today are in the National Guard and Reserve? Do they know how much money we get out of this bill today? We only get 10 percent of it. So it is a good buy for the taxpayers.

However, under this legislation we were able to add $770 million for new equipment for all of the Reserves and give them better equipment to operate with. The technicians for the Guard

and Reserves were raised by 1,250 people. These are the ones that run our armories and our reserve centers.

We have a number of National Guardsmen and Reservists that are flying on these great airplanes into Bosnia, and, if they do not get an extension of 44 days, they cannot get paid. Under this bill, we have given them an extension of 44 days that they will get their pay for doing this special flying. There is a youth challenge program that is extended for 18 months, a wonderful program.

The National Guard can still do community service if it is tied to training. There was talk about not letting the National Guard use the equipment in the different States. It would be a terrible mistake. Under this bill, the National Guard can help out the community.

Instead of cutting each fighter squadron to 12 in the Air National Guard and Reserve, the bill provides for 15 aircraft in each squadron. The bill includes a program that I was proud to sponsor. It is a buy-down of interest rates for service personnel at military bases where there is a shortage of houses. This is the way it works. It would cover personnel with the rank of E–4 and above, and buy-downs their mortgage interest rate, 3 percent in the first year, 2 percent in the second year, and 1 percent for the third year of the loan. This would help the enlisted person get them housing where it is not available on the base.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, there are also kickers for the educational benefits for Reservists, just like the active forces get for special MO's. This can be implemented by the Secretary of Defense. This is a good bill and I certainly support it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY], a distinguished and very effective new member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and of the DOD authorization conference report. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for this rule and especially thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for his diligent work on trying to get this bill to the floor and get this bill into law. It has a lot of important provisions and, I think, not the least of which is the 2.4-percent pay raise for our military and the COLA equity for our military retirees.

However, as has already been addressed this morning and this afternoon, one important provision is missing, which is the provision which prohibits placement of the U.S. forces under U.N. operational and tactical control.

Many in this body, including myself, strongly oppose any time our Armed Forces are being asked to be put under U.N. command or control. The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief, and I think it is wrong for him to cede his authority, his constitutional authority to the United Nations. Apparently the President does not feel this way, and he has insisted that this provision prohibiting our troops coming under control of the United Nations, he has insisted that it be taken out. I nevertheless support this rule and this bill, and I, with some reservations, urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

(Mr. STUDDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my great disappointment that the conferees have chosen to retain the section of the bill which would require the discharge of military personnel who test positive for HIV. This provision was cited by the President in his veto message as blatantly discriminatory, exalting ideology over common sense. The Department of Defense itself has consistently opposed this provision. It is unnecessary, unjust, and unwise, and I deeply regret that the conferees have chosen to retain it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment and dismay that the conferees have chosen to retain section 567 of this bill, which would require the discharge or retirement of military personnel who test positive for HIV.

As the President acknowledged in his message vetoing the first conference report, this is a blatantly discriminatory measure which exalts ideology over common sense. It is justified by neither the need to ensure military readiness nor any other legitimate legislative concern.

The Department of Defense has consistently opposed this provision on a number of grounds. First, the number of servicemembers who test positive for HIV is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the active force and does not pose a significant problem for our military.

Second, these servicemembers are experienced, highly trained, and physically fit, and it will not enhance readiness to deprive the Armed Forces of their services.

And third, if and when their medical conditions render them unable to carry out their duties, current law already requires that these servicemembers be separated or retired. Moreover, current law gives the Secretary of Defense full authority to discharge even asymptomatic individuals should he determine that their retention would adversely affect the military mission.

The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that this measure is not about military readiness. Had it been so, it would not have singled out service members with one particular medical condition, but would have mandated the discharge of all who are non-worldwide assignable due to a medical condition, whether they suffer from asthma, diabetes, cancer, or heart disease. That would have been no less gratuitous, but it would at least have had the virtue of consistency.

Why, then, are only servicemembers with HIV to be discharged? The answer is inescapable: The proponents of this measure believe that people living with HIV/AIDS do not deserve the same consideration and compassion afforded those with other medical conditions.

Nor is it too far fetched to suggest that, for some, this provision is really a proxy by which they hope to bring about the discharge of HIV-positive servicemembers who happen to be gay. The shifting demographics of this disease make it less and less likely that they will actually achieve this result, but there are undoubtedly some gay servicemembers who will be discharged under this provision who up to now have managed to weather the unending waves of persecution to which they have been subjected.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I object to what is perhaps the most mean-spirited aspect of this provision: It not only deprives these men and women of their careers, but by requiring their discharge rather than providing for their medical retirement, it denies them continued medical care at Department of Defense facilities. The bill allows these servicemembers all of 30 days of transitional care before consigning them to Veterans' Administration facilities—most of which are ill-equipped to serve their needs. What is more, those who are enrolled in military medical research would no longer be eligible to participate as volunteers.

This is an unconscionable way to treat people who have honorably served their country. It also places in jeopardy one of the most important clinical vaccine programs in the world. Given the human and strategic significance of the advancing pandemic, this is unforgivably shortsighted.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this provision is unnecessary, unwise, and unjust. I urge the House to reject the conference report.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to be in the position that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is in. This is a really tough situation for him, and I am really delighted with the work that he has done on this bill to finally at least get a conference report that will have the authorization in place. I am going to vote for it. But I have to say that it is with some great reluctance, particularly with respect to the ABM section of the bill.

Let me read first of all what the President said in his message. This is his veto message:

> First the bill requires deployment by 2003 of a costly missile defense system able to defend all 50 States from a long-range missile threat that our intelligence community does not foresee in the coming decade, which would require a multiple-site architecture that cannot be accommodated within the terms of the existing ABM Treaty.

Well, let us just think about how intelligent our intelligence community is with respect to their speculation about this foreseeable or nonforeseeable, as they say, threat to the United States, and I will make it as current as this morning.

Dateline, January 23, Beijing, China, New York Times, says that preparations for a missile attack on Taiwan by

China and the target selection to carry it out have been completed and await a final decision by the Politburo in Beijing. A senior Chinese official is quoted as asserting, ''China could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan.''

Obviously a veiled threat against the United States, a veiled threat of a missile attack against Los Angeles, the idea being that we would not defend our ally in Taiwan against a missile attack, because we would be afraid that China would launch a missile attack against Los Angeles or New York or Cleveland, or Washington, DC.

□ 1330

Mr. President, the whole idea is that we have got to get rid of the ABM Treaty. Mr. President, we have to wake up in this country. There is a real threat. It is a genuine threat, and the first thing or the first order of business, the first responsibility of any moral government, is to protect its citizens. That means beginning with the repeal of the ABM Treaty.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and passage of the DOD authorization bill. I would like to commend especially the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, and the gentleman from California, ranking member DELLUMS, for their hard work on this very important piece of legislation.

While the authorization process has dragged on far longer than expected, I certainly applaud their commitment to its completion and the resolution of some very many contentious issues surrounding the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to congratulate the parties involved for bringing to closure the issue of equity in the COLA for military retirees and civil service retirees, and especially also for bringing a full pay raise for our men and women in uniform. As many Members fully understand, Guam is the home to very many people in uniform, but perhaps not equally understood is that very many of our own people are in the service.

I also want to draw attention to some concerns I have. I have serious concerns about the reductions in the environmental cleanup funding included in this legislation. But I am pleased with the compromise reached on funding of technical assistance for restoration advisory boards at military bases. RAB's are critical to building strong relations between the military and local communities. The small amount of technical assistance that RAB's receive enables them to acquire reliable and independent information that maintains this strong relation.

I especially want to point out, and appreciate the attention of the chairman and ranking member, a particular issue of concern to Guam. At a time when Guam is suffering from the largest BRAC reductions and closures of any American community, the commitment to assist in this process is important.

For the first time, Guam is included as a U.S. area for the repair of vessels. It may sound incredible, but Guam up to this time had to compete with foreign SRF's for the repair of U.S. vessels in voyage repairs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman and ranking member for their work on this legislation, and I urge passage of the rule and ultimately the legislation.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a wise leader on the Committee on National Security and my good friend.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the consideration of the authorization conference report and ask for support for the bill. I would like to address my comments, in closing, to the issue of missile defense and what we did as authorizers on the conference committee to bring forth a bill that this administration would hopefully sign into law, in spite of the objections they raised earlier this year and last year in terms of the missile defense provisions.

Some would say that perhaps we negotiated too far and that in fact we no longer have as a priority the issue of national missile defense. I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. This is not the end of the fight, this is the beginning of what promises to be a war in this country, in this session of the Congress, on the fate of the future of protecting the people of America from missile proliferation and the threat of a rogue attack.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the administration say they tried in good faith to negotiate with us. Mr. Speaker, I say, hogwash, disingenuous, totally misleading and totally self-serving. I was in those negotiations, Mr. Speaker, with three other Members of the Congress. In fact, no other House Members were present. It was Senator NUNN, it was Senator THURMOND, and it was Senator LOTT. We invited the administration over in the form of Bob Bell, and we in good faith addressed the 12 specific issues that he raised.

But, Mr. Speaker, it was like negotiating with a bowl of jelly, because in the end the administration had no intent on coming to grips with this issue of whether or not to protect America from the threat of a rogue attack. We in good faith in fact compromised in each of the 12 areas. We made a good faith effort to change language to give the administration the changes they asked for. But, Mr. Speaker, in the end the President did not want a bill and would not agree to the bill because we finally held his feet to the fire and said we want to deploy a system by a date certain. Where was this date certain picked from? It was picked from the recommendations of the President's own administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of rhetoric during the debate on the floor. We heard this was going to violate the ABM Treaty. Guess what, Mr. Speaker? A week ago Monday, the administration's point person on missile defense said that we can protect the entire 50 States from a single site by either using the Air Force or the Army program, which would in no way violate the ABM Treaty. All of a sudden the administration has no more argument that our efforts would have in fact violated ABM, because in fact the administration's own point person said that is not the case. Then the administration shifted gears and said it might jeopardize START II.

Mr. Speaker, I just spent 7 days in Russia where I met with the leaders of the Yeltsin administration on proliferation and on arms control issues. They were not pressing me on the issue of an allowable program under the ABM treaty. They are pressing me on expansion of NATO.

Why has this President not chosen to speak to the issue of Russia's concern with expanding NATO? If they want to know the real cutting edge issue that will cause START II to be delayed in Russia, it is not what we want to do, it is the administration's rhetoric about NATO and what it wants to do. We did not hear that in the debate on the House floor.

Then we heard, Mr. Speaker, the administration finally resort to a last ditch argument, because they could not make the argument on the ABM Treaty alone, because this bill originally did not attack the ABM Treaty. It did it in compliance with the treaty, even though many of us feel the treaty has outlived its usefulness and ultimately has to be changed. They then said there is no threat.

Get this, Mr. Speaker: The administration comes out with the most politically biased intelligence brief I have ever seen in my 10 years here, gives Senator LEVIN a political letter from the Deputy Director of the CIA for use in debate on the Senate floor, saying there will be no threat in 15 years, even though we requested this information for months. Two weeks later we are able to get advanced telemetry equipment the Russians are sending to Iraq to be used for a long range ICBM. The treat is there, it is real, and the battle for a national missile defense system is just beginning.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to state, so my colleagues will understand very clearly, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] made the point, that this President does not want to defend the United States against incoming ballistic missiles. That was his major objection to this bill, along with the idea that he also wants to have the right to delegate to foreign commanders the command of U.S. troops.

We are now going to enter a period in which it is important for Members of this House who feel that defense is important to enter a full-court press this year to develop defenses against incoming ballistic missiles, both for the people of the United States and for our troops in theater. We are going to do this.

The President has given up his most solemn responsibility, and that is to defend the people of the United States of America, and he is denied that responsibility in this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this rule and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 340, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of January 22, 1996, at H351.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of H.R. 1530 over the Christmas holiday was unfortunate and unjustified. As I stated several weeks ago when the House attempted to override the veto, if it has achieved nothing else, the President's veto has helped to further highlight the stark differences between the Congress and the President on critical issues of national security.

There were two primary issues on which the original bill was vetoed. First, was the provision in the original bill that called for the deployment of a national missile defense system—that is, a defense of the American people—by early next century. And second, was the provision requiring the President to certify in advance that any future deployment of U.S. military troops under the operational control of the United Nations is in the U.S. national security interest.

Expressing what I know to be the sentiment of many of my colleagues, these are issues of basic, fundamental principle. Accordingly, a majority of the conferees believed that no deal with President Clinton on these issues in this bill was far preferable to a bad deal.

Therefore, the conferees removed the national missile defense and U.N. command and control language that the President objected to so strongly rather than weaken the provisions. Nobody should think, however, that this is the last that either this Congress or this President has seen of these issues.

On both issues, however, the conference report still retains: Full funding for ballistic missile defense programs, including an increase of $450 million over the President's request for national missile defense programs; strong direction on critically important theater missile defense programs; and a provision of permanent law prohibiting the Department of Defense from paying the U.S. share of the costs of U.N. peacekeeping operations.

This conference report remains critically important for the numerous pay, allowances, benefits and reforms that it contains. This is why so much effort has been expended in such a short period of time to turn this conference report around. I support this conference report which, through two conferences now, has remained true to the four basic defense priorities this House established and articulated beginning early last year: improving military quality of life; sustaining core military readiness; reinvigorating lagging modernization programs; and beginning the long overdue process of Pentagon reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the troops and their families with a ''yes'' vote on the conference report. It is time to put our money where our mouths are.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] for the purposes of conducting a colloquy.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. Could the chairman please describe the outcome reached by the conferees on S. 1124 with regards to the B–2 bomber program?

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman would yield, the conference outcome on the B–2 was identical to the outcome on H.R. 1530 which the President vetoed. It successfully establishes the conditions necessary to permit the production of additional B–2 bombers beyond the currently authorized 20 aircraft.

There is a key issue, however, that requires clarification for the legislative record. First, as both the bill and report language clearly indicate, the fence on the obligation of B–2 funds until March 31, 1996, applies only to the $493 million in additional fiscal year 1996 procurement funds. In no way does this fence impact obligation of prior year B–2 funding.

Therefore, the balance of the $125 million authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1995 to sustain the B–2 industrial base is available immediately for such purposes. The use of the phrase ''merge with the $493 million'' in no way captures any prior year funding and refers only to the use of those funds for the same purpose as the $493 million.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the chairman. Is it therefore the chairman's perspective that the purpose for which the additional $493 million is being authorized is the facilitization and acquisition of long-lead items necessary to procure additional B–2 aircraft if such a decision is made in the future?

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman would yield. Consistent with the purposes specified in House Report 104–131 and House Report 104–208, the increased authorization of $493 million for the program is for the purpose of reestablishing critical elements of the B–2 production line and procuring long-lead items consistent with the acquisition of additional B–2 aircraft.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the Chairman for his clarification.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of the committee, in bringing to the floor the conference report on Senate bill S. 1124, the Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1996.

As Members know, and as the gentleman has already indicated, this is the second conference report that has been brought to the floor on fiscal year 1996. I am pleased that after the President's veto and the Congress' sustaining of that veto of the first conference report, that the conferees agreed to drop many of the provisions that the President and many of us in this Chamber found objectionable.

With respect to the National Missile Defense program, and what this gentleman perceives to be a tax on the ABM Treaty, I am pleased that the concerted attack on the important antiballistic missile treaty was finally removed from the report. The revised star wars concept that the conferees eliminated from the bill would have been a return, in this gentleman's humble opinion, to a program, Mr. Speaker, in search of a threat.

The intelligence community has reiterated on numerous occasions its assessment that there is no threat to justify the rapid deployment of a missile defense system at this time, one that is at this point unnecessary and extraordinarily expensive. This is particularly important in view of the fact that such a plan has, indeed, the potential for the abrogation of the ABM Treaty.

With respect to command and control, the conferees also dropped the provision that would have restricted the President in his role as Commander in Chief. With respect to contingency operations, the conferees also dropped the provision that required the President to fund contingency operations in a specific way.

Fourth, with respect to the pay raise, I am pleased that the provision to provide the full 2.4-percent pay increase to our troops was included in this report. But I continue to believe, Mr. Speaker, and would reiterate at this time, that it should not have been held hostage to such a controversial bill in the first place.

While this bill represents an improvement over the original bill, it still commits the Nation to a national security posture and spending plan that is misguided at best.

Some of the provisions of this conference report continue to concern me, and my concerns are as follows: One, the HIV provision which states that anyone testing positive for HIV must be discharged, regardless of circumstance. This has enormous implications, Mr. Speaker; not only enormous implications for people inside the military. I would believe that one day we will be back here revisiting this provision, because it would just wreak havoc on a number of people in the military who have tested positive.

But above and beyond those concerns that are specific and exclusive to the U.S. military, at a time when AIDS is an incredible disease in this country, we should not be sending the message from the Federal Government that citizens should not be tested. The one way, Mr. Speaker, that we gain knowledge about this incredible disease that is killing and destroying human beings in America, try to understand it, to gain some control, is by testing.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government sends the message that to be tested is to be harmed, that, in this gentleman's opinion, is a foreboding, incredible statement that this Nation should not be sending, because the potential for your children, Mr. Speaker, our children, and our children's children are at stake.

We need to be about understanding, learning, treating, and controlling this disease. To communicate that message is awesome, in this gentleman's opinion.

Second, provisions restricting open communication in awarding shipbuilding contracts. Think about that, Mr. Speaker. At a time when we are considering billions of dollars, provisions are included in this bill that would retard competition. Is that good government?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we would be back in these Chambers one day, Mr. Speaker, and we would rue the day that there are provisions in this bill that would retard competition for the use of Federal dollars.

Third, almost $500 million is included for B–2 bombers that is not required by the administration. If my colleagues heard the colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], the essence of that colloquy was that this $493 million is designed for the purpose of purchasing long-lead items that ultimately result in the purchase of additional B–2's.

I would submit in these Chambers, Mr. Speaker, that this is a weapons system we do not need, a weapons system we cannot afford, and finally, a weapons system for which there are alternatives.

Fourth, it resurrects, Mr. Speaker, the antisatellite program. What can be more bizarre than $30 million to resurrect the antisatellite program potentially placing us in a position of further militarizing space, with the potential of all of the destabilization that goes with gaining the capacity to destroy satellites, the eyes and ears of nations in moments of controversy and difficulty?

Next, it constrains in certain ways the cooperative threat reduction program euphemistically, referred to as the Nunn-Lugar program.

Next, it reduces funding for environmental cleanup programs at a time when we are closing military installations all over the Nation and people in local communities wanting to convert those lands to higher and better use in their community, when we ought to be cleaning them up as rapidly and as expeditiously as we can. In this bill we find where the Department of Defense, in the conduct of its activities, has polluted many of these facilities, we ought to be about trying to do that as rapidly as possible, and we retard it by reducing the funds in this program.

We terminate the technology investment program. What we do in this bill is simply fund those programs that are in the pipeline. We then end it at a time when, in the context of a post-cold-war world, we ought to be answering the question: How do we convert from a heavy reliance on military purchases and militarism, and converting ourselves to an economy rooted in the principles of peace and the reality of a post-cold-war world?

This bill, also, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], my distinguished colleague, in the context of her discussion on the floor regarding the rule pointed out that this bill retains a provision that would eliminate the right of women, with certain exceptions, in the military to receive—at their own expense—abortion services at military facilities overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I would add parenthetically that this provision was incorporated in this significant piece of legislation without one single hearing. The same can be said with respect to my comments regarding HIV.

Finally, this bill still, still adds $7 billion, not million, $7 billion over and above the President's request for the authorization for the Department of Defense in the context of a post-cold-war world and during a period of time when we even shut this Government down around the issue of balanced budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate one more time that we spend virtually as much as all of the other nations combined in our military budget. And when we add the U.S. military expenditures with the expenditures of its allies, it constitutes slightly in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget. Which means that if everyone else in the world is perceived as an enemy, which is bizarre, extreme, and absurd, but let us for the moment for the sake of discussion in this moment assume that that is real, we still, along with our friends, are outspending the rest of the world 4 to 1.

In this bill, when we talk about balancing the budget and cutting health care and cutting education, and other programs, $7 billion, $7 billion to buy this weapons system and that weapons system and the other weapons system because we need it? Because there is someone out there poised to attack the United States? Because there still is a Soviet Union? Because there is still some extreme enemy out there? No, because it helps someone's economy. Because at the end of the day, this is about jobs in the local community.

My response is I understand work. I understand jobs. I understand the need for people to have work that is dignified, that allows them to take care of themselves, their family, and their loved ones, to feed their people, to clothe their people, to house them, to educate them.

But is the way to create jobs to use the military budget to purchase expensive and unnecessary and potentially dangerous weapons systems to produce jobs? No, it is about facing the reality of a peacetime economy, of a post-cold-war world, developing an approach to the American economy that addresses those realities where we stimulate the economy to expand its employment, to move toward full employment, not by building B–2's and building ships we do not need and building rockets we do not need and building all those expensive and unnecessary weapons systems. Every study that I have seen shows that that is an awesome cost to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we need jobs. On that point I am totally sympathetic. Where I am not sympathetic is that we should use the military budget as a jobs bill. The military budget should address our national security needs.

□ 1400

So in conclusion, several points have been addressed in this bill that the President saw as important issues dealing with the veto. They have been dropped. The pay raise has been included. But there are still a number of issues out there that would allow Members to continue to rise in opposition to this report. And though we have now come back with a bill that is better than the one the President vetoed, it is still a bill that this gentleman cannot support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, briefly I would ask our colleagues on the other side that perhaps they should start the conversation of increased spending with the man in the White House. We talked about the $7 billion item. It was President Clinton who signed the appropriation bill, which my understanding is, it contains $7 billion more.

To my amazement, in California, President Clinton gave a speech where he talked about seeing the need for more B–2's. This is President Clinton, the champion of cutting defense. I can guarantee Members he will be at every shipyard where there are funded programs for new ships being constructed this year. Unfortunately, we have a disingenuous White House.

Let me talk about missile defense for a moment, because what we have heard has been nothing but rhetoric and hogwash. Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that General O'Neill did not confirm my statement on the floor until a week after we voted on the defense bill. When my colleagues on the left said we could not build a low-cost missile defense system from a single site without violating the ABM, General O'Neill says on the record we can. The Air Force can do it for about $2.5 billion over 4 years. The Army can do it for $5 billion over 4 years, and both of them can do it in compliance with the ABM treaty. This is all in the public record, I might add.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we heard our colleagues talk about no threat. I was in Russia last week. I want to tell Members, when I was at the Kremlin meeting with Yeltsin's advisors on proliferation, I asked them a simple question, Can you explain to me how the advanced telemetry equipment for a long-range ICBM was obtained going from Russia to Iraq?

Do my colleagues know what they said? We know nothing of this incident. Mr. Speaker, we have the devices in our hands with the Russian markings on them. Do Members know why the administration does not want to confront this issue? Because it is a direct violation of the MTCR. This administration would rather bury its head in the sand than to face the Russians on a direct violation of the missile technology control regime. This administration has sanitized intelligence more than any other administration in the history of this country.

The most outrageous thing about what this President is doing is undermining the ability of this country to protect our people. That is outrageous.

When I asked Ambassador Pickering for an answer, he said, We did not ask the question yet. That is outrageous, and we will get to the bottom of that story in the appropriate hearing scenarios.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in favor of sustaining the President's veto of this bill, I said that 1 week of earnest negotiation could produce an acceptable bill. I want to give credit to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They were flexible on the three issues most opposed by the administration. We now have a bill I think which on balance is worthy of support. I congratulate my friend and my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], for navigating this difficult bill through a difficult conference.

I am happy with the pay raise, with the increased housing allowances. I think all Members of this House should be, and I am hopeful that these payments will not be any longer delayed. I am pleased, too, to see that there are provisions here that will ensure that there is a timely COLA for military retirees. They earned it; they are entitled to it. So I will vote for this conference report and I will encourage my colleagues to do the same.

But I do have concerns that I want to express. I am concerned that this bill is not the long-term blueprint for the defense budget which we need. I want to sound a friendly caveat to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. If we do not discipline the add-ons in the next defense bill more diligently, we have a train wreck coming just down the track.

This bill makes costly commitments like more B–2's, and I voted for the money, but it makes costly commitments like that without tackling any of the tradeoffs necessary to carry those commitments through in the years ahead.

This bill starts up an antisatellite weapon, expensive, a space-based laser, expensive, dubious technology, four prototype submarines, without resolving just where all this money is going to be found to carry these programs to fruition.

This bill speeds up existing programs like the Navy's Upper Tier, the Navy's Lower Tier theater missile defense systems, the Army's Comanche helicopter, the Air Force space and missile tracking system, so-called Brilliant Eyes. It is doubtful we can maintain the speed in the years ahead.

Unlike the appropriation bill, this bill mandates milestones, program milestones, dates when things have to be done, deadlines for a host of different programs. This is congressional micromanagement. It is a practice that is often questioned, often decried by those very Members who are practicing it here right in this very bill.

I, Mr. Speaker, see no way to sustain funding for all these initiatives in the outyears. Between now and the year 2002, it is true that the Republican budget for national security will add some additional money over and above the Clinton defense budget, but it is only $18.4 billion plus 1 percent of the total amount to be spent on national security in the next 7 years. If we follow through with all the systems that this bill either starts up or spends up, we will need a lot more money than $18.4 billion.

If we do not come up with that additional money, we will have to slow down or stop in future years that which we are starting up or speeding up this year. That is not an efficient way to spend the scarce dollars that we have for national defense.

It is also not good precedent to authorize $821 million for national missile defense with nary a word about how Congress wants this program structured and how this money should be spent.

I know that striking all the national missile defense language was the best we could do, if we wanted an authorization bill, and I hope this year when we do the bill we can settle on common ground and not repeat this precedent of authorizing $821 million without any direct examination or guidance.

I know that those who wanted the national missile defense provisions, the language in this bill, think that the ABM Treaty is outdated and a barrier to ballistic missile defense development. They have got a point. The ABM Treaty is 23-years old, but the ABM Treaty does not bar any particular development that we will do this year or in the immediate future. And if we imply, even imply in an act of Congress that we would possibly violate or even want to abrogate or renegotiate the ABM Treaty, then we may put ratification of START II by the Russia Duma in even greater risk that it faces now. START II will reduce Russia's nuclear arsenal by some 5,000 warheads. The missiles that carry these will be dismantled. The silos will be filled with concrete. The warheads will be stored in a facility built according to U.S. specifications in Tomsk, Siberia. And as to these 5,000 warheads, if this comes to pass START II will give us 100 percent defense effectiveness.

So for the sake of ballistic missile defense, we should concentrate now on

ratification of START II and later, when it is necessary and the time is propitious, then we can concentrate on amendments to the ABM Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, every year since 1959, we have had an authorization bill. A lot of Members do not understand that we really did not have an authorization process prior to that date, and it has built up since then. It is more necessary than ever, now that we are in a period of changing national defense years. This is an important bill. We should not break precedent and fail to pass it this year.

Since we settled the three most contentious issues, the pay raise for the troops is here, the increase in the housing allowance, all rides on this bill, I will vote for it and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Members to vote ''yes'' on S. 1124, the revised fiscal year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act, and point out that this is just another example of how Members on our side have reached out and tried to cooperate with this administration.

The White House and a minority of Members in the House and Senate have objected to the original conference bill because for the first time Republicans committed this country to the actual deployment of effective missile defense systems. I have to say that an article from the New York Times today, page A3, which has been referred to earlier, discusses a veiled threat from China to bomb Los Angeles by way of missiles. I am absolutely shocked that the administration and certain Members in this House and the other body would try, would actually leave this country defenseless against such a threat to the continental United States.

I want to put the administration on notice that these concessions on missile defense policy are only temporary, and they are made because we do need this entire bill. Important provisions in it like the 2.4-percent military pay raise; the 5.2-percent increase for housing allowances for our military families; the military retiree COLA fix; increases for family housing construction so that one-fourth of all barracks do not remain substandard; increases in modernization to stop the 71-percent decline in procurement since 1985; and various Pentagon reforms.

This is a good bill. It was a good bill in its entirety, and it is a good bill today. But it is missing this vital ingredient, to protect the men, women and children of America from the potential devastation of an incoming missile. That to me is mindboggling, that we would just abdicate our responsibility to defend against such a threat is wholly mindless.

I would like to make some additional points. While the President talks about the serious threat posed by nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons proliferation, it is clear to me he is not serious about doing anything to combat these threats.

The President's blind devotion to the ABM Treaty is leaving our Nation increasingly vulnerable. His lip service to ballistic missile defense is just that, a placebo that places our Nation at serious risk.

Although the conferees have dropped ballistic missile defense language from this conference agreement—but it is not because of agreement with the President. It was done because we cannot condone the administration's efforts to water down our ballistic missile defense program. We will not be party to this irresponsible act.

Instead, this year the Congress will initiate its own ''spring offensive.'' The Congress will make certain that ballistic missile defense is one of our Nation's top priorities. Despite the obstruction of the President today, the Congress will pursue a vigorous ballistic missile agenda this year. Chairman SPENCE and the National Security Committee intend to hold extensive hearings on this critical issue to thoroughly review the nature of this threat, and determine the programmatic options available to defeat this threat. I am confident that the Defense subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will also do its part in this critical review.

Let me repeat—we will not be party to the President's total unwillingness to respond to this growing threat.

I strongly believe it is now incumbent upon the Congress to fashion its own ballistic missile defense program and policy. At the same time, the Congress must also begin devising a responsible strategy for withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. This treaty's time has come and passed. Overtaken by technological progress, this treaty now represents the ultimate placebo. If America is to defend itself in the future, ballistic missile defense must be our highest priority. We cannot continue to adhere to an antiquated arms control treaty which directly negates the ability of the United States to protect itself from ballistic missile attack. This would be a mistake of tragic proportions—a mistake which will directly affect the security of our children and grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, this issue will be revisited. We will not go away. I urge the passage and adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I included for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1996]

AS CHINA THREATENS TAIWAN, IT MAKES SURE U.S. LISTENS

(By Patrick E. Tyler)

BEIJING, Jan. 23—The Chinese leadership has sent unusually explicit warnings to the Clinton Administration that China has completed plans for a limited attack on Taiwan that could be mounted in the weeks after Taiwan's President, Lee Tenghui, wins the first democratic balloting for the presidency in March.

The purpose of this saber-rattling is apparently to prod the United States to rein in Taiwan and President Lee, whose push for greater international recognition for the island of 21 million people, has been condemned here as a drive for independence.

While no one familiar with the threats thinks China is on the verge of risking a catastrophic war against Taiwan, some China experts fear that the Taiwan issue has become such a test of national pride for Chinese leaders that the danger of war should be taken seriously.

A senior American official said the Administration has ''no independent confirmation or even credible evidence'' that the Chinese are contemplating an attack, and spoke almost dismissively of the prospect.

''They can fire missiles, but Taiwan has some teeth of its own,'' the official said. ''And does China want to risk that and the international effects?''

The most pointed of the Chinese warnings was conveyed recently through a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Chas. W. Freeman Jr., who traveled to China this winter for discussions with senior Chinese officials. On Jan. 4, after returning to Washington, Mr. Freeman informed President Clinton's national security adviser, Anthony Lake, that the People's Liberation Army had prepared plans for a missile attack against Taiwan consisting of one conventional missile strike a day for 30 days.

The warning followed similar statements relayed to Administration officials by John W. Lewis, a Stanford University political scientist who meets frequently with senior Chinese military figures here.

These warnings do not mean that an attack on Taiwan is certain or imminent. Instead, a number of China specialists say that China, through ''credible preparations'' for an attack, hopes to intimidate the Taiwanese and to influence American policy toward Taiwan. The goal, these experts say, is to force Taiwan to abandon the campaign initiated by President Lee, including his effort to have Taiwan seated at the United Nations, and to end high-profile visits by President Lee to the United States and to other countries.

If the threats fail to rein in Mr. Lee, however, a number of experts now express the view that China could resort to force, despite the enormous consequences for its economy and for political stability in Asia.

Since last summer, when the White House allowed Mr. Lee to visit the United States, the Chinese leadership has escalated its attacks on the Taiwan leader, accusing him of seeking to ''split the motherland'' and undermine the ''one China'' policy that had been the bedrock of relations between Beijing and its estranged province since 1949.

A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, asked to comment on reports that the Chinese military has prepared plans for military action against Taiwan, said he was awaiting a response from his superiors. Last month, a senior ministry official said privately that China's obvious preparations for military action have been intended to head off an unwanted conflict.

''We have been trying to do all we can to avoid a scenario in which we are confronted in the end with no other option but a military one,'' the official said. He said that if China does not succeed in changing Taiwan's course, ''then I am afraid there is going to be a war.''

Mr. Freeman described the most recent warning during a meeting. Mr. Lake had

called with nongovernmental China specialists.

Participants said that Mr. Freeman's presentation was arresting as he described being told by a Chinese official of the advanced state of military planning. Preparations for a missile attack on Taiwan, he said, and the target selection to carry it out, have been completed and await a final decision by the Politburo in Beijing.

One of the most dramatic moments came when Mr. Freeman quoted a Chinese official as asserting that China could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders ''care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan,'' a statement that Mr. Freeman characterized as an indirect threat by China to use nuclear weapons against the United States.

An account of the White House meeting was provided by some of the participants. Mr. Freeman, reached by telephone, confirmed the gist of his remarks, reiterating that he believes that while ''Beijing clearly prefers negotiation to combat,'' there is a new sense of urgency in Beijing to end Taiwan's quest for ''independent international status.''

Mr. Freeman said that President's Lee's behavior ''in the weeks following his re-election will determine'' whether Beijing's Communist Party leaders feel they must act ''by direct military means'' to change his behavior.

In recent months, Mr. Freeman said he has relayed a number of warnings to United States Government officials. ''I have quoted senior Chinese who told me'' that China ''would sacrifice 'millions of men' and 'entire cities' to assure the unity of China and who opined that the United States would not make comparable sacrifices.''

He also asserted that ''some in Beijing may be prepared to engage in nuclear blackmail against the U.S. to insure that Americans do not obstruct'' efforts by the People's Liberation Army ''to defend the principles of Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan and Chinese national unity.''

Some specialists at the meeting wondered if Mr. Freeman's presentation was too alarmist and suggested that parliamentary elections on Taiwan in December had resulted in losses for the ruling Nationalist Party and that President Lee appeared to be moderating his behavior to avoid a crisis.

''I am not alarmist at this point,'' said one specialist, who would not comment on the substance of the White House meeting, ''I don't think the evidence is developing in that direction.''

Other participants in the White House meeting, who said they would not violate the confidentiality pledge of the private session, separately expressed their concern that a potential military crisis is building in the Taiwan Strait.

''I think there is evidence to suggest that the Chinese are creating at least the option to apply military pressure to Taiwan if they feel that Taiwan is effectively moving out of China's orbit politically,'' said Kenneth Lieberthal, a China scholar at the University of Michigan and an informal adviser to the Administration.

Mr. Lieberthal, who also has traveled to China in recent months, said Beijing has redeployed forces from other parts of the country to the coastal areas facing Taiwan and set up new command structures ''for various kinds of military action against Taiwan.''

''They have done all this in a fashion they know Taiwan can monitor,'' he said, ''so as to become credible on the use of force.''

''I believe there has been no decision to use military force,'' he continued, ''and they recognize that it would be a policy failure for them to have to resort to force; but they have set up the option, they have communicated that in the most credible fashion and, I believe, the danger is that they would exercise it in certain circumstances.''

Several experts cited their concern that actions by Congress in the aftermath of President Lee's expected election could be a critical factor contributing to a military confrontation. If President Lee perceives that he has a strong base of support in the United States Congress and presses forward with his campaign to raise Taiwan's status, the risk of a military crisis is greater, they said. A chief concern that Congress would seek to invite the Taiwan leader back to the United States as a gesture of American support. A Chinese military leader warned in November that such a step could have ''explosive'' results.

In recent months, American statements on whether United States forces would come to the defense of Taiwan if it came under attack have been deliberately vague so as to deter Beijing through a posture of what the Pentagon calls ''strategic ambiguity.''

Some members of Congress assert that the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 includes an implicit pledge to defend Taiwan if attacked, but Administration officials say that, in the end, the decision would depend on the timing, pretext and nature of Chinese aggression.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I urge Members to support it as I support it strongly.

For more than a year I have been concerned that there is a mismatch between the Nation's military strategy and the level of defense resources. Last February, I testified before the House Committee on the Budget and proposed a budget with additional and necessary funding for the military. My concerns were many. I spoke of a shortfall in funding for modernization, maintenance and infrastructure, daily operations and training.

For fiscal year 1996 alone, I proposed a minimum increase of at least $6 billion over the administration's request as a necessary requirement to sustain a quality force into the future. I am pleased that this conference report authorizes an increase of nearly $7 billion.

However, this conference report is not perfect. But I do point out that it does have the necessary pay increase for the young men and young women in uniform, that it has the necessary housing allowance increase. Those are so terribly important for those people who wish to make a career of our military.

There are provisions I would have deleted and others I would have added. But compromise has been necessary, and the report is a step in the right direction. It authorizes an end to the freefall in defense expenditures and includes many necessary policy initiatives. Most important, the report includes a permanent endstrength floor for personnel levels in each of the respective services. This provision alone warrants support from this body. The endstrength floors are necessary to counter and to offset low moral resulting from the strains of increased training schedules and overseas deployments.

As our Nation sends additional troops into the Balkan region, I ask my colleagues to assure the uniformed ranks of our commitment to them. If you are for a first rate naval and marine force, then you should support this report. If you are for a healthy and capable Army, then you should support this measure. If you are for a robust and well-equipped National Guard and Reserve, you should support this package. And if you are for a strong Air Force with an unmatched B–2 bomber force, then you must support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The Chair advises Members that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

□ 1415

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that we were able to take this bill after it had been vetoed by the President and run it back through a limited conference and get it back on the floor and, hopefully, get it back to the President's desk for signature, is a tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE]. I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

When we put this abbreviated conference together to get the bill back through, the gentleman from California worked equally hard to see to it that we had a Defense authorization bill.

It is important that we have this bill. This bill is about $8 billion more than the President's initial suggestion. On the other hand, the President's own vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Owens, has said that we need to spend $20 billion more per year on procurement. In this bill we not only have the pay raise and the increased housing allowance for the troops, but we have modernization. We have increased airlift, increased sealift, more ammunition, more precision guided munitions, and such very basic things as trucks and other transportation equipment, so we are giving the troops the equipment that they need to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying we did strip out missile defense from this bill. We said in our bill that we would defend the United States against missile attack and we would have that system, that defense system, ready by the year 2003. The President

said, ''I object to defending the United States of America against missile attack,'' and that was his primary reason for a veto.

Mr. Speaker, on this date we should launch a campaign to overturn the decision by President Clinton to leave this country defenseless against missile attack. We live in an age of missiles. It is something the President has resisted.

We are going to start the campaign as of this day and, hopefully, at the end of this year we will have a defense authorization bill that builds a defense against ballistic missiles.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I further thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, because the two of us have sat next to each other on this committee for almost 24 years now. I thank him for his friendship and constant leadership on this bill.

I must say, I like the gentleman from California, but I am rising to say please vote ''no'' on this bill.

I really do not understand this. The favorite thing I have on my schedule today says that between 10 and 4 today I can go to either room 2340 or 2117, in each room there is one copy of this conference report, where I may go read it at that point. Mr. Speaker, I do not even know what it is we are really dealing with. I do not know where this is, why we could not see it ahead of time, what is going on. I must say, this is not the process that I was proud of in this House. I am very sorry to see that happen.

Let me go to some of the very substantive issues. Let me move off this process. In this summer, this summer the Pentagon lost $14.5 billion. It could not find it from last year. So what do we do? For the first time in my 23 years, we reward them by giving them even more money than they asked for this time. Can Members think of another agency of Government where we would do that if this summer they had not been able to account for $14.5 billion?

So, there would be a committee saying, ''I will tell you what, the President does not want more, the Joint Chiefs do not want more, but we are going to give you more anyway. Have a nice day.'' We have not done that in my 23 years, and I cannot believe we did it this year.

There are increases in here for the CIA. I have tried very hard many times to get that number open so we could at least tell people what we are spending for the Central Intelligence Agency. These are the guys who missed Carlos Salinas in Mexico when we were doing NAFTA, they did not know the Wall was falling down, they have been falling all over the place trying to find a mission. Every year they get more money, too. That is great. We have B–2's in here which no one knows what to do with.

I could go on and on and on. I think this bill is pathetic, and I hope people vote ''no.''

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], who is chairman of our Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong—in fact, strong support would be too weak a term—I rise in fervent support of S. 1124, the Department of Defense authorization conference report. I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], and all members of the committee who have labored long and hard to achieve what I think is truly a bipartisan work product.

During the many weeks of debate over this legislation, one very important issue which was always bipartisan from the very beginning has been the provisions to significantly reform the procurement system of the Department of Defense and the civilian agencies in order to make the Federal Government a smart shopper, something it has not been accused of being in my tenure here or for a long time before that.

The provisions that are in this bill are consistent with H.R. 1670, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995, which was a joint initiative of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on National Security. Those measures passed the House by a vote of 423 to 0 in September of last year.

The private sector continues to increase its productivity and its effectiveness in this whole area because they are not bound down by the arcane, convoluted Rube Goldberg type of provisions that the Federal Government has to operate with in its procurement system. It is a centrally planned system as it exists, expensive to operate, and heavily laden with paperwork requirements and bureaucracy. Piecemeal reforms just have not done the job. Today's system forces taxpayers—and this is the significant point, Mr. Speaker—forces taxpayers to pay a 20-percent premium on Federal purchases; on all Federal purchases, from fighter aircraft to office supplies, we are paying a premium of 20 percent, which this bill is going to go a long way toward correcting.

This agreement provides reforms needed to make DOD and the civilian agencies smart shoppers, as I said. The conference agreement promotes affordable and commonsense approaches to meet our budgetary goals by, among other things, providing for the increased use of commercial items, increasing the competitiveness of U.S. defense products in international markets, eliminating numerous government-unique procedures, and creating a whole new system for the purchase and management of Federal information technology.

Mr. Speaker, this is a marvelous bill. It is a tremendous reform of our procurement system. It is the one thing we can do today that can save more money than almost anything else we do.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the previous speaker, was the cosponsor on the individual original bill, the acquisition bill, and did yeoman's work in getting it through. He deserves a lot of credit for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], chairman of our Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I commend him for his outstanding work on making sure we brought this work product on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and urge its adoption.

This conference report is good for our military personnel and good for their families.

This measure enhances force readiness. It fully funds the operations and training accounts and provides additional resources to other important readiness activities. It also protects these training and readiness accounts by establishing short-term financing mechanisms to pay for the initial costs of unfunded contingency operations.

This measure contains a number of provisions which improve the quality of life for our service personnel and their families. Additionally, this conference report contains reform measures to generate efficiencies in order to maximize limited defense resources.

Our military personnel put it on the line daily to provide for this Nation's security. They do so willingly and with pride. We must keep faith with them and their families.

We owe it to our troops to adopt this conference report today. The President owes it to our troops to sign this measure as soon as it reaches his desk.

This legislation is needed. Vote ''yes'' on this conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1124, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

Last evening, the President stood at the rostrum and gave a nice speech. He talked about the challenges facing the country and he urged us to set aside our differences and work together for the best interest of the American people.

One of those challenges, he said, is ''to maintain America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace

throughout the world.'' We all know that we can only meet this challenge by providing the Nation with a strong defense—a defense that can meet the threats posed by those who would challenge our interests and those of our allies or would threaten the liberties of our people.

Mr. Speaker, speeches and rhetoric are not enough. I regret that the President chose last month to veto the original defense authorization bill. That veto was unjustified. The original bill, like the one before us today, was a bipartisan product. Republicans and Democrats came together to provide the American people with what they expect—that is, a robust defense that could deal with any immediate threat and which looks to the future to deal with the emerging threats of the 21st century.

The President vetoed the bill principally because he objected to working toward a viable national missile defense by 2003 and to providing the American people with assurances that the placement of American military personnel under the operational control of the U.N. is in the national security interests of the United States. On these issues, the President is out of step with a bipartisan majority of this House and, more importantly, with the American people. I remain committed to seeing these provisions enacted into law.

The President's veto put a lot at risk. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I can assure the House that we need an authorization bill. Over 9,200 military families will benefit from housing improvements this bill would authorize and 68 new barracks projects would begin this year. In addition to these significant housing improvements, this bill would provide needed child development centers and medical facilities for our personnel. Hundreds of construction projects in this bill are designed to enhance the readiness of our forces. We are confronting a significant deterioration in military infrastructure. Without an authorization bill, none of these projects will go forward and the housing privatization initiative cannot proceed.

The military services, the men and women who serve in them, and the families who support them need this bill. It is my hope that the President will sign this defense authorization bill as soon as it reaches his desk. We should have no further delay.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of legislative history, I want to note the colloquy that I had with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, on December 15, 1995, concerning sections 2836 and 2837 of H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996. In our colloquy concerning those provisions, I gave the gentleman from Illinois some clarification concerning the application of those provisions to the Glenview Naval Air Station, Glenview, IL. Although the President vetoed that legislation, those sections were unaltered in the subsequent conference with the Senate on the defense authorization bill, S. 1124. Sections 2836 and 2837 of S. 1124 are identical to the provisions in the earlier bill and my assurances to the gentleman from Illinois remain unchanged.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Personnel.

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, even though critically important language on the U.N. or foreign command of U.S. troops and the deployment of this critically needed national missile defense system and contingency funding, all those are out, and Mr. Clinton is going to pay a heavy price during the next 286 days for that, I am very proud to stand up here and defend our chairman and this great authorization bill.

Among the important personnel provisions included in the bill that I authored or fought for as the chairman of the Subcommittee on military personnel are prohibition against all abortions in overseas or U.S. military hospitals, mandatory discharge of all nondeployable, noncombat trainable AIDS virus carrying drug users, and others, excellent new guidelines for accountability of American POW–MIA's, finally, a 5.2 percent interest pay raise in housing allowances, a cost of living adjustment, COLA, for military retirees, and a pay equity adjustment.

Among the other provisions I have championed as a member of the full committee or the Committee on Research and Development are increased funding for Navy upper tier ballistic missile defense, key; increased funding for more Army Kiowa OH–58D helicopters and for the Comanche RAH–66 Scout helicopter of the future; conditions on aid to Nunn-Lugar type money to Russia, pending a screeching verifiable halt to Russian work on the evil biological weapons; increased funding for near-term precision guided weapons for the B–1 Lancers; increased funding for new unmanned aerial vehicles, UAV's. I witnessed them in operation 4½ months ago in the Balkan theater, flying over Bosnia from Albania. Now it is all out in the open press.

Mr. Speaker, I believe those provisions that were cut out by Clinton's demands, he is playing high-risk. We saw his last State of the Union last night because American citizens want this beloved homeland of ours to be protected from rogue missiles, whether they are packed with nuclear devices, biological, or evil chemical warfare.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, last night we heard two speeches about priorities and values. The Senate majority leader said, and I quote, ''The President claims to embrace the future while clinging to the policies of the past.'' Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at this legislation. This bill is clearly an improvement over the one that we worked on before, and I commend the conferees for their hard work, but the Republicans claim this bill, like the one before it, embraces the future of the U.S. defense policy. But the U.S. defense will not sail smoothly toward the future, because this bill is anchored by the policies of the past.

The Republicans speak of the need to balance budgets, cut fat, make difficult choices, but the Republicans are not making these difficult choices in defense. This bill does not make cuts, it gives the Pentagon $7 billion more than they asked for. The Republicans speak of the need to strengthen this country's defense.

□ 1430

The Department of Defense will grow stronger when it is allowed to become leaner, more efficient and equipped for the challenges in a new world order.

This bill, however, builds up programs that the Department of Defense was moving away from, like the B–2, the ballistic missile defense, and the cuts in the Department of Defense environmental cleanup programs. We are closing military bases all over the country, realizing that the Federal Government is one of the biggest polluters, and we are not providing the money to clean up those sites.

The Republicans speak of supporting our men and women in uniform, yet this bill requires a discharge of service personnel with HIV, and prohibits members of the military from obtaining abortions in our military facilities overseas. Risking the health of our military, and needlessly taking away their careers, will hardly build morale.

As Americans watch this bloated defense budget pass this Congress, they will realize which party is really tethered to the past.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the chairman of our MWR panel.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Let me add my words of appreciation and congratulations to the chairman of the full committee for his very effective work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the National Security Committee's Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation, I rise in strong support of this bill.

The conference report fully funds important military quality of life programs including family support, child care, commissaries, gymnasiums and other recreational programs and facilities. These programs are critical to ensuring that our military personnel are taken care of, especially considering the sacrifices demanded of them in places.

The conference report makes a big contribution to caring for military personnel while on deployments and to the

families who must experience the difficulties associated with this high personnel tempo. Also, special efforts were made in this bill to ease the burden on these programs that resulted from the reduction of forces in Europe.

These quality of life improvements are a direct investment in readiness because they aid in retaining quality people in our Armed Forces. This bill represents a commitment by the American people in return for the sacrifices we demand of our men and women, in uniform each and every day.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this worthy legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this authorization conference report was supported by 48 to 3, 48 to 3. To be fair, it probably would have been 48 to 4, but the gentlewoman from Colorado did not think enough to show up to vote, and she calls this bill pathetic. Maybe if it was that pathetic she would show up and vote in the report.

The President, in his 1993 budget, cut military COLA's. In a bipartisan way, this committee restored COLA equity for our military. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? In the President's last budget, he cuts COLA equities once again, and this is the last chance to protect those in this particular bill.

Let us talk about HIV. I had two people in my squadron who had HIV. They could not deploy, I could not use them, they had to be tied to the hospital. I could only tell my executive officer and the flight surgeon, which meant a risk for other people in that unit. With the limited and cut-back funds, we need full up-rounds in our units.

This also doubled the deployment time on shore duty of our military at a time when they are supposed to be spending it with their families.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of the original conference report, I would like to express my strong support for this new and improved version of the 1996 Department of Defense conference report.

This legislation, as my colleagues well know, is critical both to the functions of the Department, as well as to the men and women in uniform, who diligently serve this Nation. As has been stated time and again, this conference report provides a 2.4-percent pay raise, increases family housing, improves health care for military dependents, and funds overdue COLA equity for military retirees.

While the original conference report garnered the support of both the House and Senate, the President vetoed the measure. Chairman SPENCE has brought back to this House a conference report that adequately deals with the President's concerns, while carefully balancing the priorities of this Congress.

I believe this effort to build a consensus between congressional leadership and the administration is sound and once again merits the support of the House.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will vote this bill down. We are going to balance the budget. We are going to severely limit Federal spending. If you spend military dollars at the rate that this bill calls for, you inevitably will diminish substantially our ability to clean up the environment, to provide medical care for people who need it, to help provide public safety in our cities, to help deal with education for middle-income and working class students. There simply is not enough money to do both what this bill would do and that.

Fortunately, the gentleman from California who heads the minority on this committee has articulately and eloquently over the years, and again today, pointed that out; and that leaves me free to focus on one of the most obnoxious aspects of this bill. I admire the fact that the President singled it out when he originally vetoed it. I am very disappointed that it survives.

That is the legislation that says, if you are a young man or woman who volunteered to serve your country and you contract a terrible illness, the illness of being HIV-positive, your country will reward your volunteering and your good service by kicking you out. Any service you have accumulated will count for nothing if you are not eligible for a pension.

Fortunately, the Senate intervened a little bit to temper the gratuitous cruelty of the House bill to say that you should at least get some medical benefits. But cruel it remains.

What it says is, if you are someone who volunteered to serve your country, volunteered to join the armed services, but you become seriously ill with HIV, we will treat you as callously and as coldly as it is possible for a society to treat you. Out you will go. Out you will go. People who said, well, that about their ability to do things.

The military now has the power to say, you have reached the point of disability, you must leave. This means that well before that point people who are HIV-positive will be subjected to this incredible, callous cruelty, and it means that there will be no chance that the military now has to reassign people, to make use of their talents while they are still in a healthy phase. The military has a knack for this. It is an example of bigotry that dishonors this House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Jacksonville, FL [Mrs. FOWLER], a new and very valuable member of our committee.

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the revised DOD authorization conference report.

It is unfortunate, but telling, that the original conference report was vetoed over requirements that the President move toward deployment of national missile defenses by 2003, provide a national security certification before U.S. forces are placed under U.N. command, and seek supplemental funding prior to beginning contingency operations. As a result, this bill has been modified. I believe the original provisions served the interests on the American people well—especially with regard to antimissile defenses, which are nonexistent today.

Nevertheless, passage of this bill remains vital. Critical military readiness, force modernization, and quality of life issues cannot be addressed without it.

In particular, it provides military members with a full pay raise and increased housing allowances, it increases funding for training and maintenance, it pursues needed research and procurement to ensure our military's modernization, and it reforms pentagon acquisition policies. I also note that it spells out some very important changes in DOD maintenance and repair policies.

This bill is an excellent one. Chairman SPENCE and the members of the conference committee have done a good job, and this bill merits our strong support.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

(Mr. ORTIZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

As the ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I am proud of key elements of this bill which affect the military construction program and focus on improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families.

This bill would provide both short- and long-term solutions to a critical problem that impacts the retention and readiness of our Armed Forces.

By focusing on improvements to troop and military families, and setting strict priorities within the military construction program, we ensure that the housing backlog is addressed and quality of life is improved.

Furthermore, the bill includes a series of new authorities which would encourage the private sector to develop housing for unaccompanied personnel and military families at installations where there is a certified shortage of quality housing.

This initiative has strong bipartisan support, including the support of the Secretary of Defense.

This bill is not perfect, but it is a good bill that places priority on improving readiness and the quality of life programs that impact our personnel and their families.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] to join me in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] and I are among several Members of Congress who have been seriously concerned about the administration's proposal to retire almost one-third of our Nation's B–52 force. I am pleased that the conference report prohibits the Department of Defense from retiring or preparing to retire any B–52H's in fiscal year 1996. The committee directs the Air Force to retain in an attrition reserve status the 28 B–52H bombers that would otherwise be retired.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement again to further explain the committee's intent with regard to the number and status of B–52's to be maintained under this bill.

Mr. HUNTER. The B–52 is still our Nation's most capable and only dual-role bomber and provides substantial conventional firepower and a strong nuclear deterrent. The committee believes that maintaining the current inventory of 94 B–52's is a cost-effective investment in our Nation's defense.

Accordingly, the committee report directs the Air Force to retain in attrition reserve the 28 B–52's programmed for retirement in the Department of Defense budget request. With the funds authorized under the bill, the committee expects the Air Force to keep the 28 attrition reserve aircraft at their current operational B–52 bases, maintained ready to fly and cycled through the active squadrons.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the chairman for providing his leadership and for this important clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to compliment both the chairman and the gentleman from Kansas for their efforts to support a long-range bomber force that meets our mission requirements, and for this very important opportunity to clarify congressional intent relative to B–52's.

It is the directive of this authorization bill that the full fleet of 94 B–52's will be retagged. This is vital because it is our most versatile, cost-effective and only battle-tested bomber.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for his leadership on this bill. I wanted just to confirm what we have discussed earlier with respect to the ballistic missile defense that is so important to the national security of our country, and that even though we have obviously lost this opportunity to build that up in this bill, that it is the intention of the Committee on National Security to move forward as one of its top priorities to have hearings on a national missile defense system and do that in the second term of the 104th Congress.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to assure the gentleman that we are going to revisit this question. It is a very important question. The people of this country do not realize that we are not defenders right now against intercontinental ballistic missiles, and when they find out, as they have found out, many of them, that we are not defended properly, they become very much concerned and want to know why.

We are going to have hearings. At some time during this next year, we are going to point this problem up even further, and I assure the gentleman that we will go into great detail in promoting this new initiative next year.

□ 1445

Mr. HOKE. I really appreciate that. As the gentleman knows, I am the author of H.R. 2483, the Defend America Act. I appreciate the gentleman's support on that, and especially in light of this veiled threat from Chinese officials. I think it is terribly important that we move this forward. I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations, a very valuable Member of this House and a very strong supporter of national defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as I rise in support of this conference report, I want to say a special word about the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman FLOYD SPENCE. Chairman SPENCE and the gentleman from California, Mr. DELLUMS, and I came to the Congress together in the 92d Congress. We were all assigned to the Committee on Armed Services and we have all worked closely together since that time in behalf of our Nation's security and those who provide the Nation's security.

In the last year since the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and I assumed our respective chairmanships, we have worked together on a daily basis, and I think in an unusual partnership between authorizers and appropriators that does not always happen here. I want to compliment the gentleman. I know the rigors and the trials that the gentleman has gone through in order to get us where we are today with a good conference report on a good defense authorization bill, and one that I understand even the President is prepared to agree to.

The gentleman deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the contribution that he has made to our national defense effort over all these years and in bringing this particular bill to us today. I compliment the gentleman and appreciate our friendship and professional relationship.

One of the items in this bill is something that most of us have been concerned about, and that is what we refer to as COLA equity for retired military personnel. We thought we had this problem of equity corrected several times during the year, but each time the arrangement fell apart. But Chairman SPENCE stuck to his guns in this bill, and I would like to announce this to the 323 of our colleagues who have cosponsored H.R. 2664, to accomplish COLA equity for our retired military. This bill does what 2664 intended to do, and I thank the chairman and ranking member for including it and insisting that it be included in this bill. Hopefully the President will understand the importance of that and will sign this bill and let it become law.

Again, I appreciate the working relationship that our two committees have had, our respective members and staffs have had, a good working relationship to provide for the security of our Nation, the well-being of those who serve us in the uniform of the United States, and to get the best deal we can for the taxpayer who has to pay for it all.

Mr. Speaker, there were very many things I found disturbing about President Clinton's first budget enacted in 1993. There were the new taxes, the increase in the Social Security earnings limitation, real cuts in Medicare spending, and the failure of the President to seriously address the deficit. However, nothing in that budget seemed more outrageous than to treat our Nation's retired military personnel as second-class citizens when it came to their retirement pay.

As one of this Congress' strongest advocates for those who serve and have served in our Nation's Armed Forces, I found it deplorable that the President and the Congress would ask those who have sacrificed so much for this country to bear an unfair burden in efforts to reduce the deficit. In fact, I would argue at length with anyone who suggests we should delay cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] to military retirees as a means to help balance the budget. But I will fight to the bitter end against those who would do so while treating other Federal retirees differently. Unfortunately, this was exactly what the President's budget did as civilian retirees and military retirees were set on different COLA schedules all in the name of deficit reduction.

Many of us in this Congress and throughout our Nation have been engaged in the battle for equity between civilian and military retirees since then. Fighting along side national and local veterans and military organizations we began in opposition to the President's 1993 budget. Then, 2 years ago we fought and succeeded in eliminating the disparity in 1995 by providing funds for an April COLA.

Last year, while the President refused to include language in his budget request repealing the COLA changes, the Congress took its own action by restoring equality in the 1996 Defense authorization bill. Although the President vetoed this bill, the legislation we consider today will again ensure that military retirees receive their COLA's in April of this year, and in January in 1997 and 1998, the same dates that civilians will receive their COLA's.

Since this Congress began more than a year ago, the new leadership of this House has made it a priority to end the inequity visited upon our Nation's military retirees by that 1993 budget. When our efforts to solve this problem in November became bogged down in the politics of a balanced budget and the 1996 Defense Authorization bill had stalled, I introduced a free-standing bill, H.R. 2664, to restore parity between military and civilian COLA's. In 4 legislative days more than 250 Members of Congress cosponsored this bill. Today there are over 320 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as press reports indicate that the Secretary of Defense will recommend the President sign this new defense measure, supporting the conference report will be a major step toward restoring fairness to the way we treat both military and civilian retirees. I urge every one of my colleagues in the House to support the legislation before us today and help bring a successful conclusion to our efforts to end this inequity once and for all. Let's treat our military retirees with the fairness, dignity, and respect they so rightly deserve.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I heard the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] talk eloquently about the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the contributions that the two of them have made to this bill, I think it is important to also recognize the contributions that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member on Armed Services, has made to this whole process. The gentleman from California not only served his country in the call to the military, but has served for many, many years on this committee and was chairman of this committee and has very strong disagreements with the priorities that have been set. Yet, nevertheless, as chairman of the Committee on National Security, there is no one who took a bigger hit in his own district than the gentleman did in trying to downsize the military of this country.

I think it is interesting, last evening perhaps the greatest applause line that we heard was in the notion of ending the Lyndon Johnson big Government programs. It was not applause that just came from this side of the aisle; it came from the Republican side of the aisle. Yet the first bill that we bring up when we talk about downsizing Government, the first bill we bring up, adds $7 billion more to the deficit of this country than the Joint Chiefs of Staff in all of their wisdom requested of the Congress of the United States. They did not request the number of B–2's, they did not request the number of F–22's. Everyone who studies those issues knows those are not the aircraft we need in order to deal with the threat that the United States of America faces today. I am in favor of a strong national defense, the gentleman from California is in favor of a strong national defense, but not a wasteful national defense.

Mr. Speaker, there are homeless people on the streets of our country, housing residents that came and stood on the steps of this Capitol just yesterday, whose budget has been cut by $7.5 or $8 billion without a hearing, the same level of overspending that is occurring in this bill. Why is it that we have a country that wants to overspend on national defense, go beyond what is recommended by the greatest experts in this country, and yet go ahead and cut the most vulnerable people in this country? We go out and not only cut the housing budget, but we cut the homeless budget as well.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time for us to have a country that looks forward and recognizes that by investing in our people we can have a strong national defense and a strong society as well.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I hope my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], will listen, because the Department of Defense budget is the only budget out of the entire U.S. budget that has been cut in real terms by over 10 percent in the past 5 years. When I first got to Congress, it was $300 billion a year. This year it is about $275 billion.

There are hundreds of thousands of young men and women who want to serve their country who have been involuntarily discharged or not had their contracts renewed because of downsizing. The point of the matter is the Department of Defense is smaller, and they are doing a better job with what they have.

I want to compliment the chairman and ranking member for doing the best job that we could with the funds that we have. I want to encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill. It is our job to decide where that money should be spent, and without this bill, the President will make that decision, not us.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, let me say very quickly to my distinguished colleague from Mississippi that the $275 billion is against the backdrop of $300 billion a year that began during the Reagan era, when this military budget skyrocketed from $173 billion, went up well over $200-some odd, and leveled out at $300 billion during the decade of the 1980's. So I would remind my colleagues, compared to what? We never should have been spending $300 billion a year on the military budget. To now spend $275 billion a year in the context of the post-cold-war world, when there is no Soviet Union and when there is no strategic threat out there to the United States, is an appalling statement.

I would finally like to conclude with this on a very personal note. I take great pride, Mr. Speaker, in not attacking Members of Congress on this floor. If we want to debate, I am prepared to debate anybody in the Chamber on the substantive issue. That is my job and responsibility. I would simply admonish my colleagues that when we disagree, as ardently and as emotionally as we disagree, we should never call into play the motives of any individual Member or we should never challenge any individual Member of Congress, particularly when they are not there to defend themselves. I think we ought to be about our business with a much more dignified fashion. I think when we elevate the level of the debate to substance and policy and priorities, we are at our highest and best. When we reduce ourselves to personalities, it seems to me that is when we are not reflecting the best face of the most deliberative body in the world.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of the Members on the Committee on National Security and all the staff for the hard work they have done over a long period of time. On both sides of the aisle we have done our job.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and I came to Washington, at the same time, as has been mentioned a while ago. We come to the table sometimes from different perspectives, but we have gotten along over the years. Mr. DELLUMS was chairman the last time and I was ranking member. This time the situation is reversed. I have always enjoyed our working relationship. I believe very strongly in what the gentleman believes in, and that is he is to to express himself and maintain his position. He does it very well, better than anybody I know, as a matter of fact. I respect him for that.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report started out a good while ago as a bipartisan effort on our committee. We got a good vote out of our committee in the very beginning. I think by the vote we will have today we will show this will be a bipartisan effort again.

But I want to remind my colleagues, as I said earlier, we still revisit two very important questions, national missile defense and the U.N. command and control of our troops. These things

will be revisited in the future, and people will have a chance to express themselves at length.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

This bill is virtually identical to the defense authorization the Congress approved last month. The bill was unacceptable then and remains so today.

Like its predecessor, the defense authorization before us today calls for spending $7 billion more than the amount requested by the Secretary of Defense. Like the first defense authorization, this bill contains $493 million to begin procurement of additional B–2 bombers—a plane the Defense Department insists it does not need.

In fairness to the bill's authors, the conference report before us drops the requirement that the United States deploy a national ballistic missile defense system by the year 2003. I applaud this change. There is serious doubt as to whether an effective missile defense system could be ready for deployment in 7 short years. Surely it makes more sense to continue our program to develop an effective missile defense system before we prematurely mandate its deployment.

In addition, deployment of a national system would almost certainly violate the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, perhaps with the result of jeopardizing continued Russian implementation of real arms reductions called for by the START I and START II treaties.

The bottom line is that this defense bill spends billions more than necessary on weapons we do not need. For this reason, I will vote against it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today does not fit the direction we should be taking in the post-cold-war world. Excessive spending on weapons systems that are not needed is not the path to security. At the same time as it provides improvements for the quality of life for our soldiers, this bill also contains punitive provisions targeting HIV-positive personnel. But more importantly this measure does not provide guidance or proper policy for the mission of our forces today much less tomorrow.

Our 20,000 troops in Bosnia are there to monitor a peace agreement, to provide for the growth of peace. Despite the contrary objections, our troops in Bosnia are engaged in a clearly defined mission. In this effort our allies are assisting. Some of the most strident critics of Bosnia voice no objection to the out on sync policy regarding the long time deployment and stationing of United States troops and sailors abroad. This bill certainly does not address the issue of burden sharing or the basis for such U.S. commitments. With the end of the cold war, our role in Europe and around the world has changed greatly. We no longer need to fear a massive attack from Communist forces. Yet the troops sent to Europe during the cold war remain there with no significant redefinition of our role, literally 100,000 U.S. troops, men and material, deployed as if the world has not changed. We shoulder the burden of defense for other regions and countries with the attenuate expensive defense bills, spending on unnecessary planes, helicopters, and ships. We urgently need to realistically reassess this situation, particularly as cuts are sought in programs which help the American people. At home military bases are closed, with significant sacrifice by many communities, but abroad the same rules and sacrifice are not advanced.

We need to reexamine the way we deploy and operate our forces in the world. We need to define their mission for today and tomorrow as has been done in the Bosnian operation with just a 1-year mission. Our allies must assist further with the heavy lifting involved with providing them security. Clearly military spending should not be increasing while other necessary programs are deeply cut.

This bill authorizes the spending laid out in the Defense appropriations bill. While a mandated antimissile defense system was removed from the bill, the billions of added dollars in spending, dollars that the Pentagon did not request, remains in the measure. The shift to national missile defense is still contained in this bill. B–2 planes not requested by the Pentagon are authorized, $493 million more than was requested. Other new planes and weapons systems are also included, contrary to our needs in the view of the Pentagon. This new spending is not necessary and if we reassessed our security relationships with our allies, if we shared this defense responsibility more equitably, even more dollars could be taken from these accounts. But the fact is that even after the Pentagon has stated its opposition to numerous programs, a small miracle in and of itself, this 104th Congress beats its chest on budget balancing while lavishing dollars on pet projects rather than asking the tough questions that the tenor of the times and balancing the budget would demand.

While the spending on weapons systems increases, important programs do not get adequate funding. The legacy of our struggle in the cold war must be addressed. Environmental cleanup of military bases, arsenals, and damage from the production of nuclear weapons need to be carried through. Yet this bill reneges in this measure, providing $280 million less than what is needed to accomplish the job of environmental cleanup. We should not leave this problem for future generations, an environmental deficit is equally unacceptable. These environmental hazards are real people security problems, where there should be no question of our mission.

The legislation before us muddles our defense missions. It does not reflect a proper assessment of what we should and need to do. Congress can and should do better. Our allies need to know that we expect them to accept responsibility for their defense. The cold war is over and the ability and role of the United States has changed but much in this measure reflects business as usual. We can not afford business as usual. I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong objection to two specific elements contained in the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization conference agreement.

First, I must take strong offense to the suggestion that the members of our armed services, who have served our country honorably through times of war and peace, should be discharged merely due to contracting HIV. Military personnel must be judged on their ability to perform their assigned duties. Retaining service members who test positive for HIV but demonstrate no further evidence of illness should not be revised due to a flagrantly political agenda. Discharging experienced soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen merely for their testing positive for a virus is a patently inequitable action is clearly based on a prejudicial attitude towards HIV. Further, we owe it to the American people to not add fuel to the fire of hysteria concerning HIV. If otherwise capable of performing their duties, our servicemembers deserve the right to continue defending our Nation.

Second, this conference report denies military personnel or dependents the right to obtain safe, legal abortions at overseas U.S. military facilities, except in cases of incest, rape, or danger to the life of the mother. I must ardently protest the denial of a basic constitutional right to the military women who so diligently protect our vital national security interests by serving overseas. Servicemembers deserve the very best we have to offer, in all regards. We simply cannot deny them the very same civil rights we grant every other American, the rights they are sworn to defend with their lives. Anything less would be to reduce military women to the rank of second-class citizens.

The members of the armed services perform a necessary and vital function in defending our national interests and our liberty. Just as they struggle to protect our Nation, we must endeavor to protect their fundamental human rights.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference agreement. The majority conferees may have reached an agreement with the President. In fact they eliminated several objectionable proposals like national missile defense, and limitations on the President's ability to engage in contingency operations. However, these changes are cosmetic. The overall levels of funding are still higher than last year's levels. The bill still authorizes $7.1 billion more than the President's request. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will tell you how much this report does for military personnel to improve their lives. Well, I rise to tell you what it does to military personnel.

First, this conference report violates the rights of women on military bases around the world by forbidding them to exercise their right to have an abortion they pay for themselves.

Second, this conference report discriminates against people who are HIV-positive, by forcing the military to discharge HIV-positive personnel within 6 months of confirmation of their status.

They would be discharged regardless of their competence, or current health.

The Department of Defense objects to this policy, as a loss of valuable man-hours. DOD has its own criteria for medical discharge, and will release these people when they cannot perform their duty any further.

Not only does the bill burden military personnel, it also makes it harder to balance the budget in future years. For the first time in decades, we have begun departing from the ''full-funding'' principle. In past years, Congress requested that the total cost of a project is budgeted in the current fiscal year. In fiscal year 1996 we have paid for two destroyers, but authorized three.

The $7.1 billion increase above the President's request is a token down payment on hundreds of billions of dollars shown the road.

Third, the B–2 bomber received an increase of $493 million just to keep the production line open, even though the plane has yet to meet many of its mission requirements in flight testing. To actually purchase the planes would

cost us $15 billion if we bought 20 more B–2's at a rate of 3 per year.

We cannot commit to this kind of spending and balance the budget. Vote ''no'' on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report, although I have serious reservations regarding one key provision. I am particularly concerned about the deletion of language from the earlier conference report limiting the President's ability to place U.S. troops under operational control of the United Nations [UN] until the President certifies to Congress that it is in the national security of the United States to do so.

It is unfortunate that the President chose to veto the entire defense bill over a common sense provision overwhelmingly supported by the American people. Later this year, I will be working with colleagues on separate legislation to incorporate this provision limiting U.N. command and control. I hope to see the day that our soldiers will no longer be put in harm's way under a flag of a foreign country, without their support.

However, I strongly support the provisions in this bill that finally resolves the COLA disparity between military retirees and Federal civilian retirees imposed by the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. This is great news to thousands of military Washington retirees who feel the same inflationary pressures as Federal civilian retirees.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Security Committee, I want the record to reflect my support for the fiscal year 1996 DOD authorization act. While I do not support every provision in this conference report, on balance it moves our military and our country in the right direction.

At a time when thousands of American men and women are deployed abroad in various peacekeeping and humanitarian missions, we must provide them with the support they need and deserve. This authorization includes improvements in basic pay allowances for military personnel, and cost of living adjustments for military retirees. It includes family housing units for Hanscom Air Force Base in Massachusetts to enhance the quality of life for military personnel and their families. It retains a commitment to the successful and battle-tested F/A–18 program and the Black Hawk helicopter program. It also contains language I authored to name a Navy ship after congressional medal of honor recipient Joe Vittori of Beverly, Massachusetts.

I would like to note, for the record, my opposition to the provision in this bill authorizing additional B–2 bombers, and language to promote a social agenda within our military. In committee, and on the House floor, I opposed the measure to ban all abortions in military hospitals and the proposal to terminate any Defense Department employee who tests positive for HIV. The Defense Department is capable of supervising and implementing its own personnel policies without unnecessary congressional intervention.

I voted for the DOD authorization conference report on December 15, when it passed the House the first time. I hope this important legislation will proceed through Congress as soon as possible and the President will sign it into law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. 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 287, nays 129, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—287

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Traficant
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—129

Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Beilenson
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Cardin
Chabot
Chrysler
Clay
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gordon
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moakley
Morella
Nadler
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Torricelli
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Watt (NC)
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—17

Berman
Boehlert
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clement
Oxley
Rangel
Rose
Smith (MI)
Torkildsen
Towns
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Wyden
Young (AK)

□ 1514

Ms. RIVERS and Mr. SHAYS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2072

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2072.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present for two recent rollcall votes. Had I about been present on rollcall vote No. 11, I would have voted ''no.'' On rollcall vote No. 12, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, due to the Chair closing out the vote, a number of Members of the House have not been able to register their vote. Had the Chair not closed it out, I would have voted ''no'' on the conference report on S. 1124.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I was on the elevator over there and a whole group of us that were in the elevator were not able to vote because the vote was closed out.

Had I been here and allowed to vote, I would have voted ''aye'' on the conference report on S. 1124.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I also was on the elevator, detained, did not get to vote. If I had been here, I would have voted ''yes'' on the conference report on S. 1124.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I was on the elevator when the elevator was stuck. Of course, if I had been here, I would have voted ''no'' on the conference report on S. 1124.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 16, I was unable to cast a timely vote because I was in traffic en route to the capitol. I missed the vote on the Conference Report on Department of Defense Authorization. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—PROTECTING CREDITWORTHINESS OF UNITED STATES, AVOIDING DEFAULT, AND AVERTING ANOTHER GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a resolution which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] and I noticed pursuant to rule IX yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the inability of the House to pass an adjustment in the public debt limit unburdened by the unrelated political agenda of either party, an adjustment to maintain the creditworthiness of the United States and to avoid disruption of interest rates and the financial markets, brings discredit upon the House;

Whereas the inability of the House to pass a clean resolution to continue normal governmental operations so as to end the abuse of American citizens and their hard-earned dollars, Federal employees, private businesses who perform work for the Federal government, and those who rely upon Federal services as a bargaining tactic to gain political advantage in the budget negotiations, brings discredit upon the House;

Whereas previous inaction of the House has already cost the American taxpayer about $1.5 billion in wasteful government shutdown costs, reduced the productivity and responsiveness of Federal agencies and caused untold human suffering;

Whereas the failure of the House of Representatives to adjust the Federal debt limit and keep the Nation from default or to act on legislation to avert another Government shutdown impairs the dignity of the House, the integrity of its proceedings and the esteem the public holds for the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the enrolling clerk of the House of Representatives shall prepare an engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2862, and the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 157. The vote by which this resolution is adopted by the House shall be deemed to have been a vote in favor of such bill and a vote in favor of such joint resolution upon final passage in the House of Representatives. Upon engrossment of the bill and the joint resolution, each shall be deemed to have passed the House of Representatives and been duly certified and examined; the engrossed copies shall be signed by the Clerk and transmitted to the Senate for further legislative action; and (upon final passage by both Houses) the bill and the joint resolution shall be signed by the presiding officers of both Houses and presented to the President for his signature (and otherwise treated for all purposes) in the manner provided for bills and joint resolutions generally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] wish to be heard on whether the resolution presents a question of privilege under rule IX?

Mr. DOGGETT. Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I do. I think there are only one or two other speakers that would ask to be heard on this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this motion raises most directly a question of privileges of the House. True, the particulars of this motion concern the credit worthiness of the United States, something in which every American has a stake, particularly those with a variable mortgage, a car loan, a credit card balance, or whoever want to take out alone.

But, Mr. Speaker, what could more directly jeopardize the integrity of our proceedings here in the House of Representatives than misconduct, than tampering with the fiscal integrity of the United States?

Those who say we can live with financial anarchy would imperil both the dignity of this House and the hopes of millions of Americans for economic dignity. Indicative of this threat to the integrity of the House is the warning against a politically motivated default by six former Treasury secretaries, both Republicans and Democrats, who have expressed in their words their profound concern about the threat of default.

The very idea that Uncle Sam would tell anyone who holds a Treasury bill or a Treasury bond, sorry, we do not want to pay, is not revolutionary, it is simply lunacy. The full faith and credit of the United States is not anything to be trifled with. If there are Members of this body who are willing to mess up the credit rating of the United States, let them mess up their own credit rating, not that of the American people who they are sworn to serve.

When the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Rubin, assures us that default is upon us, when he is compelled to undertake extraordinary measures to defer temporarily that default and only faces in return the threat of impeachment in this House, the dignity of this House is jeopardized. When we hear a declaration that ''I do not care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days, not this time,'' the financial integrity of our country and the integrity and esteem with which the public holds this House is severely jeopardized. I refer, of course, to the words of the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH.

This motion and an ability to take up a clean resolution to adjust the debt limit before we run into financial ruin later this month would do something to undo the damage that has already occurred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the question of whether the resolution presents a question of privilege?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is attempting to ascertain whether or not the motion is privileged.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is hearing discussion on that at this time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion temporarily.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on whether the resolution presents a question of privilege?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from New York withdrawing his motion.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, in introducing this privileged resolution and in urging its approval so that the U.S. Government can keep paying its bills and not default for the first time in its history.

Rule IX of the rules of the House, which governs questions of privilege, states:

> Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rules of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; and second, those affecting the rights, reputation, and conduct of members, individually, in their representative capacity only.

We offer this privileged resolution because we can think of no issue that reflects more on the dignity and integrity of this House and on the reputation of every single Member than the creditworthiness of the United States.

There is no question in my mind that the dignity and the integrity of this House and the reputation of every one of us would be irreparably harmed if we allowed our Government to default. And it would be especially irresponsible for this House to recess and leave town with this threat of default hanging over our Government.

The creditworthiness of the United States should not be a pawn in a political game or a point of leverage to force huge cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and education to pay for a tax cut we can't afford. We must pass a clean bill to increase the debt ceiling and allow the United States to honor its obligations, and we can do that by voting for this resolution today.

Only the Congress can lift the debt limit and avoid default, and a failure to act in a timely manner does threaten the integrity of this body and the reputation of every one of us. If anyone doubts that, simply consider the consequences of default.

Government will come to a halt yet again. Interest rates will rise. Credit will become more expensive. Our economy could very well slip into a recession. And our Nation's unmatched reputation in world financial markets would be tarnished forever.

I hope there is no one in this body who doubts that if we allow these calamities to happen that the integrity of this body will not be damaged.

I also hope there is no doubt that the reputation of every one of us will be harmed as well. Our reputation will be harmed with every single consumer we represent who has to pay more in higher interest rates for home loans, car loans, student loans, and credit card purchases. Our reputation will be harmed with every State and local government official we represent because they will not be able to obtain financing for the services they provide. And our reputation will be harmed with every single taxpayer who will have to pay more for Government services.

I would submit to the Chair that, under a careful reading of rule IX, No. 1, ''questions of privilege,'' this resolution is a question of privilege because it addresses a serious matter affecting the dignity and integrity of this House and the reputation of every Member. In addition, I would argue that the Chair should favorably review this question of privilege because, at this time, there is no other plan for this House to consider clean debt limit legislation before February 29, 1996, when Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin has told Congress that the Federal Government will go into default. Yet, Congress may recess without consideration of the vital legislation.

So I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to carefully read section IX of the House rules. It states clearly that—

> Questions of Privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings, and second, those affecting the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members.

This resolution seeks to protect the integrity of the House and the reputation of its Members by preserving the creditworthiness of the United States. This is the argument that my colleague from Texas and I are making. This is truly a question of privilege because the reputation of the House and its dignity would be forever harmed if we fail to act and to honor our obligations.

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The Chair is ready to rule, but would entertain one additional comment relative to whether or not the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House.

Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] seek to be recognized for that purpose?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized to address the issue of the privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in my point. I think this resolution does deal with the integrity of this House in a very significant way. Unless I am mistaken, it was not too many years ago when colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle of this House came to this floor and argued that we should have privileged resolutions and measures to consider the so-called House bank scandal, because a number of House Members had purportedly bounced thousands of dollars of personal checks.

I would suggest to the Speaker and to our colleagues that if having Members of this House bounce thousands of dollars in personal checks goes directly to the integrity of this House, how in the world could we not conclude that having the U.S. Government for the first time in two centuries bounce billions of dollars of checks to people to whom we owe money, and entities all across this world, an action that would undermine the integrity of our creditworthiness and our reputation as a nation, how can the personal bounced checks go directly to the integrity of the House and not have our Nation's bouncing checks go to the integrity of the House?

I would argue, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution clearly deals directly with the question of protecting the integrity and the dignity of this House, and would suggest that to rule otherwise might be inconsistent with the arguments we heard from our Republican colleagues just a few years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is ready to rule.

The resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas alleges that the failure of the House to take specified legislative actions brings it discredit, impairs its dignity and the integrity of its proceedings, and lowers it in public esteem. On that premise it resolves that the House be considered to have passed two legislative measures.

Under rule IX, questions of the privileges of the House are those ''affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity, [or] the integrity of its proceedings.'' But a question of the privileges of the House may not be invoked to effect a change in the rules of the House or to prescribe a special order of business for the House. This principle has been upheld on several occasions cited in section 664 of the ''House Rules and Manual,'' including March 11, 1987; August 3, 1988; and, in particular, June 27, 1974—where a resolution directing the Committee on Rules to consider reporting a special order was held not to present a question of privilege.

The resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas—like those offered on February 7 and December 22, 1995, and on January 3, 1996—is also aptly addressed by the precedent of May 6, 1921. On that occasion Speaker Gillett held that a resolution presenting a legislative proposition as a question of constitutional privilege under the 14th amendment did not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House. The Chair will quote briefly from the 1921 ruling:

> [W]here the Constitution orders the House to do a thing, the Constitution still gives the House the right to make its own rules and do it at such time and in such manner as it may choose. And it is a strained construction * * * to say that because the Constitution gives a mandate that a thing shall be done, it therefore follows that any Member can insist that it shall be brought up at some particular time and in the particular way which he chooses. If there is a constitutional mandate, the House ought by its rules to provide for the proper enforcement of that, but it is

still a question for the House how and when and under what procedure it shall be done * * *.

Speaker Gillett's ruling is fully recorded in Cannon's Precedents, at volume 6, section 48.

Applying the precedent of 1921 and the others just cited, the Chair holds that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas does not affect ''the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, [or] the integrity of its proceedings'' within the meaning of clause 1 of rule IX. Rather, it proposes to effect a special order of business for the House—deeming it to have passed two legislative measures—as an antidote for the alleged discredit of previous inaction thereon. The resolution does not constitute a question of privilege under rule IX.

To rule that a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX may be raised by allegations of perceived discredit brought upon the House by legislative action or inaction, would permit any Member to allege an impact on the dignity of the House based upon virtually any legislative action or inaction.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE BORDER PATROL IN FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the House on a problem we are having in Florida and we are having all across the Nation. Last evening we had a chance to hear the President deliver his speech on the future of America. One of the things he emphasized was on changing and enforcing immigration procedures in our country.

It is ironic that this past week the Immigration and Naturalization Service announced that is was taking eight Border Patrol agents from Florida and moving them to the southwest border of the United States. Clearly I know that we are having extraordinary problems on the borders of Mexico, but Florida also is being inundated by illegal immigrants.

What has happened with our Border Patrol has been a diminishing from 85 agents in 1988 to half that strength of 42 agents today, after these agents are detailed to the southwest border. In my home district, the Palm Beach Border Patrol Office will shrink to just three agents and one supervisor who are responsible for covering eight counties and 120 miles of coastline. At the same time, the number of Border Patrol and Coast Guard interceptions of Cubans and Haitians for the first 2 months of 1996 fiscal year, 1,248 interceptions, is almost as high as the total number of interceptions for the entire 1995 fiscal year, which totaled 1,789 interceptions—1,248 in 2 months, 1,789 during the whole fiscal year of 1995.

Just yesterday Border Patrol agents arrested eight illegals who were working at a school construction site in West Palm Beach, FL. The total number of criminal alien apprehensions in the Miami sector last year totaled 1,857 people, criminal alien apprehensions in the Miami sector. These statistics clearly demonstrate the critical need for a stronger Border Patrol force in Florida, so it amazes me that the INS apparently ignores this data making policy decisions.

I fully support a strong Border Patrol force for the entire United States, but not by slashing the number of Florida agents. I had a chance to go out with the gentleman from California, Mr. GALLEGLY, and others, the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, and survey the border of Mexico. I understand their problem. I wholeheartedly support strengthening our enforcement on the border. However, Florida, much like California, Texas, and Arizona, has a similar problem. It is simply insane to remove agents from a State like Florida which continues to be strained by illegal immigration, insane.

Ironically, the day after the announcement to detail Florida agents, the Center for Immigration Studies released a new report stating that Florida remains the third largest recipient of illegal immigrants, with one of nine illegal immigrants in the United States residing in Florida. In fact, the report suggests that the illegal immigrant population in our State could be as high as 450,000 today. The State of Florida estimates that in 1993 alone, State and local governments have spent around $884 million on undocumented aliens.

In addition, there are approximately 5,504 criminal aliens in State correction facilities on any given day, costing Florida taxpayers on average $14,000 per inmate annually, 5,504 illegals in our State prison system, 5,504 beds that could be made available for rapists, murderers, and drug dealers. The INS decision to cut Florida Border Patrol agents further erodes our already limited resources and threatens the security of our borders.

In fact, by INS taking eight agents out of Florida, they have in fact said ''Welcome, one and all. Come to the State, because we are no longer enforcing the laws of this land.'' The action sends the wrong message to illegal immigrants, and it is simply not in the best interests of the State of Florida nor of the United States of America.

If, Mr. Speaker, the President is serious about changing the way Government operates in Washington, if we are in fact talking about the State of the Union of this country, the State of the Union of this country, then one of our most important challenges is to protect and secure our borders from illegal entry.

I welcome people to this country. My grandmother came from Poland. She had a sponsored job waiting and a clean bill of health. I want people who come to this country with a clear indication of wanting to support the values we hold dear. I commend you, Mr. President, for your speech. I commend the enthusiasm by which you lead this country. I urge you and I urge our leadership to sit down and work the details out of all the problems we face, but if we are in fact to have a safe and free Nation, we must protect ourselves from illegal immigration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this morning during my 1-minute speech, I chastised the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, for not telling exactly the truth this morning on one of the talk show programs when he was being interviewed

in regard to President Clinton's State of the Union Message last night, because Speaker GINGRICH said, in answer to a question as to whether the President was really for welfare reform, that the President had vetoed welfare reform twice and that one time he had vetoed a bill that had passed the Senate by 85 votes.

Now, when I brought out this morning that that bill, that bill that the President vetoed, had only gotten 52 votes in the Senate, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] got in the well and said, well that is the same bill; that that bill got 87 votes in September and it got 52 votes in December.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], it is not the same bill. I think the gentleman should learn legislative procedure. The bill that passed the Senate had different provisions in it. There were changes made in conference. When the bill went to the President, it was changed vastly from the bill that had passed the Senate with those 87 votes. That is why Members who had voted for it, even Republican Members who had voted for it in September would not vote for it in December, and that is why the President vetoed it.

I will go back, Mr. Speaker. Speaker GINGRICH should know the facts. The facts are that that bill only got 52 votes in the Senate; it did not get 85 votes in the Senate and never did, and it barely passed the Senate because there were 47 votes against it. Two Republicans even voted against it.

Now, if we really want welfare reform, we need to sit down and work together. We are not that far apart; we should do welfare reform. We need to do a balanced budget. We heard the President last night. He says, there are a lot of areas, and I agree, there are a lot of areas where both the Democrats, the President and the Republicans agree that we can make changes and reduce the deficit in future years. He said, let us do those. But that is not what we heard from this well this morning.

The President held out his hand to work together. The Republicans have thrown it back and said: No, we are not going to do that. We are going to do it our way or no way.

That is probably what we will have, is no way. That is what is wrong with this Government and this Congress today.

There are many things that need to be done, and little has been done, so little that this congress will go down in history as the most do-nothing Congress since 1933.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that this Congress in its first session worked for 365 days, had more votes than at any time in the near past Congresses, spent more hours working, but did less. A total of either 88 or 89 bills actually became law. We have not had that few since 1933, folks. Every Congress before this, immediate Congresses, the 1st session of the 103d, the 2d session of the 103d, the 102d, the 100th, the 99th, the 98th; even with Democrats under Bush we did more than this Congress. This Congress, if we really want to know, is a do-nothing Congress.

There was a great bit of fanfare a year ago right here on this floor, and it started on the 4th of January last year. It lasted for 100 days, of all of this great legislation that is going to change this country. I remember the Speaker standing down here and clipping those little cards every time a bill would pass. He would stand here and clip that little card.

Somebody better tell the Speaker and the majority that just because the House passes a bill, it does not do anything. It does not become law, it does not make one change. They act like all these changes were taking place. It has to go through the Senate. And what happened when those bills got over to the Senate? Well, we can go down the history of it and find that the majority over in the Senate, who are the same party, said no; they are too radical. No, those bills are too extreme. We are not going to do that radical approach to change in the Government.

HOLOCAUST: THE CHINA PARALLEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier, and I just want to take a little time after the 1-minute to really urge Members to get a copy of the Washington Post piece by Walter Reich called, ''Holocaust: The China Parallel.''

The writer is a physician, the director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. He points out that what is taking place in China is parallel to the Holocaust that took place in some respects in Nazi Germany. Now, this Congress last year was going to do something with regard to China. It passed a bill with regard to putting some restrictions on China and dealing with Radio Free China. Frankly, nothing has happened to it. This year the Congress I think is obligated on both sides of the aisle to do something to deal with the issues of religious persecution and what is taking place in China.

As a couple of examples, and I will submit them for the RECORD, Freedom House has documented 200 Christian Leaders in prison since April 1, 1995. A Christian ministry in the United States had delegates recently to visit a house church during a recent visit to China. The leaders in these churches have to be itinerant in their own country. They cannot meet with their own families. They have no permanent home. Many leaders have been jailed, beaten, fined, tortured, or sent to labor or reeducation camps for their religious beliefs.

Quite frankly, I wish that Ronald Reagan were back in the White House whereby we could have somebody who could come out and stand up and raise these issues. Frankly, since the Berlin Wall has fallen and since Ronald Reagan has left the White House, neither the administration, the Bush administration, nor the Clinton administration, nor Republican Congresses or Democratic Congresses, have done anything with regard to human rights in China and many of the other countries.

Quite frankly, the business of the Clinton administration is business. It is not human rights. They do not care if Catholic priests are being persecuted and bishops are going to jail. They don't care if evangelical ministers are being put in prison. They don't care if Buddhists are being put in prison.

Mr. Speaker, does the Congress care? We know that Clinton does not care. We know that Secretary Christopher does not care, because we have seen no action out of the State Department. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the sound of silence that has come from the Clinton administration on religious persecution is deafening. Mr. Speaker, to be fair, the sound of silence coming from the Republican Congress on this issue is deafening.

Now, all one had to do was watch ''60 Minutes'' Sunday night where they showed Chinese children tied to beds, mainly female children, and they starved them to death, similar to what the Nazis did before World War II. Had that happened in the 1980's, had Ronald Reagan been able to see that, had Senator Jackson of Jackson-Vanick been able to see it, leaders who have fought on both sides of the aisle for human rights, this Congress would have passed a resolution on it. This Congress would have debated this issue. But frankly, Mr. Speaker, this Congress, along with the Clinton administration, has done absolutely nothing.

It would be my hope and prayer that both parties would have a plank in their platform this year for religious freedom from dissidents around the world, for persecution of all religious beliefs, whether they be Buddhist or Christian or Jews. This issue should be on the forefront of the burner of both political parties.

As I again urge my colleagues after they read the article in today's Washington Post, I will close with what the author said. He said, ''If the Human Rights Watch report can be verified by international inspections, the parallels between the Chinese orphanages and the Nazi programs that killed disabled children are alarming. These parallels remind us that human beings, including physicians and other caregivers, are extraordinarily vulnerable to inhuman acts and extraordinarily capable for justifying their behavior on what they see as rational grounds. And they remind us that countries in which democratic institutions are forcibly forbidden and human rights systematically quashed are ones in which human life becomes, quite simply, expendable.''

This issue is not going to go away. If the Clinton administration does not deal with it, I hope and pray that at least this Republican Congress will deal with it.

CHINA STEPS UP RELIGIOUS REPRESSION

DECEMBER 22, 1995.—The Chinese government is subjecting unauthorized Catholic and Protestant groups to intensifying harassment and persecution as social tensions in the country increase, says Human Rights Watch/Asia in ''China: Religious Persecution Persists,'' released today.

''During the last two years, the Chinese government broadened its drive to crush all forms of dissent. In addition to targeting prominent dissidents such as Wei Jingsheng, who last week was sentenced to fourteen years in prison, all religious believers, and especially Christians, are seen as potential security risks,'' said Mickey Spiegel, research consultant for Human Rights Watch/Asia.

Chinese authorities have issued new directives requiring all congregations to register with religious authorities, stepped up pressure on evangelists, and tightened controls on contact with foreigners and on distribution of religious materials. Individuals suspected of linking religion to political activity have received the harshest treatment. The extensive crackdown on Protestants and Catholics violates both the Chinese constitution and freedom of religion as guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

As Communist ideology has lost public support, interest in religion, particularly evangelical Protestantism, has spread rapidly in China. But since the early 1990s, a new development has emerged which the country's leaders consider even more ''subversive'': a growing alliance between underground Christian churches and pro-democracy activists, many of whom have converted to Christianity in recent years. Dissident groups such as the League for the Protection of the Rights of Working People (LPRWP), some of whose members are Protestants, have been particularly targeted for official repression, with President Jiang Zemin describing the LPRWP as ''the most counterrevolutionary organization in China since 1949.'' After witnessing the role of the Catholic Church in undermining Communist power in Eastern Europe, the authorities have renewed their determination to eradicate all autonomous religious activity in China.

For example, Xiao Biguang, a thirty-three-year-old former professor of literature at Beijing University, was one of the main drafters of the charter for the LPRWP. He was arrested on April 12, 1994, and put on trial this past April 1995 on criminal charges including ''swindling'' and creating a ''negative atmosphere'' among his students at a theological seminary. As of mid-December 1995, he had not been sentenced and was still being held in a Ministry of State Security lockup in Beijing. Meanwhile, Xiao's wife, Gou Qinghui, has been continually harassed, subjected to periodic surveillance, and forbidden to continue seminary teaching or to meet with co-religionists at home. She has been detained at least four times in May 1994 and May 1995.

The most recent crackdown began in January 1994, when Premier Li Peng signed new regulations tightening the existing requirement that all church groups in China register with the state-controlled Religious Affairs Bureau. This policy, which violates international standards on freedom of expression and association, has forced Christians and other religious believers to choose between registering their congregations lawfully, which often exposes their services to intrusive surveillance and official control, or continuing to operate underground, thereby risking fines, arrests, and even prison terms. The January 1994 regulations also reiterate China's ban on proselytizing and other public religious activities by foreigners, depriving Chinese believers of their right to associate with their co-religionists from overseas.

Local authorities seeking to suppress unauthorized church groups have often violated China's own laws and regulations, acting even more brutally than the national religious policy allows. Christians in many rural areas are routinely and often repeatedly harassed through arbitrary detentions, beatings, and confiscations of property. Those considered ''ringleaders,'' especially Protestant preachers with a large popular following, are at risk of arrest and imprisonment.

In one case, Huang Fangxin, a twenty-nine-year old seminarian from Yongkang County, Zhejiang Province, was sentenced without trial to three years of ''re-education through labor'' in April 1994, after organizing a group of young people from the country into a ''gospel team'' to recruit new members to the local church. Several of his followers have since faced further harassment, including mandatory ''study classes'' at which they are lectured, fined, and sometimes physically abused.

Similar abuses against underground Protestant groups, including raids on churches and mass arrests, have been reported throughout China, particularly in Henan and Anhui provinces where the evangelical movement is especially strong. Roman Catholic bishops who maintain ties to the Vatican have also faced harassment and arbitrary detention.

Foreigners suspected of promoting Christianity among Chinese citizens have become a major target of the new crackdown, especially those caught bringing Bibles and other religious literature into the country illegally. During the Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in September 1995, foreign participants were warned to bring in no religious materials other than those for personal use. Leaders of Protestant ''house churches'' in Beijing were warned to avoid contact with conference delegates arriving from overseas, and one Catholic leader. Bishop Jia Zhiguo, was removed from his home and detained until the day after the conference ended.

The presence of foreigners was in part responsible for a mass arrest in Hubei Province on April 18, 1995, in which security officials, armed with electric batons, broke up a theological training class for new pastors and arrested at least sixty-seven Chinese and three overseas Protestants. The detainees were interrogated, some of them were badly beaten, and some of the men had their heads shaved.

Human Rights Watch calls on the Chinese authorities to lift all official controls on religious activities, including the compulsory registration of church groups, and to thoroughly investigate all reports of illegal mistreatment of religious believers, including beatings, ill-treatment, and torture. All those held for participating in religious activities outside the official churches should be unconditionally released, including those convicted of violating state security laws or the laws on counterrevolution.

Human Rights Watch also urges the international community to exert pressure on the Chinese government to allow greater religious freedom. The U.S., European Union, Japan, and other governments should sponsor and vigorously promote a resolution censuring China at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva next March. Among other abuses, the measure should specifically call for an end to religious repression. In addition, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Religious Intolerance should be invited to make a second visit to China early in 1996, following his previous visit to Beijing and Tibet in November 1994; he should seek to visit those Chinese provinces where the persecution of Christians is most severe. Human Rights Watch/Asia urges delegations of parliamentarians and trade delegations to China to make specific inquiries about cases of religious activists still in custody and those detained, ill-treated then released. They should call for the immediate repeal of all official restrictions on free expression of religious belief and practice.

Copies of the report are available from the Publications Department, Human Rights Watch, 485 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10017 for $6.00 (domestic) and $7.50 (international).

HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH/ASIA

Human Rights Watch is a nongovernmental organization established in 1978 to monitor and promote the observance of internationally recognized human rights in Africa, the Americas, Asia, the Middle East and among the signatories of the Helsinki accords. It is supported by contributions from private individuals and foundations worldwide. It accepts no government funds, directly or indirectly. The staff includes Kenneth Roth, executive director; Cynthia Brown, program director; Holly J. Burkhalter, advocacy director; Robert Kimzey, publications director; Jeri Laber, special advisor; Gara LaMarche, associate director; Lotte Leicht, Brussels office director; Juan Méndez, general counsel; Susan Osnos, communications director; Jerera Rone, counsel; Joanna Weschler, United Nations representative; and Derrick Wong, finance and administration director. Robert L. Bernstein is the chair of the board and Adrian W. DeWind is vice chair. Its Asia division was established in 1985 to monitor and promote the observance of internationally recognized human rights in Asia. Sidney Jones is the executive director; Mike Jendrzejczyk is the Washington director; Robert Munro is the Hong Kong director; Jeannine Guthrie is NGO Liaison; Dinah PoKempner is Counsel; Patricia Gossman and Zunetta Liddell are research associates; Joyce Wan and Shu-Ju Ada Cheng are Henry R. Luce Fellows; Diana Tai-Feng Cheng and Paul Lall are associates; Mickey Spiegel is a research consultant. Andrew J. Nathan is chair of the advisory committee and Orville Schell is vice chair.

CAMPAIGN REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I ran for this office was I did not really do a great job of housekeeping. When I was a young housewife many, many years ago, housekeeping was supposed to be your specialty. We had dust kittens under the bed that probably weighed about 10 pounds. But now I must say as I look around this House, we got some housekeeping we need to do that actually by comparison would make my dust kittens under my bed look small, because there are some big clumps of dirt in this place, and it really all gravitates around campaign finance reform.

I think that Common Cause on the outside has been doing a great job of

pointing out how, if we do not move to do some campaign finance reform, the people who ran against Washington have become the Washington they ran against. And we all know how rapidly that happens to people. Voters have moved from being disillusioned with that to now being flat-out cynical about it, and they have every right to be.

When I first ran for office, my average campaign contribution was $7.50. Now, as an incumbent who has been around for 23 years, my average campaign contribution, PAC's and individuals, is $50. There are not many people that could say that, but that is exactly what Jefferson had in mind.

Tonight, as we know, there is a huge Republican dinner, one more time, where people are paying a gazillion dollars for whatever. You know, I hate to tell those people, but in my district you can get a chicken dinner, a really good chicken dinner, for $5 to $10. So obviously they are not going there for the chicken. They are going there for some other reason.

This is one of the very few countries in the world that pretends someone would give you $10,000 because they believe in good government and did not want anything for it. Having finished today the Armed Services Committee bill and looking at all of the stuff that got jammed in that bill that the President did not want, the Joint Chiefs did not want, the Pentagon did not want, but some special interests wanted that had given people a lot of campaign money, and guess what? They got it. They got it. They got their B–2's, they got their whole laundry list of whatever it was they wanted, although generals did not want it and the President did not want it, and what does that say?

□ 1600

I think that it is so important for this bipartisan group who has introduced the bipartisan Clean Congress Act to get this moving. I hope every American holds Members' feet to the fire to discharge this bill and get it on the floor.

What are some of the things in this bill? Doing away with political action committees, so you go back to individual contributions. That is what it is supposed to be about, not big, huge groups.

It also asks that we collect 60 percent of what we get from the State that we run in. If you are getting 100 percent of your money from a State that you are not representing, you have got to wonder who is calling the tune and whose tune the Member is dancing to.

There are other things in here that ban tax-funded taxpayer mailings during election years and many other of these areas that we really need to clean up, too.

This is what is wrong here. This place looks like a coin-operated legislative machine. The average American feels they do not have the coins to put in, and they do not. So they feel they will never be heard here, and many are not. That is why when you look at your priorities you scratch your head and say, Wait a minute, how did these priorities get here?

Well, they got here because of this ridiculous funding process. I think it is so important we clean this House of that special interest money. It is more important than probably anything else we do, because that is the only way we get to real priorities, the people's priorities, and not the fat cat priorities.

So I encourage every American to take some time and think about this, and say we want our Government back as we start to close this century out and this decade out, and ask every Member to move on this bipartisan bill that will clean this House and correct this great injustice, I think. Finally we will be able to have real priorities and not big money priorities.

TRIBUTE TO DR. AND MRS. BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House we voted to give and grant to two people, well deserving, the Congressional gold medal, and that was to Dr. Billy and Ruth Graham, and that motion passed overwhelmingly in this House. It is going to the Senate and hopefully will be passed by a similar margin there and signed by the President of the United States.

I just wanted to recognize these two extraordinary Americans and what they have done, for their extraordinary service they have committed to this country and the people of this planet. Dr. Graham has evangelized to more people on this globe, on this effort, than any human in history that he has witnessed to during the time period of his service, and it continues.

Many writers, both political and religious, in this country are saying we as a Nation are entering a period of a fourth awakening, a time period of moral and spiritual renewal in America, where we look at ourselves and say, Are we doing the rights things? Are we doing the things that will last, not just for this lifetime, but for a further period of time on into eternity?

They are saying we are entering into a period of moral and spiritual renewal, a reassessment of our values as a country. That is going to do a great deal to solve our true problems in America.

Mr. Speaker, as I travel my district in eastern Kansas and talk to people back home, I ask them, do they think the biggest problems we face as a Nation, are they moral or are they economic? Are they the problems associated with the economy or problems associated with values? And I will get in almost every crowd 8 or 9 to 1 that will say the problems are moral rather than they are economic we are facing. They are problems with family and a disintegration of the family. They are problems with drugs. They are problems with crime. They are problems with people not willing to work. They are problems with people willing to do things that if they would think about it or if their own moral compass was a little better set, they would not do at all.

The problems we are facing are moral, and the decline is taking place there. Yet I am optimistic in looking to the future, because I think we are finally starting to address the fundamental problems we have as a society, the value problems we have, and one does not address them in Congress. One addresses them in the individual community, in the individual family, in the individual person and what he does.

That is how we change the culture, the society of this America. That is how we make ourselves better. That is how we solve our problems of family. that is how we solve our problems of crime. That is how we solve our problems dealing with drugs, problems dealing with welfare. We change ourselves and our own values and moral and spiritual outlook.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to get back to the basics and get back to the basic values, values of family, values of work, and recognition of a higher moral authority. When we as a society do that, we will solve many, many of our problems. That is what Dr. Graham and his wife Ruth have been about for a lifetime, is dealing with that, looking at the internal person and what they are doing and their personal relationship with a higher moral authority.

So that is why I voted in favor of that. I was very strongly in support of it. And I hope that when Dr. and Mrs. Graham get this, if it passes the Senate and is signed into law by the President, I hope that he and Mrs. Graham will be invited to this Chamber to address a joint session of Congress and address the Nation, calling for moral and spiritual renewal in America.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN OUTSIDE THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, with the talk now about whether we shall have clean or, shall we say, dirty CR's or debt limit bills, I would like to offer some views that go to the intent of the Framers. We need to think through this process, for we are engaged in something that has never happened in 200 years, or more than 200 years of the Constitution, and it looks like we are headed toward some recidivism in trying to attach things to the debt limit

or to the CR, when it would appear that the tolerance of the American people for this gridlock is way down.

What is wrong with the strategy of dirty CR's and dirty debt-limit bills? Besides the fact that you do not want to stop the Government or put the full faith and credit of the United States in any doubt, one might begin with the fact that it is not working or it has long since stopped working. You got the President to the table with a 7-year balanced budget. If victory had been declared then we might be somewhere.

But more seriously, this strategy is outside of the constitutional framework, and that is why it is stopping up this place. I teach a course at Georgetown, where I was a law professor, called Lawmaking and Statutory Interpretation. This gridlock has made me think about the course and about what we are doing in a deeper fashion.

What we are doing is outside of the constitutional framework. It is not that it is unconstitutional; it is indeed an abuse of the Constitution, because it thwarts the intent of the Framers.

Now, conservatives pride themselves on being what we in academic law call originalists. They insist upon going back to the Framers for everything, and it gets very awkward because very often the Framers did not even think about certain things. But here I think it is legitimate task, what did Thomas Jefferson and what did James Madison intend, what did they have in mind?

We have heard the argument on the floor here that the Government is shut down or the debt limit will not rise because the President did something, the President vetoed it.

My friends, the veto was not meant by the Framers to produce any counter weapon here in this House. Once there is a veto, three things are possible: A negotiated solution, let the matter stand, or overrule the veto with a supermajority.

The Framers did not build a system that did not have cloture. What we are doing in this body now, 200 years after the Constitution was passed, is creating a system without cloture, where there is point-counterpoint, shutdown of the Government following a veto. The Framers were more brilliant than that. They knew that if you could not bring cloture at some point, the Government could not operate.

We have, in fact, done that. What we have done is to give new meaning to the word ''gridlock.'' First, we have created the word the Framers never intended. The Framers never intended that the Government would be paralyzed.

Now, the gridlock that was the slogan of the last Congress have come back in ways that no one ever dreamed of, and if you think, particularly you on the other side of the aisle, that people sent you here to make gridlock worse, I think you got a big surprise coming for you when you go home to your primaries and when you go home in November.

We must not introduce gridlock into a brilliant system that has its own built-in cloture. Do not blame the President for using the veto. The Framers intended that. Show me where the Framers intended to allow you to shut down the Government? Show me where the Framers intended for you to allow a game of chicken to be played with the debt limit of the United States? The were much too brilliant, much too thoughtful to leave the system in that state.

We must not try to undo their brilliant work. What we must do is what the originalists, the conservatives, have always insisted upon doing. We have lost our compass. We have lost our way.

Let us open the Constitution, try to find the original meaning in the structure of checks and balances, and understand that the veto was meant to produce civilized responses, and not to take the Government out. It is too late in the game, and it is too late in the day, for us to try to upset and wreck a brilliant system of Government. History will not forget us or forgive us if we allow this to happen.

TRIBUTE TO HON. MIKE SYNAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, as Sandy and I joined in that overflow crowd today in the St. John's Episcopal Church to celebrate the life of Mike Synar, I looked around and I realized what an incredibly vital person Mike was, as every person in that church felt a personal tie to Mike; someone who was so full of energy, so full of life, so full of commitment, so full of passion for what he did; and how someone in such a short life span, a life of only 45 years, could mean so much to so many people, not only in that church, but people across this country, who felt a personal kinship to Mike.

One of my early memories of Mike is I invited him, when I was a new Member, to come to our district to our annual senior citizen convention. I remember Mike grabbing the microphone, he would not be contained by lecterns and podiums and stages and things like that, grabbing that microphone and charging into this crowd of several hundred people. He did not know them; it did not matter. They were people, and he was incredibly empathetic, and his infectious enthusiasm revved them up as well.

That enthusiasm characterized Mike's whole life, and certainly his service in this Chamber, because in many ways his service in this Chamber was his life, 16 years of service, being elected at a very, very early age.

Courage is another word that describes Mike. The previous speaker spoke eloquently about the Framers of the Constitution. Mike was the most ardent defender of those Framers. If the Congress violated the will of the Framers, Mike knew how to take care of that.

He went to the U.S. Supreme Court. That is what the Constitution said to do. I remember particularly one piece of legislation, I believe it was the Gramm-Rudman bill, he went and won. Do you know how popular it was to take on a so-called balanced budget provision and get it struck down on legal grounds? Mike did, and won, and forced this Congress, of course, to do it properly.

Mike could be a policy wonk, but he was one of the few people I know that combined policy and commitment. He knew the ins and outs of legislation. He could get very excited about how the words were phrased and what this word was and how it fit in the context of the overall passage.

But he was not just a policy wonk. At the same time he was out there organizing people. He was a grassroots organizer, one of the best I have ever seen; not only organizing people in the grass roots at his district or across the country, but organizing people in this Chamber. He always was asking ''What can I do to help,'' and he meant it.

Mike was never bitter. He certainly had some setbacks. I remember one time one of his many causes, one he believed passionately in, as he believed passionately in so many things, was campaign reform.

□ 1615

In order to get a bill passed, a decision was made by those whom he had been working with to go with a lesser version, and so in the last moments before the vote was taken, the message went out, ''Vote for the lesser version to try and get something through.'' In many ways, I guess, that undercut what Mike was doing. I asked him whether he was bitter, and he just smiled and said, ''That is the way the process is and we will try and go get the rest later.''

I have mentioned reform several times. I guess change or reform would have to be what characterized Mike Synar. He was always fighting for reform and change. Regardless of the issue, you could disagree with Mike on an issue. He would work with you, and he would argue with you and he would realize that he would have to go some place else, but he would come back and work with you on the next issue.

He brought a lot of change and much reform to this country. One of his greatest issues, and he would want me to mention it as he dedicated much of his time even after his leaving the Congress, was campaign reform. Mike believed that the strength of this body is how we get people here, and that is a battle that still must be fought. My hope is that when it is, we recognize the role that Mike Synar had in bringing us to this day.

Mr. Speaker, Mike was one of the few people I know that took no PAC contributions and had a very strict limitation on individual contributions, and

yet through a grassroots effort was able to raise the amounts of money that he needed to wage very difficult campaign battles.

Mike was 45 years only when he died. Not many of us who have lived much longer could have accomplished what he did.

The test, Mike, of someone's life is how much you leave in others. You leave a lot in a lot of us. We carry on much better because we know that you are behind us and we know the example that you have set for us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SHAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO MIKE SYNAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up in part of my 5 minutes and also pay tribute to Mike Synar as my colleague from West Virginia just did.

Mike Synar was the first person, actually, from Washington, or a Congressman, if you will, who came down when I first ran for election in 1988. He was also a champion of the environment, and I was largely elected to Congress back in 1988 because during that summer in New Jersey we had our beaches closed and huge washups of debris that came ashore and caused us to lose billions of dollars in our tourism industry.

Mike came down as a leading environmentalist in Congress and did a press conference with me and met with some of the editorial boards. It was for the first time I saw him on the train coming from New York to New Jersey. I never met anybody who was so dynamic and cared so much about the environment and about the principles of the Democratic Party and the Nation as a whole.

I watched him here. He was sort of a mentor in a way because he was on the Committee on Commerce, then it was called the Energy and Commerce Committee, which is the committee that I am now on, that deals so much with environmental issues. He encouraged me to become a member of the committee and helped me to get on the committee. I often looked to him for advice.

He was almost exactly the same age that I am, and when I heard about his illness and when I heard that he had actually passed away, I was very saddened because there really were very few people in the House of Representatives who had the dynamism, who cared so much about his country, who cared so much about the principles that he espoused and was able to translate that into action. He will be sorely missed.

BUDGET CUTS IMPACT ON EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, I came here today because I was concerned about the budget and where we are going in terms of education programs in this country. Last night during the State of the Union address, President Clinton stressed education. He stressed the need for a properly educated America because of the challenges that we face in the future, particularly with regard to job opportunities, competing in the global marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a shame, and he certainly challenged the Congress to do something about it, but it is a shame that in the last year in this House of Representatives the Republican majority has really cut funding for education programs, whether it is on the secondary school level or the higher education level. I think over the next few months, unless something dramatically changes and the Republican leadership decides that they are going to prioritize education as they promised, we are going to see dramatic change in the ability of our schools and our colleges to provide affordable educational opportunities for the average American.

The budget, as many of us know, manifests itself in many ways. There has not been appropriation for the Education Department. The budget that the Republicans passed actually cuts back significantly on a number of education programs. The CR, the continuing resolution that we are operating under now that was proposed by the Republican majority, cuts funding or lets the Department operate its various education programs at significantly lower levels than what is necessary to keep going with the programs that we have.

Already, we are beginning to hear that some of the Republican suggestions for spending or appropriation levels for next year will also severely impact our educational programs.

One of the things I am most concerned about is the GOP proposal to eliminate $1.9 million in direct student loans. They do not favor the direct student loan program. In the last couple of years, the Democrats put forward this new program where the loans would be coming directly from the colleges and universities rather than banks and financial institutions.

In my district, at Rutgers University, Rutgers has been able to take advantage of this program and provide a lot more loans to a lot more students than would be available under the existing institutional student loan program. Officials at Rutgers, and a lot of other colleges in the State, have told me that if this program is abolished or limited, as the Republicans propose, to certain schools and eventually phased out, that there will be a lot less student loans available.

We have also seen programs with the Pell Grants because of the shutdown and the uncertainty. The Education Department now really does not know what kind of schedule or information it can provide to the colleges and universities about student loan availability for next year or Pell Grants and other higher education grant availability for next year.

I think that what the Republican majority is forgetting is that when we talk about higher education loans or grant programs, students need to know in advance what kind of funding levels are available and what kind of student loans are available. This process of shutting down the Government and not having an appropriations bill, not being able to plan for next September or even next semester is having a terrible impact on our educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to wise up and prioritize education. That is what President Clinton said last night, and I hope the Republican leadership gets the message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KILDEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CUTS IN EDUCATION FUNDING COULD RESULT IN HUMAN DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, our children's future is at risk as the Republican Congress is defunding education. I very much agree with my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, and his comments about education, especially higher education.

The initial 7-year budget plan, in fact, sliced $10 billion out of the higher education loan and grant programs. Now, since then, some of the message has gotten through and that has not persisted in the final version of the budget. But, nevertheless, they in fact deauthorized the direct lending program, which will indeed mean that the dollars do not go as far in terms of

loans and, second, they reduce in essence the Pell grants to fewer recipients. Furthermore, there is a cutback on the work-study programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize for anyone, and for my colleagues, that Federal higher education assistance is the total package for many students. And with the unavailability of jobs today, it is not possible to work and go to school as so many of us have done to achieve and to gain our education.

Mr. Speaker, more importantly, of course, which has not been highlighted, are the dramatic cuts that have occurred in elementary and secondary education. Mr. Speaker, it has been 20 years since I taught science in Minneapolis, but I can tell you that the problems that science teachers in 1996 face are much more serious than what I faced in 1976.

The fact is that the kids coming into those classrooms today are much more disadvantaged. They are obviously coming from families, sometimes single families, families with less income. In fact, of course we know of the children in our Nation, almost 1 in 4 live below the poverty level. They do not have the resources and the support at home.

The Federal programs in education tend to try to eliminate the valleys that exist in terms of kids that are more greatly at risk. The kids at risk, the kids that receive the sort of title I program, the kids that get the nutrition programs, that need the meals. I can tell my colleagues one thing, if kids do not eat in the morning they do not sit still to listen to someone even as forceful as I am. The fact is, in fact very often they are not aware and able to pay.

The title I program goes well beyond this. In fact, what is happening and what this Congress is proposing, I hope my colleagues are listening, is a 17-percent cut, a 16- to 17-percent cut in title I education. And they are not cutting the increase. They are cutting the program 17 percent below in 1996 what was spent in 1995. So, we can eliminate that particular argument when we are talking about education.

They are, of course, defunding Goals 2000. They are defunding or attempting to cut out the school-to-work programs. They are cutting out important programs. The President pointed out last night the Drug-free and Safe Schools Act, a 57-percent cut in a program of that nature.

Now, we all know the problems that our youth are having. The problems in the communities with drugs come into the school. Here are the important programs like the D.A.R.E. Program that the President pointed out last night, and many, many other programs. Programs, in fact, in which almost every school district in our Nation participates are being cut in half by this particular budget. So, where are the priorities?

Mr. Speaker, I point out frequently that we need the smart machines, we need the smart research, but we need the smart children and the workers to run these machines. Who is going to operate these fantastic military systems that my colleagues seem hellbent on spending money on? Who is going to run this particular equipment? The fact is we need to have a good education program. We are not going to get it, based on the direction that we are going in this budget.

The American people, in almost any poll that we see, will suggest that education is one of their highest priorities. And why? Why does education persist in being a high priority? Because it deals with a core value of the people of this Nation and of families. It deals with the value and the concept that I want my kid, I want my grandchild, to do better and to have an opportunity to do better than I had.

What is the road to success and what has been the American story and the American chapter? What is the chapter we have written? I would suggest to my colleagues it is that we have provided that opportunity to many, many children and to many kids in elementary and secondary where it counts. In nutrition, so the kid has the right type of growth so that he is not impaired by retardation because of lack of proteins in terms of sustenance and by lack of dollars.

In total education, one aspect is the schools, but we must do much more to invest in people and that is where we need to focus our attention. Yes, we need a fiscal budget balance, but we also do not need a human deficit. That is where we are headed with the type of priorities that we are reflecting in this Congress today.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose initiatives proposed by the Republican majority that would work to drastically reduced our Nation's commitment to America's schools, students, parents, and educators. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spoken about the importance of investing in America, such as increasing our savings rate, supporting our Nation's infrastructure, and creating jobs that are able to support our Nation's working families. However, one type of investment that their budget plans ignore is an investment in our nation's most vital resource, our young children.

Previous versions of the Republican 7 yr budgets sliced $10 billion from higher education loans and other programs some of that has been restored. But funding restrictions persist for direct lending Pell grants and work study. Federal support largely makes up the total higher education assistance package for students.

Without investing in the education and training of our citizens, these other investment initiatives cannot succeed. People are the driving force behind America's success. It is our Nation's people, through hard work and dedication, that allows technology and infrastructure to enhance our quality of life and maintain our Nation's competitive edge in the global economy. And it will be the skills and knowledge of future generations that will allow those generations to maintain America's place as a global leader. We need smart machines, i.e., the computers, and the smart research and creative ideas, but all this and more is based upon smart workers and that comes about because of schooling and more broadly education, total education.

For these reasons, education is consistently considered a top priority for the Nation and a priority that Congress should take seriously. The funding cuts being proposed by the Republican majority do not take this responsibility seriously, in fact, Republican budget proposals relinquish that responsibility altogether.

One of the most obvious examples of this abandonment of a reasoned commitment to education is the reduction in funds proposed for elementary and secondary education programs fundamental to the success of our most vulnerable students. One such program, which has been targeted for a 16-percent funding cut under the misguided Republican budget plan, is the title I program. Title I provides additional academic assistance to those students who have fallen behind or are at risk of falling behind academically. These children are also part of moderate and low-income families that often lack the network of support and enrichment that contributes to successful education and schooling.

Unfortunately, more and more children in our Nation are at risk, therefore, the need for such help is greater than in past years. The single parent families, the low levels of income means that nearly 1 in 4 children live below the established poverty level of minimum income.

In the Twin Cities, title I funds are used to provide these students extra time with teachers and to promote parental involvement in their schools. These funds also support efforts to educate homeless children, sending educators to homeless shelters so that these children have the opportunity to learn and succeed. As with many other types of investment, investing early is the key. Providing extra assistance to students before small problems become big ones is easier and less expensive and ensures that those students are able to get the most out of future school years.

Another example is the defunding by the Congress this past year of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, assisting nearly every school system across the country, is slated for a 57-percent cut by the Republican budget scheme—including under funding of the D.A.R.E. Program included in this program. This program has become increasingly important as drugs and violence are increasingly present among our Nation's youth. We must maintain our commitment to help educators keep their hallways free from drugs, gangs and violence and give all students a safe environment in which to learn. The safe and drug free school law and funding provides for the instruction about the negative impacts of these activities early and giving students alternatives to these types of lifestyles is an important part of ensuring not only students' academic success, but their prosperity after graduation as well.

Funding cuts have also been proposed for programs such as educators professional development, the very successful Head Start Program, and vocational education which cuts would compound the problems for schools already trying to do more with less. Similarly, school to work initiatives are short changed by

this Republican budget an innovative new effort to empower education and schooling with new dynamic programs responsive to the current needs of our constituents. School systems and educators should not be forced to choose which students receive the aid they require and which must go without that assistance. All students must have the opportunity to succeed, and it is the responsibility of Congress to join with localities and States to ensure that each student receives a quality education. The budget package proposed by the Republican majority in Congress falls very short of the investment needed to ensure that our students are receiving the help they require to succeed and prosper today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DISAPPEARANCE OF CHERYL ANN BARNES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity today to talk about something that happened earlier this month in Sumter County, FL, which is in my district.

On January 3, Cheryl Ann Barnes, a 17-year-old high school senior, disappeared. Cheryl is a white female, 5-foot-4-inches tall, and has brown hair and brown eyes. At the time of her disappearance, Cheryl was driving to school in her 1988, metallic grey Mazda 626. The license plate number is RQP74X.

Mr. Speaker, I took this time today to talk about Cheryl's disappearance for a number of reasons. First, despite the continuing efforts of law enforcement and the Sumter County community, 21 days have passed since Cheryl was last seen driving to school. I am hoping that someone watching on C–SPAN today may have seen Cheryl's car somewhere recently and will contact me or the Sumter County Sheriff's Department.

Second, the problem of missing children is a national issue. Just recently, President Clinton issued an Executive order making it easier for pictures of missing children to be posted in Federal buildings.

□ 1630

Getting information out regarding Cheryl's disappearance has not been a problem. In fact, the Barnes family and the Sumter County sheriff's department say they have been very gratified by the level of cooperation that they have received from all missing children's organizations. And yet 21 days have come and gone without any word about Cheryl's whereabouts.

I cannot imagine the agony Cheryl's grandparents, William and Shirley Barnes, are continuing to experience daily or her older sister Sheila Burgess or many of her friends. Cheryl is one of those students who is a friend to everyone. She is a devoutly religious young woman who is very active in school and community activities. They think it would be totally out of character, according to those who know Cheryl, for her to have run away or left voluntarily. That is just not a possibility. In fact, the last time Cheryl was seen, she had made one stop about four blocks away from her high school; then she disappeared.

Again, I am asking that if anyone has seen someone resembling Cheryl, 5 feet, 4 inches tall and about 120 pounds with brown hair and brown eyes, to please call me or the Sumter County sheriff's department at 904–793–0222. I know that the Barnes family has still a lot of hope that Cheryl will one day return. I hope someone listening today can help make that happen.

I also know that the Barnes family would like me to let people know within the Sumter County area how much they have appreciated the support that they have received, the countless hours that they have spent in their searches, and certainly all of law enforcement's help in trying to get this done.

If anybody might have or is asking or needs any kind of information or a picture or anything, please do not hesitate to either call me or, as I said, the Sumter County sheriff's department at 904–793–0222 and we will be glad to get this information. Any businesses that would like to have these pictures, remembering this is a nationwide search, this is not just in the State of Florida, any help that any of you can give us, we would appreciate it.

I thank the Speaker for letting me have this opportunity to get out this information that is extremely important to this Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NORTHERN MARIANAS DELEGATE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Northern Marianas Delegate Act, to provide for a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives to represent the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands became the newest territory of the United States and an American commonwealth in 1976. This commonwealth is comprised of the northern islands in the Mariana Island chain, the principal islands being Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. Guam is also a part of the Mariana Island chain, and it is fitting that the people of Guam have the honor today to share in the introduction of this bill for our Pacific neighbors, and for our brothers and sisters of Chamorro heritage in the Northern Marianas who share Guam's indigenous identity.

It is important that the Northern Marianas be accorded representation in Congress, not just for fair and just representation of an American community whose interests are affected by the actions of Congress, but more importantly for what the people of Northern Marianas can contribute to the Nation through their Delegate.

The American relationship with the Northern Marianas began just over 50 years ago when American forces fought on the beaches of Saipan and Tinian, and at great human cost, expelled a colonial power that had acquired these islands as part of a Pacific empire. The Americans, in the years to come, established the seeds of democracy that have resulted in this new American commonwealth. This commonwealth, whose roots to America are traced to a violent military encounter in World War II, is the first American soil acquired by conquest in this century. That the people of the Northern Marianas have freely chosen to become a part of the American family is a great credit to the United States; that they do not enjoy any participation in the national political process as citizens discredits our commitment to democratic principles.

Today the American citizens who live in the Northern Marianas contribute to the Nation and participate in the life of our Nation in all the same ways that every other American citizen does in his own community. They pay taxes, serve in the military, and work hard for the progress of their communities. They are part of the fabric of our great Nation.

Participation in this American democracy is not based on a particular citizen's tax contribution to the Treasury and it is not based on a preordained size of a community. It is based on a community's commitment to our democratic form of government and our Nation. Our American citizenship has as its foundation a promise of fair and equal treatment by our Government and that promise extends to Congress where fair and equal treatment demands that the Northern Marianas be represented by a Delegate.

The bill that I introduced today mirrors the legislation which granted Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands representation in 1972 and the legislation which granted American Samoa representation in 1980. The Northern Marianas will join the ranks of Delegates representing these islands, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, and the Northern Marianas will add its voice to those who represent American citizens who do not reside in the 50 States, but who do reside in a diverse group of American communities on American soil.

In introducing this bill today I commend the work of the resident Representative of the Commonwealth of

the Northern Mariana Islands, Mr. Juan N. Babauta, and his staff. I also commend the unity of purpose in the leadership of the Northern Marianas expressed by senate joint resolution No. 9–6 of the Ninth Northern Marianas Commonwealth Legislature, the majors of Saipan, Tinian, Rota, and the Northern Islands, and the municipal councils of Saipan, Tinian, Rota in the adoption of resolutions requesting the U.S. Congress to grant delegate status to the resident Representative to the United States. I further commend the leadership of the Hon. Jesus R. Sablan, president of the Senate of the 10th Commonwealth Legislature and the Hon. Crispin I. Deleon Guerrero in their support of this bill. I hope that the House of Representatives and the Senate will act on this legislation in this session, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Northern Marianas Delegate Act.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Guam for being the chief sponsor of this important legislation. I think it is not only long overdue but, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Native Americans and Insular Affairs, I think it is most needful that the Congress should address this very important issue of true representation by our fellow American citizens that live in the Northern Marianas. I would like to ask the gentleman for just a couple of responses to one question that I have.

I think it is needful that the American people need to know how important these islands were in World War II, even at this point in time. The fact that this covenant that was signed between the leaders and the people of the Northern Marianas and the United States Government still to this day holds a very important strategic importance to our security interests in that part of the world. I would ask the gentleman if this is still true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely. As a matter of fact, Saipan, which is the principal island, is most identified to the people of this Nation as a battleground but, of course, their importance continued dramatically even after World War II, serving as a CIA base and providing military support for a number of years.

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING IS LEAKING RADIOACTIVITY INTO SOUTH PACIFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, since September of last year, France has resumed detonating nuclear bombs in coral atolls in the South Pacific, defying worldwide protests against this crime against nature and against the lives and welfare of some 27 million men, women, and children who live in the Pacific region.

In deciding to resume nuclear testing, the French President Jacques Chirac promised the international community there would be no environmental consequences from their nuclear tests, as radioactive substances would not be discharged into the ocean and the surrounding areas.

Mr. Speaker, despite the intense fears of millions of residents in the Pacific, France's nuclear bomb detonations over the past 30 years are laying the foundation for a major environmental tragedy like Chernobyl. The French Atomic Energy Agency has repeatedly stated that radioactive substances from their nuclear tests are trapped in the ground and there is no danger of radioactive contamination.

Yesterday, France's big lie was revealed.

After a Japanese newspaper broke the story yesterday, media reports confirm that France now acknowledges that radioactive materials have, indeed, leaked into the sea from their recent nuclear tests at Moruroa Atoll. Radioactive iodine-131, which is created by nuclear explosions and causes cancer in humans, was detected by French officials after the tests but was apparently covered up. Only after a French nuclear specialist mistakenly revealed the information during a disarmament conference held right here in Washington last November—that the radioactive leakage was brought to light.

Mr. Speaker, this just confirms what we all know. The French Government cannot be trusted to tell the truth. One wonders what other monstrosities they have been hiding in the name of national interest.

Although the French routinely deny that their nuclear tests threaten the health and safety of Pacific residents or endanger the region's fragile marine environment, documents from France's Atomic Energy Commission confirm that at least three tests in the past have also led to radioactive contamination at Moruroa Atoll. Scientific missions to Moruroa—although severely restricted by French authorities in to their access to test sites, test data and time for study—have verified the presence of radioactive isotopes such as iodine-131, cesium-134, tritium, krypton-85, and plutonium. The presence of these radioactive materials substantiate fears that leakage, venting, and accidental dispersal of radioactive materials have occurred at France's test facilities in the two island atolls in the Pacific.

Despite France's assurances to the contrary, these reports and the events of yesterday confirm that France's underground testing program cannot ensure that radioactive contamination is fully contained.

While France's Defense Minister and Foreign Minister denounce accounts that Moruroa Atoll has suffered deep cracks and fissuring from the nuclear testing, a confidential French Defense Ministry study directly contradicts them. As reported in today's Washington Post,

> The French Government has been aware, at least since 1979, that Moruroa's underwater basalt foundation is fractured in several places.
>
> The report described the effects of an accident in 1979 in which the French detonated a 150-kiloton weapon only 1,300 feet below the surface of the lagoon. The blast was supposed to occur at 2,600 feet, but the bomb got stuck halfway down the test shaft, and the French detonated it there rather than risk trying to move it. The explosion blasted loose more than 130 million cubic yards of rock and coral, causing a tidal wave that injured several French scientists and guards. The document also described underwater avalanches that followed three tests as proof the growing number of tests was posing serious environmental risks to Mururoa Atoll.

Mr. Speaker, with French President Chirac expected in Washington next week, I would ask our colleagues to join me in urging that the French Government stop this madness and immediately cease nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I've said it earlier and I'll say it again—the French Government has already exploded some 177 nuclear bombs in this atoll in the Pacific, and Prime Minister John Majors of Great Britain and our own President have given only lip service to these acts of atrocity against the marine environment and against the lives of human beings who live in that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

RADIOACTIVE LEAK FOUND AT FRANCE'S MURUROA

> TOKYO (Reuter)—A Japanese newspaper said on Tuesday that France had detected a toxic radioactive substance near Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific after resuming nuclear testing there last September.
>
> Yomiuri Shimbun, quoting unnamed sources close to the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, said the radioactive substance called ''Iodine 131'' was detected near Mururoa Atoll.
>
> The sources said a specialist from the French Nuclear Energy Agency disclosed the radiation leakage at an unofficial meeting in Washington last November of experts from prospective signatories of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
>
> The French expert, however, did not make it clear exactly when the radioactive substance was detected.
>
> After making the disclosure, the French expert asked the other participants to ''forget what they had just heard,'' saying the data was ''extremely confidential,'' the sources were quoted as saying.
>
> Quoting one source close to the Washington meeting, Yomiuri said the radiation level of the substance was so low that it would not harm humans.
>
> But when Iodine 131, commonly detected after frequent nuclear tests, is taken into the human body, it could cause cancer, Yomiuri said.
>
> France has defied worldwide protests and conducted five nuclear weapons tests in the South Pacific since last September.

CLINTON URGES ACTION ON NUCLEAR TREATY

(By Stephanie Nebehay)

GENEVA (Reuter)—President Clinton pressed Tuesday for a quick resolution to talks on an underground nuclear test ban treaty so the text could go to the U.N. General Assembly by June but India demanded nuclear powers first give assurances to eliminate nuclear weapons, Clinton said.

But the Group of 21 countries, which includes nuclear ''threshold'' states India and Pakistan, criticized the major powers for refusing to open new negotiations on a nuclear disarmament treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The 38-state negotiations, sponsored by the United Nations, were overshadowed last year by France staging five underground nuclear tests in the South Pacific, and two blasts by China.

''A Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is vital to constrain both the spread and further development of nuclear weapons,'' Clinton said in a message read by John Holum, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

''Now, urgent national political decisions must complement your painstaking work in Geneva, so that the Conference can forward a completed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the U.N. General Assembly by June.''

In New Delhi, Foreign Ministry spokesman Arif Khan told reporters India's conditions to support the CTBT were unchanged despite Western pressure.

He said India's stand was clearly stated in Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao's address to the recent summit of non-aligned countries.

India exploded a nuclear device in 1974 but says its nuclear program is peaceful. It declined to sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty last year, saying the pact discriminated against non-nuclear powers.

''A handful of nations perpetuated their monopoly over the means of mutually assured destruction by the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty,'' Rao told the non-aligned summit.

''They did so without even obtaining an expression of intent to eventually abolish all nuclear weapons as envisaged in that treaty itself.''

India says it wants both the CTBT and a proposed convention on the cut-off of fissile material for weapons.

''While the aim of both these treaties are laudable, and we support them wholeheartedly, we must ensure that we do not lose yet another opportunity to obtain a commitment to universal and comprehensive nuclear disarmament,'' Rao said.

But Holum told a news briefing in Geneva that Clinton's message ''made clear that this is a very high priority commitment of the United States. We are dedicated to completion of the test ban on time. We believe that will happen.''

Holum, noting some states wanted to link the CTBT to a timetable for totally eliminating nuclear weapons, warned in his speech: ''. . .I must acknowledge that the CTBT is at risk here in Geneva.''

He said it was imperative to report the complete text of the CTBT to the General Assembly by June ''at the very latest.''

This would allow governments to examine the text, endorse it at the General Assembly and open it for signature in September.

All five declared nuclear powers: Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States are taking part in the talks.

Holum said the United States continued to believe a moratorium on testing, as observed by Washington, was the most positive way to support the negotiations.

But he also said the latest blasts might help forge consensus around a CTBT, which would extend the 1963 Moscow treaty banning tests in the atmosphere and under water.

Asked whether a further French underground blast, due before May, might be harmful to the negotiations, Holum replied: ''I would think it would be just the opposite.

''This is our chance to accomplish a nuclear CTBT. This window of opportunity may not stay open forever.

''If countries are concerned by those tests, it seems to me that a CTBT is the answer, not the problem.''

Meanwhile, the Group of 21, in a statement read by Peru, called for immediately establishing a special ad-hoc committee, under the conference, to negotiate a nuclear disarmament treaty.

Pakistani Ambassador Munir Akram, in a separate speech, said the Geneva conference faced a ''moment of truth'' at a time when there were no confrontations between the nuclear powers.

''It is, therefore, most disturbing that most of the nuclear weapon states seem to be unprepared to consider the measures required to lead to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

''Some of them, while reducing their nuclear arsenals quantitatively, are upgrading them qualitatively,'' Akram added.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1996]

FRANCE ACKNOWLEDGES RADIOACTIVE LEAKAGE IN SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR TESTS

(By William Drozdiak)

PARIS.—France acknowledged today that radioactive materials have leaked into the sea from its nuclear tests in the South Pacific but insisted that the quantities were so minimal that they posed no threat to the environment.

The confirmation that radioactive elements such as iodine-131 have seeped into the lagoon near the Mururoa test site seemed likely to revive the storm of protests that followed President Jacques Chirac's decision to conduct a final series of underground nuclear explosions before signing a global test-ban treaty.

Japanese Foreign Minister Yukihiko Ikeda said he will demand a full explanation from France about the nature of the leaks. Other countries in the Pacific region, notably Australia and New Zealand, are expected to follow suit, French officials said.

Defying international criticism, France has carried out five nuclear tests since September to verify a new warhead and to perfect simulation technology that will be used to monitor reliability of its nuclear weapons. A final test will take place next month before the test site is shut down permanently, French officials said.

But the latest accounts of radioactive leakage at the Mururoa test site have raised questions about the credibility of the French government's arguments that the nuclear explosions present no environmental menace.

''There is no way to assess whether their is a coverup because the French do now allow independent verification,'' said Tom Cochran, a nuclear-test specialist at the Natural Resources Defense Council in Washington. ''What makes people suspicious about whether they are hearing the truth is the fact that these tests were really unnecessary in the first place.''

France has already contended that its underground nuclear blasts inflict no damage on the fragile ecology of the Mururoa coral atoll, 750 miles southeast of Tahiti, which serves as its principal test site. Explosive devices are bored deep within the basalt foundation of the atoll, and French scientists say the intense heat from the blast vitrifies the rock and traps all radioactivity before it can escape.

But Alain Barthoux, director of nuclear tests at France's Atomic Energy Commission, acknowledged that traces of radioactive material are usually ''vented'' into the lagoon when scientists drill down into the rock to obtain samples after every blast.

Barthoux claimed, however, that such leaks involve ''insignificant amounts'' of radioactive substances, such as cesium, tritium or iodine, that vanish quickly in the environment. Quantities of iodine-131, for example, which can cause cancer when ingested by humans, shrink by half within eight days and disappear entirely within 80 days, he said.

Barthoux denied a report in the Japan's Yomiuri Shimun newspaper that small amounts of radioactive iodine were continuing to leak into the water as a result of the latest round of nuclear tests. The paper quoted sources at the Geneva disarmament conference, where the global test-ban treaty is being negotiated, as saying a French nuclear expert disclosed the radiation leakage at a meeting in Washington last November.

The French specialist was quoted as saying the information was ''extremely confidential.''

France first acknowledged the release of radioactivity from its nuclear tests when oceanographer Jacques Cousteau visited the Mururoa site in 1987 and was allowed to conduct independent tests of the water in the lagoon. He found the presence of radioactive iodine, cesium, cobalt and europium, but in quantities that were not considered dangerous.

But he warned the Mururoa's coral crown was deeply cracked and could pose a problem if testing continued. He said risks grew that higher levels of radioactive residue could seep into the the lagoon.

French Defense Minister Charles Million denounced reports from last year of widening fissures in the atoll as ''unreliable.'' Foreign Minister Herve de Charette told the National Assembly that ''never have any cracks of any kind been spotted.''

But a confidential Defense Ministry report acknowledged the government has been aware, at least since 1979, that Mururoa's underwater basalt foundation is fractured several places.

□ 1645

UPDATE ON AMERICA'S PEACEKEEPING MISSION IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am giving this second in a series of speeches updating the Congress on the state of our peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. Last night in his State of the Union Address the President thanked the American troops taking part in the Bosnian peacekeeping mission and the families that support them in their efforts. Also, it was good to see the President make a visit to the forces in Hungary and in Bosnia just a few days ago. The Americans in uniform seemed to appreciate this. I am pleased the President made the trip. Mr. Speaker, the men and women in our country's military deserve the full support of every Member in this body and the American people.

There continue to be causes for concern regarding our peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. First, there is the enduring presence of Muslim extremists in that country. According to news reports, most recently in an article in last Sunday's Washington Post, some Muslim extremists who previously aided the Bosnians in their military efforts have not left the country. Many of these groups oppose the presence of our troops. Their stated opposition to our mission poses a serious threat to the success of our peacekeeping effort and the safety of American troops.

On January 18 I sent a letter to President Clinton asking that the American-led effort to arm and train the Muslim Croat Federation be delayed until groups such as the Iranians and Mujaheddin leave Bosnia. I asked the President to require Bosnia to certify on a regular basis that no such outside extremist Muslim forces remain. If any of these groups reappear, the arming and training effort would cease.

For several months I have voiced concern that assisting the Federation would jeopardize the neutrality of the U.S. troops. Although the U.S. military will not have a direct role in arming and training, independent contractors, including retired U.S. military officers, will conduct the operation. But if the administration insists on arming and training the Federation through soldiers for hire, we should use the effort as a club to make sure Muslim extremists leave the country.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the January 18 letter.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 18, 1996.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It appears the Administration is proceeding with arming and training the Muslim-Croat Federation, not with our military as originally proposed, but by independent contractors. It further appears the contractors are former U.S. military leaders.

I remain opposed to any arming and training of the Federation, as I believe there exists a military balance between the Federation and the Serbs. Also, this effort still has American fingerprints, with only a short distance between the contractors and our military. It reinforces the perception that we are not neutral in the peacekeeping mission. This effort is proceeding, despite the resolution that passed the House 287–141 on Dec. 13 which states ''the United States Government in all respects should be impartial and evenhanded with all parties to the conflict.''

If the Administration proceeds, I urge you to require the Bosnian government to ensure all Muslim fundamentalists, such as Iranians and mujaheddin, have been expelled before any arming and training begins. According to news reports, some Muslim extremists who previously aided the Bosnians in their military efforts have not left the country. Their stated opposition to our mission poses a threat to the success of the peacekeeping effort and the safety of American troops in the region.

Bosnia should certify on a regular basis that no such outside Muslim fundamentalists remain. If any of these groups reappear, the arming and training effort paid for by American tax dollars should cease.

This is a basic issue. Such certification will not only strengthen the outcome of the peace effort, but will enhance the safety of our American forces in that region. If the Administration insists on arming and training the Federation through ''soldiers for hire'', we must use this effort as a club to ensure Muslim extremists leave the country.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Member of Congress.

Second, Mr. Speaker, there is the concern of mission creep for our forces in Bosnia. I addressed this concern in my January 3 speech. Recently the Americans have been urged to provide security for investigators looking into Serb atrocities. The commander of the forces in the region, Adm. Leighton Smith, is to be commended for his resistance to deeper American involvement in these investigations.

Third, there seems to be a serious breach of the Dayton peace agreement by the refusal of all three sides to release prisoners of war, despite a stipulation in the accord that required doing so by last Friday. This refusal bodes ill for the future prospects of peace.

These are three ongoing concerns that this body and the American people should keep in mind. Our hopes and our prayers are with the success of the mission and the safety of the uniformed Americans in Bosnia. This is a difficult task, but I remain so very proud of the men and women who wear the American uniforms.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STATE OF THE UNION SPEECH AND BORDER PROTECTION FOR CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to make some brief comments on the State of the Union Message last night to say first that, as I said earlier today, it was interesting to juxtapose the State of the Union Messages of the past to the State of the Union Message that we got last night.

If we go back to the campaign of 1992, we heard a very strong message that came from candidate Bill Clinton. He promised to end welfare as we know it, balance the Federal budget, and in fact, bring about a reduction of the tax burden on working Americans, that middle class tax cut. Then, in the State of the Union Message in 1993, we obviously saw the message that ended up being the largest tax increase in American history. Then, 2 years ago, we saw right here in the well of the House a State of the Union Message in which the President held up a card, a card in which we were going to move ahead and see the Federal Government usurp control of one-seventh of our economy with a national health care plan.

Then last night he said that the era of Big Government has come to an end, so I was gratified to see that shift, but if one looks at those speeches that have been delivered from the campaign of 1992 through the governance of the Clinton administration over the past 3 years to the speech that was delivered right behind me here last night, it is very interesting.

One of the things in the speech that troubled me greatly was a statement that was made toward the end of his speech. I would like to share that, because it is something that concerns not only all of us from California, but from other parts of the country as well.

The President said, ''but there are some areas that the Federal Government'' must address directly and strongly. One of these is the problem of illegal immigration. ''After years and years of neglect, this administration has taken a strong stand to stiffen the protection of our borders.''

The thing that troubles me about that is that while it is great that the President said it, it is great that the President is proceeding with a focus on this issue, but over the past year, since we have seen a new majority come into this Congress, since we have seen the fine work of my colleague, the gentleman from California, ELTON GALLEGLY, who chairs our task force on illegal immigration, since we have seen the Speaker's Task Force on California focus on the issue of illegal immigration as its number one priority, and thanks to the great work of people like the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, we have been able to move ahead with very important legislation that, tragically, the President has vetoed.

I would like to share with my colleagues a letter which I have just sent today to the President, in which I say, ''I was greatly encouraged by your decision to include addressing illegal immigration as a national priority in Tuesday's State of the Union Address. However, in this light, I was dismayed by your veto record that has killed historic congressional proposals to combat illegal immigration and lift the burden of illegal immigration from States like California.''

Those include, Mr. Speaker, providing $500 million to reimburse States for the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrant felons in State prisons, tripling prior year funding, and relieving California taxpayers of a $300 million burden that clearly is a Federal responsibility;

Second, increasing funding for INS border control efforts by $300 million, to add 1,000 Border Patrol agents and 400 support staff;

Third, establishing that illegal immigrants do not qualify for any Federal or State welfare programs;

Fourth, prohibiting illegal immigrants from qualifying for taxpayer-provided health care services;

And finally, creating a new $3.5 billion Federal fund to assist hospitals with the cost of emergency health care to illegal immigrants, with $1.6 billion of that going to the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, it was wonderful that the president would stand here and talk about this issue, but he has been given the opportunity to address those concerns that not only the people in that State, where 54 electoral votes are held, but people around the country are concerned, and when he has been given that opportunity, he has chosen to bring out his veto pen and in fact slap the face of those who have been focusing on this issue.

He opposed proposition 187 in California, which passed by an overwhelming landslide, people saying that the State of California should not be responsible for what is clearly a Federal issue. So it saddens me that while I am pleased that the statement was made, that the record of President Clinton on the issue of illegal immigration and the record of past congresses in the control of his party is that people have chosen to ignore this. In the past year, we have successfully stepped up to the plate to deal with it, and unfortunately, the President has chosen to veto it.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter of January 24, 1996, to which I referred:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
Washington, DC, January 24, 1996.

Task Force on California.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was greatly encouraged by your decision to include addressing illegal immigration as a national priority in Tuesday's State of the Union Address. However, in this light, I was dismayed by your veto record that has killed historic congressional proposals to combat illegal immigration and lift the burden of illegal immigration from states like California. These proposals include:

Providing $500 million to reimburse states for the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrant felons in state prisons, tripling prior year funding and relieving California taxpayers of a $300 million burden;

Increasing funding for INS border control efforts by $300 million to add 1,000 border patrol agents and 400 inspectors;

Establishing that illegal immigrants do not qualify for any federal or state welfare programs;

Prohibiting illegal immigrants from qualifying for taxpayer-provided health care services; and

Creating a new $3.5 billion federal fund to assist hospitals with the cost of emergency health care to illegal immigrants, with $1.6 billion targeted to California.

While I was disappointed in 1994 when you chose to oppose California's Proposition 187, which was overwhelmingly supported by California citizens, it has been more disheartening to see vetoed the California delegation's efforts to implement federal policies to meet the goals of Proposition 187. I look forward to working with you to see each of these measures, as well as comprehensive immigration reform, enacted this year.

Sincerely,

DAVID DREIER,
Chairman.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there's more than meets the eye when we hear the Republicans talking about their plans to keep the Government running through the rest of the year.

Their latest plan is to introduce a new temporary spending bill each month to keep the Government running.

That plan might not appear too bad at first to the public but when the American people take a closer look they'll quickly see that this month-by-month approach will leave our schools and teachers with the two main ingredients for disaster—too little time and too little money!

Right now is the time of year when schools—elementary schools, high schools, and colleges—begin to plan for the next school year which, in case my friends on the other side of the aisle have forgotten, begins in September.

Schools can't wait until the new fiscal year to hire teachers, buy books and computers, and repair damaged buildings.

If we don't pass a year-long appropriation, elementary and secondary schools won't know how many teachers they can afford to hire. They won't be able to plan special programs. Students at postsecondary schools could be hurt even more by the Republican strategy. If Congress does not set the maximum amount for Pell grants, colleges and universities won't be able to figure how much financial aid their eligible students will get.

Even worse, students won't know if they will receive the financial aid they need to go to college.

That's not how we should be treating our Nation's students.

But, on top of robbing our schools and students of crucial planning time, the new majority month-to-month approach to governing is going to rob them of crucial funding.

Let me make it clear. If the Gingrich Republicans continue to fund education at the level in the continuing resolution that is set to expire this week, education will be cut by a total of $3.1 billion below last year.

And that, my friends, will be the largest cut to education in the history of this country.

You have to wonder what they are thinking on the other side of the aisle. At a time when numerous polls show that improving the quality of public education is the top priority for Americans, the Gingrich Republicans are planning to cut funding for education more than it has ever been cut before.

The Gingrich Republicans' sneaky assault on education, however, shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone because the new majority has already passed some of the most antieducation legislation I have ever seen.

Just take a look at the education budget for 1996 which the House has already approved.

This terrible bill cuts: Head Start, Chapter One, Safe and Drug-free Schools, School-to-Work, and vocational and adult education.

In all, it cuts education by 13 percent in 1 year alone—13 percent.

But that's nothing compared to what they want to do to our education system over the next 7 years.

The new majority's 7-year budget plan would deny Head Start to 180,000 children by 2002.

It eliminates Goals 2000, which helps schools meet higher national standards and increase parental involvement.

It kills Americorps, which has provided thousands of Americans with college tuition assistance in exchange for community service.

And, it cuts in half the President's program aimed at helping schools bring technology into the classroom.

Under their budget, my State of California alone will lose, among other things, $1 billion for the School Lunch Program, and over 181,000 Californians will be denied participation in the cost-effective Direct Student Loan Program.

My friends, that's the wrong direction, and that's not the way we are supposed to be taking care of our children.

Mr. Speaker, we can balance the budget, but it does not have to be on the back of our children and their education.

As the President talked about in his speech last night, we can continue to move this Nation forward without leaving those who depend on Government the most—our children and their education—behind.

Let's stop playing politics with our Nation's schools and students. They need time to plan, and they need adequate funding to meet the growing needs of our students.

I urge my colleagues to pass a clean continuing resolution immediately that ensures that our schools can do their jobs, so that our children are prepared for the challenges of the next century.

□ 1700

LEARNING FROM OUR HISTORY

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, while my good friend from Arkansas is in the chair, I plan not to bore you, sir, but to educate you. You are already pretty darn educated, and I love your State; and I have told you more than once,

there are 23 Medal of Honor winners from Arkansas, and it is a great State. And it is under a cloud for awhile, but it is going to be liberated 286 days from right now, 285 from when we wake up in the morning, to regain its place in the pantheon of the 50 American States.

Let me take a moment again to do what I did in one of the five times I spoke today, a 1-minute four times on the defense bill, and point out again the headlines from yesterday, last night, or the headlines this morning.

Mr. Speaker, are you aware that last night, because I was on television a year ago last night on all three networks, CNN all day long, PBS, because I inadvertently used formal words from the U.S. Constitution about giving aid and comfort to an enemy. I had not realized how archaic this language was.

I carry around a Constitution most of the time. Here it is. What it says in article III, section 3, in very archaic language, listen to this and why I should have said sustenance and support to the Communist enemies in Hanoi, referring to a certain 23-year-old Rhodes scholar who is ditching class to travel Europe lobbying for a Ho Chi Minh victory. But here is article III, section 3, and of course I did not mean treason. You have to be very smart and diabolical and clever to be engaged in treason.

Article III, section 3, U.S. Constitution: Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, meaning the States, they always wrote that way in our pre-Civil War, true Federalist period, or in adhering to their, the States', enemies, giving them aid and comfort; and in the original document, they actually gave a capital letter A to aid and a capital C to comfort.

No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court. Even then, our original Founding Fathers, the colonialists, British citizens, tell the Concord Bridge and Lexington Green gunfights, they were very strict about what treason is. So, of course, I meant nothing about treason.

I had my words taken down, and I refused to apologize because the essence of my remarks was true and is true now, that when Mr. Clinton puts in the gallery Barry McCaffrey, I didn't have time in my 1-minute to really explain that General McCaffrey is one of our combat CINC's. He is the Commander in Chief of Southern Command, stationed in Panama. He is an outstanding man, and when I met him in Desert Storm as the two-star major general division commander of the 24th Mechanized Infantry Division, not knowing then, unless he had the battle plan, that Schwarzkopf, General Schwarzkopf would pick him to be the point of the spear and to be the main trusted armored force, backed up by the 101st Airborne in the Harbor Division like the 101st that is now in Bosnia coming down from Europe, brigades thereof, that he would be the point of the spear, circling into Iraq, cutting around Kuwait, and that he had been allowed to complete his mission and he was shocked that he was not allowed to, as I saw him so state on television in a documentary.

He could have taken Basra, cut off the Republican Guard. Tens of thousands of Kurdish men, women, and children would not have been butchered in the north. Saddam Hussein would have been captured and executed by his own officers, 400 of whom he tortured to death because we didn't end that war, like the person that my good and honorable friend George Bush called Hitler.

So here is Barry McCaffrey, two stars. He gets a third star. Clinton comes into office, McCaffrey is coming over as Chief of the Joint Chiefs, and he is sitting in the waiting room at the White House 2 years, 10 months ago, and a prepubescent puke staffer of Clinton's walks up to him when he says, good morning, and she comes over to him and leans in his face and says, we don't talk to people who wear the uniform down here at the White House.

Now, Clinton told Gen. Colin Powell, who was then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, try and get me an I.D. on this young woman staffer and we will nail her; and Colin Powell promptly said, I am not interested in who it is or finding out who this one person is. Change the attitude of your staff toward people in the military.

Well, of course, all of this was picked up from the top down, from the loathsome remarks in the letter to one of Arkansas's great retirees, Bataan Death March survivor Col. Eugene Holmes, and had the honor 11 months ago to have dinner with him and his beautiful Irene, his wife of 55 or 60 years down in their home in Fayetteville. This letter still resonates in my head when I look up at Mr. Clinton standing there at that roster where Winston Churchill has stood more than once, Douglas MacArthur has stood, all the great and not-so-great leaders of the world of late, and I look when he talks about families.

And I look at my own stickers and bumper stickers and signs that I have used all during this Presidential quest and it says, Faith, Family and Freedom, the motto of all of my congressional campaigns, and I hear this resonate in Clinton's remarks last night. Faith, family, and he talks about this noble Gen. Barry McCaffrey fighting for freedom and for his country.

As I pointed out this morning, Clinton could not gag out of his throat the word Vietnam. He talked about McCaffrey's Silver Stars, two of them; most people die earning that highest decoration. It is No. 3 after Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross. He said he had three Purple Hearts, as my dad did in World War I, but he could not tell us, sitting next to his beautiful daughter Chelsea and then Mrs. Clinton and on this side the great hero survivor of the Holocaust, 14 years of age, survived a hell on Earth, the horror of Auschwitz. Clinton couldn't refer to General McCaffrey and say, he won those honors fighting for his country and fighting for the country of Vietnam that I helped to turn over to communism and that I am now normalizing relations with the Communist killers who tore up General McCaffrey's arm, gave him those three Purple Hearts, using Russian equipment and Russian bullets and AK–47 rifles to tear up this young captain's body.

And where was Clinton when Moscow was sending those weapons to Hanoi? He was in Moscow. Unbelievable.

Now, here are the headlines, Mr. Speaker. Clinton Embraces GOP Themes in Setting the Agenda. Wednesday, today, January 24, 21 years ago today my hero dad died. As I said in my 1-minute, he would be tormented by the lack of character and integrity at the top of our Government today.

The era of big government is over, Clinton tells the Nation. Here is the New York Times, America's so-called mother paper, whose motto is, All the News That's Fit to Print, Clinton offers challenge to the Nation, the era of big government is over. Subtitle, appeal to voters, tries to preempt the GOP message.

How about this one; that was the New York Times. Here is the Washington Times, a better newspaper if you are looking for hard-core truth or conservative reporting. Clinton concedes the end of the big government era, State of the Union stresses responsibility and self-reliance.

Well, before the media would—before the media calls me and says, well, what would you have done as a theme tonight? I thought back to something written 23 years ago by Alistair Cooke. Some people may remember the great character Archie Bunker. He called him Alistair DeCooke.

Alistair Cooke was one of those rare people who kept his British homeland citizenship and became an American citizen. He came here in 1938 right before World War II as one of the young reporters for the BBC. He stayed on to be the immediate prior host of Masterpiece Theater. He loved the United States, loved our mother country, brilliantly reported for Vogue. And my colleagues who may be listening, I am joined on the floor by my pal, SONNY BONO of California. SONNY, I want you to listen to this for your kids.

Mr. Speaker, listen to Alistair Cooke in a birthday present for our 200th bicentennial, written 4 years in advance in 1972, published by Knopf & Company in 1973, run on television in 13 wonderfully produced 1-hour presentations, 13 documentaries, called Alistair Cooke's America, rerun 3 years later in our exact bicentennial year.

Here is his present, and imagine if Clinton had said words like this. Now, remember, this is written 24 years ago this spring and summer.

What is fiercely in dispute, Mr. Cooke says, between the Communist

and non-Communist nations today is the quality and staying power of American civilization. Who uses that term more than any of us, ''American civilization''? Why, our Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH. Maybe NEWT is on to something.

Every other country scorns American materialism while striving in every big and little way to match it; envy obviously has something to do with it. But there is a true basis for this debate, and it is whether America is in its ascendance or its decline.

Cooke continues, and I used to have this memorized, the next three paragraphs, probably could still recite it without looking at the page, but I want it to be precisely correct. I traveled to all 50 of our States on child pornography, all of 1973, 1974, 1975, and intermixed with my campaigning in my first congressional victory in 1976, opening my speeches all over America, including Arkansas, Mr. Speaker, with these words: I myself, Alistair Cooke, think I recognize here in America several of the symptoms that Edward Gibbon maintained were signs of the decline of Rome and which arose not from external enemies, but from inside the country itself.

Then I would take a footnote and quote Abraham Lincoln when he was about 38 years of age where he said this country would never be conquered from outside, no despot would ever take a drink of water from the Ohio River; that if we collapsed, it would be suicide from our own decadence.

Alistair Cooke continues, the signs of Rome: a mounting love of show and luxury, a widening gap between the very rich and the very poor, our liberal colleagues could agree with that one, an obsession with sex.

Think of modern American television today: prime time, afternoon soap operas, slime-ball talk shows. They are still on, all claiming they will reform within the next 6 months, still running ads backing, trying to seek broken and dysfunctional families to come on and make fools of themselves, an obsession with sex.

Get this next line, Mr. Speaker, and think how many debates we have had in the last decade; this is written 24 years ago: Freakishness in the arts masquerading as originality, and enthusiasm pretending to creativeness, these symptoms are shared by Western Europe, though they seem to be milder there, only because America has a livelier tradition of self-criticism. Thank heavens for our self-criticism.

In the past decade, that would be 1963 to 1973, America has demonstrated the Roman folly of exercising military might in places remote from the centers of power. He is referring to Vietnam. Could that also mean Somalia, Haiti, or Bosnia in the Balkan winter?

Cooke continues, And in finding herself, America, so frustrated by the stamina of primitive peoples on their own ground as to fall back to the Roman conclusion that, and he is quoting from original Roman 2,000 years old, nothing could reconcile the minds of the barbarians to peace unless they experienced in their own country the calamities of war.

And who used that immoral Roman policy on the Vietnamese, the Laotians, and the Cambodians? Robert Strange, his mother's maiden name, I guess, McNamara. That criminal, McNamara, who has poured salt into the raw wounds of all of the MIA families across this country with his groveling Council of Foreign Relations-organized trip to Hanoi and his appearance on talk shows across this country with some sort of gutless apology for what he did not only to our young men and our eight nurses whose names are on the Vietnam memorial wall, but what he did to millions of South Vietnamese and North Vietnamese, and eventually created the failed pattern by a gutless President LBJ to turn all of Southeast Asia over to communism.

□ 1715

So it is McNamara that he is talking about here in 1973, even though he resigned 5 years before, but McNamara was still in his 5th of 13 years at the World Bank, drawing about, in now dollars, $800,000 to $900,000 a year tax free for 13 years since he walked off the battlefield in Vietnam, McNamara, and only did it come to an end in Reagan's first year of 1981.

Back to Alistair Cooke's TV series and the book that grew from it, ''America.''

There is too, Cooke says, the general desire to live off the state, whether it is a junkie on welfare or an airline subsidized by the Government.

We did end that during my tenure here.

In a notion that Washington, big daddy, will provide, and most disturbing of all, a developing moral numbness to vulgarity, to violence, and to the assault on the simplest of human decencies.

This is written 24 years ago. Quo vadis, whither goest thou? What have we done since then? Yet the original institutions of this country still have great vitality. The republic can be kept, but only if we care to keep it.

There Alistair Cooke is paraphrasing the great Benjamin Franklin some 200 years earlier.

Much of the social turmoil in America springs from the energy of people who are trying to apply those institutions to forgotten memories and who have awakened after a long sleep.

I thought Republicans, conservatives, because the other power was decaying and were devoid of ideas, I thought we would take that power in the late seventies, and because of Watergate, and again corruption at the top, my party was to wander for 40 years in the political desert.

Back to Cooke: As to the rage to believe that we found the secret of liberty, in general permissiveness from the cradle on, that is liberal permissiveness, this seems to me a disastrous sentimentality, which, whatever liberties it sets loose, loosens also the cement that alone can bind any society into a stable compound.

A code of obeyed taboos. That means taboos on child abuse, homosexuality, adultery, all the taboos that are written into Mosaic law and written about powerfully and poetically in the Old Testament, the Bible of the Hebrew people.

I can only recall the saying of a wise Frenchman that ''Liberty is the luxury of self-discipline.''

Self-discipline. What does Clinton say last night? He stresses responsibility and self-reliance. Self-discipline. What a source for those virtues.

Historically, those peoples that did not discipline themselves had discipline thrust upon them from the outside. Usually, Mr. Speaker, in a bloody revolution. Or in a bloody revolution. That is why, Cooke continues, the normal cycle of life and death of great nations has been first a powerful tyranny, broken by a revolt, the enjoyment of liberty, then the abuse of liberty, and back to tyranny again. As I see it in this country, America, a land of the most persistent idealism and the blandest cynicism, and this is where it ended my memory of these paragraphs, the race is on between its decadence and its vitality.

The race is on, 24 years ago. And what a race it has been these last two-and-a-half decades. How did anybody ever believe that somebody with such disrespect for the Presidency, the office of the Presidency, would come to us as a perpetual Governor in a one-party State, changed by the gentleman in the chair and a vibrant growing Republican Party in Arkansas, that a person would come to the Democratic primary process with so much baggage that we are still reading in our papers about grand juries and suicides and is it a murder and Whitewater and one horrible $100,000 bribe hidden by cattle futures; Jennifer Flower's name ricocheting around, Paula Corbin Jones, Marilyn Jo Jenkins, Sally Perdue. And I am lectured to? In the week my grandchild is born, that I must cherish the children? And I must be a good family man?

Look at these quotes that I wrote down last night. I did not want to be disrespectful to the office, so I did not sit in this Chamber. Here is the first note I took down. The era of big government is over.

That is what I said when I ran for Congress in 1976. Citizens must not be left to fend for themselves. What does that mean? Is that what Alistair Cooke was talking about, big daddy, let Washington do it? What has that got to do with self-reliance and responsibility?

Is it the command of Mother Teresa, who shook my hand on December 8 and said, ''When you are President, a special love for the poor and vulnerable.'' But she means all those little infants in their mother's wombs. Yes, she commands us and every rich nation in the

world to love the poor. But I do not think that is exactly what we were talking about last night, because any time either one of the Clintons meets with Mother Theresa, they give her great lip service, and then disregard everything she says the minute when she leaves their country. The same with Pope John Paul II, Billy Graham, or the head of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Self-reliance, teamwork, we must have both. That is what we are developing on this side of the aisle, teamwork. He talks about a new, smaller Government, finally, when we have $5 trillion of debt and we are heading for $6 trillion, before we begin to even turn around that debt.

I was in the well the day before yesterday with Molly Christine Oona Dornan, Molly O. Dornan, not 10 days old when I had her here, and look at the debt that we have already put on all of my 10 grandchildren. Although like I am seventh or eighth here in the House, I am like a piker compared to JIM BUNNING who is sitting here with 28 grandchildren, or HENRY GONZALEZ, with 31 or 32 and a couple of great-grandchildren, or RON PACKARD, one of my colleagues from Orange County, who has 32 grandchildren, I think.

What a debt we have put on all of these kids. When I talk about our posterity or our children around here, I am thinking of names and faces. I have got five and five now, five grandsons who are going to be told you can do anything with a woman you want, and have high school kids say to me. And on my other side, I have five granddaughters. Every single one of these shows I turn on now is all T&A, and in the trade they know what that means.

Mr. Clinton says last night he wants to meet with the executives of the television industry. SONNY BONO is trying to do a terrific job to try to talk common sense to these people. That was one of the best real lines in the speech. Produce things you want your children to look at. That does not means a tough version of Shakespeare or violence where it is necessary when you are doing a cocaine story in South America or something. But this mindless violence, even by some conservative producers, and Sylvester Stallone's name comes to mind, and other people, Arnold Schwarzenegger, who are supposed to be associated with the Republican side of events and issues. This worship of violence, egregious, promiscuous sex, and a sneaky little message that drugs are OK, I do not know how we are going to get it done under this Presidency, over the next 286 days, any more than we did under Mr. Nixon.

Here was the plea last night. Stronger families, a stronger America. There it is, faith, family and freedom. I guess we can thank God for small favors, that he did not say he was the new and everlasting covenant again. That is Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

He still does not get the second amendment straight. That was wrong. And I repeated what got me my words taken down last year about claiming that there is no Russian missiles pointed at us. What got me a little exorcised a year ago this week was he said we won the cold war.

That brought to mind the joke I heard as a kid when Tonto and the Lone Ranger were surrounded. He says ''What are we going to do, Tonto?'' And says ''What do you mean we, Kemo Sabe?'' No we. Clinton had nothing to do with winning the cold war. Never lifted a pinkie. As a matter of fact, he was helping the other side, because it was an undeclared war. Again, there are people I call traitors. He is not one of them, not some misguided 23-year-old student ditching class at Oxford and traveling through all the Scandinavian capitals who were on the wrong sides of that conflict for freedom against Barry McCaffrey and his quest to rid Vietnam of oppression, as my dad helped rid France of oppression at the beginning of this century.

No, we have got one heck of a battle before us. And let me give some good news here on the defense authorization bill that we just won with 287 votes to 129. Now, just some simple arithmetic for young students who may be following the course of events here on the floor. Mr. Speaker. To override a President's veto in this House you need two-thirds. Two-thirds of 435 is 290. So if you are looking up at the lights at either end of the Chamber and you see that they hit 145, you know that the President is going to be supported in a veto. They hit 129.

We did not have to hit 290, although I saw three Republicans running who missed the vote, who were all going to vote with me, so we would have hit 290. Now, if he vetoes this defense authorization bill because of Dornan language in it to cut off abortions, to put out of the military, respectfully, gently, over 6 months, with full military hospital service and an honorable discharge, people who stuck a filthy needle in their arm, rolled up their white, khaki, or blue sleeve to stick a needle in their arms and get infected with the HIV virus, and we are going to give them an honorable discharge. If they go to a men's room and have unsafe sex with a stranger, anal sex, we are going to give them an honorable discharge in 6 months. If they go to a house of prostitution and have sex, against orders of their commander, do not go to that house of prostitution, it is off limits, every prostitute is infected with AID's, and they break the law, dishonorably, and go, they get a 6-month time to adjust their affairs, FIIGMO, FIIGMO means, let me get a softer version, ''forget it, I got my orders.'' They will not be productive for 6 months. And then they get an honorable discharge, while Michael New, who would not put on the U.N. beanie or wear the U.N. patch on his military uniform, which is in the regs that he should not have to, today he got a bad conduct discharge in Germany. As the chairman of Military Personnel, Mr. Speaker, you better believe I will be having hearings on that.

So there is the two bad things about the defense bill today. Why we had to take out U.N. command and control beats me, but is that going to be a key Presidential issue of the next 286 days? And I have been on that trail without much money, back in the track, let me tell you without refutation, Mr. Speaker, the surest standing ovation in Republican primaries, whether it is Buchanan or Keyes or Lamar Alexander or our leader in the other body, BOB DOLE, the minute one of us says to U.S. men and women under foreign or U.N. control, instant standing ovation, Mr. Speaker, pounding standing ovation, long. And Clinton wants to take that one on and demanded that we take our language out of the bill.

Here are a few notes on that. In vetoing the defense bill, in part due to the provisions on U.N. and foreign command the control, Clinton demonstrated once again he is more interested in furthering the multilateral agenda of the United Nations than in looking out for the welfare of U.S. troops.

This is all from Mr. SPENCE's team, these talking points. The provision in question would have required by law that before placing U.S. troops under the operation and control of the United Nations, or any other foreign entity, a President would have to certify that it would be in the national security interest to do so. It would not have prohibited a President from placing U.S. forces under the U.N. control. It would have merely required that he formally justify such action in writing to this Congress, thereby to our American people. Rather than weaken our provision, the conference agreement drops this provision. Again, no deal is better than a bad deal.

This action represents a continued commitment to the principle that only qualified U.S. commanders, like Barry McCaffrey, should command U.S. troops in battle.

In contrast, the Clinton administration continues to insist, I call this the Strobe Talbot factor, the Clintons had dinner with him again on New Year's Eve or New Year's Day while our troops, and I, were in Germany at the railheads, trying not to mash their fingers in ice rings, lashing all that heavy armored equipment to trains that go through disgusting railheads in Hungary where, there were no toilet facilities or anything, and there is Clinton golfing at Hilton Head at South Carolina with Strobe Talbot.

But the Strobe Talbot factor is to place U.S. troops under the operational command of U.N. commanders during so-called peacekeeping or peace enforcement operations, this in spite of the U.N. having repeatedly demonstrated in Bosnia and Somalia, and I have left out Haiti, a nightmare waiting to explode, the incompetence of the U.N., their negligence in attempting to

carry out the most rudimentary of military operations.

□ 1730

The Army officer friend of mine just back from Haiti said the whorehouses in Haiti are thriving with U.N. personnel on a revolving-door visit policy, just as they went to the houses of prostitution like Sonia's Kontiki in Bosnia where some of the women being held there were slaves under the control of renegade Serbian Bosnians.

Accordingly, we conservatives remain committed to limiting the ability of any administration to place U.S. forces at risk on behalf of the United Nations and will aggressively pursue our policy in any number of legislative vehicles during the upcoming session of Congress, and we are well into it.

Now, national missile defense. This one blows my mind. In the week that one of my heroes, Danny Graham, three-star general, West Point graduate, son of an Army sergeant major, Danny Graham was buried at Arlington this week. In the week that General Graham is buried, the father of high frontier. The main civilian, albeit retired military, proponent of strategic defense, the strategic defense initiative. One of the men, that great genius, Dr. Edward Teller brought the idea to Ronald Reagan.

Danny Graham died too young a man. He was 75, and Danny was buried with full military honors, because he is a former head of DIA, a No. 2 man at CIA. A three-star general's funeral at Arlington is something that will not leave any dry eye with any patriot in the audience. The week he is buried, this Paul Revere, as I used to call him when I would introduce him. I worked for him during the 2 years I was out of this House when I had to move from West Los Angeles to Orange County to continue my congressional career.

In that week, Clinton vetoes, jerks out of our bill with his veto power, National Missile Defense. Clinton's veto of the original defense bill further the differences between the Congress, which supports the deployment of a national defense way in the majority here and in the Senate, and Clinton who has now demonstrated his opposition to defending the American people at home in America from ballistic missile attack.

Rather than compromise on an issue of principle, the national missile defense language opposed by Clinton was removed from the bill we passed today. To modify it to meet the White House's objections would have weakened to the point of making it meaningless.

The fight goes on, Mr. Speaker. On a matter of principle, no deal is better than a bad deal. Other ballistic missile defense related provisions have been retained, particularly the one I championed, Navy high-tier, upper-tier missile defense. We kept in the additional $450 million for the establishment, just transferring it to a core theater missile defense, TMD.

The acceleration of key theater missile defense systems, that is where we protect our men overseas and women, and the allies who are with us, which is fine, should be done and a moral thing to do. But what about the wives and husbands and children and families back in the good old U.S.A.?

We have provisions which will prevent Clinton from implementing any agreement with Russia on theater missile defense demarcation, quote-unquote, unless certain conditions are met. We House Republicans remain committed as ever to pursuing an aggressive policy to protect the American people from ballistic missile defense. Our fight will continue on several fronts, including the fiscal year 1997 budget cycle, which begins any day now, where we start our housekeeping with 13 appropriations spending bills.

The gentleman from California, Mr. BONO from the gorgeous lower desert of California, Palm Springs and that area, it was a year ago tonight, give or take a few days, that the gentleman regaled the glitterati, the cognoscenti, the Washington press corps, and told them that his introduction to the rough and tumble in the House was BOB DORNAN in the well with a 1-minute critiquing Clinton, and he thought I was going to eat the lectern that he is now leaning on.

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. I did, approximately a year ago, joke with him and that is the way he took it. But I just want to say about Congressman DORNAN that he is not to be taken lightly. He is a fighter, if I have ever seen a fighter. He is a man that lives, breathes, and sleeps what he believes.

There is not a hypocritical bone in his body. There is no hypocrisy in the man whatsoever. And so I am proud to be his friend. When I listen to him sometimes, the determination that he pursues a fight to bring America where it should be, and continues, whether the odds are a million to one or 1 to 1, and I know this, until his dying breath, he will never quit.

So, I am proud to call him my friend and I am proud that he is on our side. I am proud that he is working so hard for this country, and I thank him.

BOB, did I hear the President say he wanted charter school systems last night?

Mr. DORNAN. Yes, you sure did.

Mr. BONO. I find that fascinating, because in California, we had Proposition 174. I think you recall that. The Democrats were vehement against Proposition 174, which simply said we should have the right to school choice. Last night I heard the President say we should have the right to school choice. That is baffling me, Mr. Speaker.

I think he even mentioned vouchers, did he not, BOB?

Mr. DORNAN. He sure did.

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, we again said we want vouchers, not for the rich, but for everybody so that they could choose what school their children went to.

I was not going to come down here, but I heard Congresswoman WOOLSEY talk about education. First of all, our budget increases education. It does not decrease. So, where or why she has concluded that it is a decrease is simply not the facts.

It is so frustrating to come to this body and listen to talk or rhetoric or whatever you want to call it, and hear people just say whatever they want to say and it has nothing to do with the truth. I guess that is why I ran for office.

Last night, the President talked about education. He revered education. Education is a wonderful thing, and as I said, we have increased funding for education. But he left out, I guess, kindergarten to elementary because in elementary schools now, they have barbed wire along the fences right now. I would love to send my children to a public school, but I would not dare.

Mr. DORNAN. Not to keep people in, but to keep thugs and drug pushers out.

Mr. BONO. I would love to send them to a public school so they would have that kind of exposure to total life, but I would fear for their lives.

I remember when I was a little boy, the President was saying how rosy things are now, but I remember when I was a little boy, 5 years old or 6, I could walk to school. I guarantee you if your child walked to school now at that age, he would get kidnaped and molested and probably killed. So to say things are so much rosier and better now is simply not true. Our public education system at that level is horrible. It is dastardly.

If you send your child to elementary school now, the chances of him or her getting an education are impossible. It cannot happen. Fortunately, I have a few dollars. I can send my kids to a private school.

Mr. DORNAN. You mean like Sidwell School, like where beautiful Chelsea goes?

Mr. BONO. Exactly. Exactly. Which again is very interesting, because schools are so safe and so wonderful, but our very own President sends his child to a private school. I never could figure out the justification for that.

Mr. DORNAN. SONNY, reclaiming my time. Let me read one of those opening paragraphs.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, listen to this. This is the paragraph after the ''thank you'' to the Speaker and Mr. Vice President and Members of the 104th Congress, and other pleasantries. ''I want to begin by saying to our men and women in uniform around the world.'' That is great. He is always with them taking photo opportunities, but we wonder still why he cannot gag

out the word Vietnam, although he did slip once last night in introducing another hero from the Oklahoma City bombing. He slipped and said he had been a Vietnam veteran. That is the first time I ever heard him say the word. He did not say that in the order to sending our men to Bosnia. He mentioned Northern Ireland and every war we have been in, but he forgot to mention Vietnam. Interesting. And all the Vietnam senior sergeants and officers noticed it. Now he says the state of our Union is strong, but your kids cannot walk to school.

''We have created nearly 8 million new American jobs.'' That is still way below what Ronald Reagan created, and he created it by cutting taxes. If Clinton had not created the largest tax increase in the history of any nation and all of civilization, because we cannot codify what the Egyptians got out of slave labor, this is the biggest tax increase in history.

But here is a part germane to what the gentleman is talking about. He says, ''Our leadership in the world is strong.'' We are the last superpower because of what Reagan and Cap Weinberger and George Bush did, not because of him; not the way we are chopping back the military.

He says, ''We are gaining ground and restoring our fundamental values.'' Not according to what the gentleman just said. He said, ''The crime rate is down.'' That is a misrepresentation. The baby-boomers are aging out of their high-testosterone-lending-itself-to-violence period. But at the bottom. The violence among young people is worse than ever.

He says, ''Welfare rates are down.'' They are not. ''The food stamp rolls are down.'' They are not. That is a misrepresentation. And then he says, ''The teenage pregnancy rate is down.'' That drove our Whip, the gentleman from Texas, TOM DELAY, up the wall. What country is he looking at? Because I saw the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] take him on, and I saw our one Independent, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], cheering, ''That is right.'' It is not that rosy.

We do have problems with our workforce. And then he says, ''We live in an Age of Possibility.'' That sounds like Jack Kemp and NEWT and the Opportunity Society and all the upbeat stuff that we Republicans are getting BOB DOLE to talk about, and that is what is giving Steve Forbes the shot, with his inherited millions, in the number 2 spot.

But, back to Mr. BONO and a reality check on how rosy things are.

Mr. BONO. Thank you for pointing out exactly what I am talking about. You know, I chose to be a Republican because the symbol of Republicans is responsibility. Selling the message of be a victim is an easy message to sell. It is probably 200-to-1 to sell, a message of ''Be responsible.'' But this man has been talking for half an hour about that we have to become responsible. Well, we must become responsible.

I get so fed up when I hear the other side come down here in this well and just say whatever they feel like saying. And when Congresswoman WOOLSEY took off on education, education stinks. I cannot say it another way. It stinks.

We spend more money than anybody and have the worst results. So now the solution to that is to spend even more money and still have it not achieve anything? No, that is not the truth. No, that is not what we should do. We should really look at our educational system and find out what we are doing wrong, which is staggering, and make an attempt to start doing things right so that all children, like when I was a little boy, can go back to public school again, which is almost impossible in this day.

Public schools do not teach. They are not safe. They have become political. They do not stand for what they are supposed to stand for any longer.

So, to paint that rosy picture about education just disturbed me so much because I wanted so badly for my two little children to go to public school and experience that, but I cannot. I would not dare do that to them.

Now, I am telling you the truth, and I guess the other side finds the truth unpleasant and, therefore, they prefer to not tell reality. Reality, when they say how mean we are. Well, when we talk about Medicare, all we are trying to do when we talk about Medicare is instead of ending it in 7 years, which is what will happen now if we continue on this rosy path that supposedly exists, it will end in 7 years.

□ 1745

We have extended it to 5 years. So we are telling you the truth. It is so hard to tell you that truth because it is so much easier to hear, do not worry about anything. There is plenty of money here and we will give it all to you. That is a lie. We do not have plenty of money. We owe $5 trillion and we are starting to work on 6, and that is going to accumulate fast and that rubberband is going to break very soon.

I think that all my colleagues, including Mr. DORNAN, I give them credit for being brave because what we are trying to convey to you is not necessarily popular and it can hurt our polls. It can hurt our public relations. It is so much easier to say rosy things, but to not tell you the truth, to not let you really confront the future as it is going to exist in reality but paint a rosy picture is a lie.

I did not come here to lie. I came here because I think we are at the edge. We are right at the cliff. If we do not grab this country and bring it back, it will dissipate and explode and we will not have it anymore.

Mr. DORNAN. Let me ask Mr. BONO, a freshman, as well known as any of the freshmen in that exciting group of 73 people, was this first year for you more difficult than you imagined it would be? Did we accomplish more than you thought? Is your energy and your optimism level still at high pitch?

Mr. BONO. I follow your example. I am very impressed by the amount of energy that you put into this job and not necessarily deal with the consequences. I happily go in that path of whatever the—I am dedicated to saving this country. So my energy will always be 110 percent.

Mr. DORNAN. We only have about 6 months. We are going to vote tomorrow, Wednesday, Thursday next week, then no votes until after the Iowa caucuses and the primary at the end of February, February 20 in New Hampshire. Because BOB DOLE is the leader and wants to be in those States, there will not be any votes in the Senate, none. So then we have March, April, May, June, and July, that is 5 months, out for August. We come back for a wild September, hoping to get our 13 spending appropriations bills, our housekeeping work here finished by September 30. We will be out in the first few days of October to have 1 month to campaign. So we are talking about 6 months.

What I am building up to is, do you appreciate how the American people in their own enlightened self-interest should give the Republicans for the third time in 66 years more than one of 2-year berths. If we are defeated and lose this on November 5 of this year, that means in 66 years, since 1930, before I was born, we have had three 2-year berths.

What I am going to recommend the rest of this year is give us a 100-percent disabled charging war hero, if DOLE prevails, and I am trying to overtake him but I need some money to do it, if DOLE prevails, put DOLE in the White House, a man who put his blood into the soil of your native land, Italy, in Europe and TRENT LOTT is a leader in the Senate and NEWT GINGRICH reinvigorated, listening more to his true conservative friends in this House than the person who says he embraced him as he sobbed uncontrollably, so this person says, and then this farm State Congressman leaked all of that to NEWT's enemies at the Washington Post for a front page story last week. I know who that dairy farm State Congressman was. NEWT better pay attention to his friends in this House, his friends who believe in family and faith and freedom and espouse it in their life styles.

If he comes back to home base and is inspired by TRENT LOTT and we have a Republican in the White House, we are going to need not just the next 6 months but the 105th Congress, two exciting sessions, to try and bring us, as you put it, on the edge of the lectern, back from the brink or as Alistair Cooke said, we are at a crossroads. We are almost schizophrenic, tearing ourselves in half. We better make the right decisions.

Let me read something to you, where Mr. Clinton last night said, here are the seven challenges. First, cherish our children and strengthen the American

family. This weekend I went to Memphis, SONNY, and I stayed with two families, the Langstons and the Fergusons. They had both been to Promise Keepers, the big event in Dallas, tens of thousands of fathers swearing to not commit adultery on their wives, swearing to be loyal to their children and their brides. And who attacks them? NOW. Patricia Ireland, chief spear carrier for the lesbian movement in America. She is yelling at Promise Keepers because men are standing up and saying they want to be loyal to their families. Unbelievable.

He asked the broadcast industry to rate the programming, as the movie industry does. I do not know where we are going to go with that.

Second, provide Americans with educational opportunities. You are on the right committees. Listen to this. He wants to lash every classroom to the information highway by 2000. What is going to be on that highway? He says schools and communities must adopt national standards. What is that, dumbing down to the lowest common denominator.

Then under challenge 3, this is the one that caught your attention among several items, he said help every American achieve economic security, create a $2,600 voucher for the unemployed or underemployed to use for their education and training. How about vouchers for all of our children? That will be stopped by the liberal dominant wing of his permissively liberal party.

Then he says, fourth, take back our streets from crime, gangs, and drugs. That is what I have been trying to do as a father and since I have come here a grandfather all my life. It is liberal permissiveness and liberal fascination, not with the victims of crime but with the perpetrators of crime, trying to figure out how to help them work their way through the legal system and get back out on the streets more quickly.

He says keep the crime bill of 1994 on the books. You could have lost because of that crime bill. And because 11 Republicans went down to the White House and gave him what he wanted, we lost 10 to 20 Republican seats. We should be at 256, if it were not for the political garbage and waste of billions in that phony crime bill of 1994.

Mr. BONO. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, since you are making these points on crime and crime prevention. Are we not at war?

Mr. DORNAN. It is a war.

Mr. BONO. Is it crime prevention anymore or is it full blown war?

Mr. DORNAN. SONNY, you may not know Gen. Barry McCaffrey personally. Nothing is all dark in life. Clinton's appointment to the FBI, Louis Freeh, father of five kids, great guy, tough judge, tough agent in the street, Barry McCaffrey and the southern, the CINC, Commander in Chief of Southern Command down there in Panama. He came to the Heritage Foundation recently and gave this startling statistic: 100 percent of the cocaine in the world comes from South America through the Panama Canal, through the Caribbean area. He is going to be a great general in command of a war against this poison of narcotics.

Mr. BONO. Would you consider it a war when a family accidentally drives down the wrong street and is blown to oblivion because they simply accidentally made a wrong turn? Can crime prevention help that or is that war?

Mr. DORNAN. I was in Los Angeles the night that story broke on the news. We had not recovered from the travesty of justice that O.J. Simpson got away with, slitting two throats to the spine and stabbing an innocent young man 17 times. The whole city is still in the throes of that, all these divisions. And here comes this unbelievable story, throwing ashcans. I do not know the ethnic background of anybody in that story. I never saw enough pictures.

I did see one crying uncle, trying to make a statement to the press, but it was a little 4-year-old girl that took a bullet in the head as the father tried to drive out of a cul-de-sac where he had gotten off the freeway and took a wrong turn. A gang decided to take him on.

Let me tell you something, SONNY. I only have one classic car I am trying to rebuild.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Members are reminded to refer to other Members by their last name and State.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. BONO, last week a car that I was restoring—just spent about $3 to $4,000 on it last year—a 31-year-old classic 1964 fire mist red El Dorado automobile, was towed by a tow truck out of my son's carport on Church Lane in west Los Angeles, a few blocks from OJ's Rockingham house—but an apartment building. They came at noon on a slight rainy, drizzly day last week, hooked it up to a tow truck, because the battery is not hooked up, the gearbox is not finished. I am restoring the car that I bought 31 years ago used.

I got it with some residuals from the series ''Twelve O'clock High.'' It is gone now to some shop down somewhere in Los Angeles. The people that stole the car were sitting in it 3 days before. My son was back here with me, got snowed in with that blizzard. Neighbors saw them. They said, would he sell this car, the owner? No way, they are restoring it. Cut the Club off the wheel. Police were called by my son's neighbors. They came and said somebody has to call the owner. They forgot who.

They said this car is going to be stolen. Two or three days later at noon, by tow truck. My 31-year-old classic is towed away.

I heard somebody asking for help to bring down a child molester. Let me be creative, SONNY, since this well goes into homes all over America, maybe 1,300,000 people. I do not want to get too wild with the reward, but I will give $2,000. I will cash the check, 2,000 bucks cash for whoever will get me back my 1964, I call it my POW El Dorado because I got it the month the first POW as shot down. I was going to give it to a POW, I fantasized, at the end of that war, get back my fire mist red, and that license plate, this historical vehicle, HV295, D for DORNAN, HV295, D for DORNAN. This is what I will give, 2,000 bucks cash to get my El Dorado back.

By the way, that is my fourth automobile stolen in Los Angeles in 20 years, three of them in the last 10. I have only gotten back one. It was in Tijuana sitting on a hill with the tires off it, but I got that back and I still own that red Bronco.

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that, do not ever take Congressman DORNAN lightly. One thing you can be sure of, as certain as these are chairs, that he will always tell you the truth. And whether it is pleasant or unpleasant, he will tell you the truth. And that is why I am a Republican. So you are an inspiration to me.

For that reason, of which I am very proud of you, and I hope that I can always follow in your footsteps in that I will always, whenever I speak to the public, tell them the truth.

With that, I thank the gentleman for giving me the time in the well.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have got one final valuable contribution to offer here.

Turning back to my Constitution, printed by the bicentennial committee that I have been carrying for years here, as far as the President's Commander in Chief responsibilities, I quoted article III, section 3 earlier, here is article II, section 2; III.3 is on aid and comfort to the enemy. II.2 says this, 16 words: The President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. Bingo. Sixteen more words on militia, and of the militia of the several States, 13 then, when called into the actual service of the United States. There was no National Guard then. So that is 18 more words, if you strip away all the the's and the and's, and the Army and the Navy and the in chief and all of this, it says President, Commander in Chief. That is it. That is it. There is nothing else in the Constitution.

Who says that our Presidents, and this is my disagreement with one of our great leaders on the other side, who says the President of the United States can send people to Somalia, to Bosnia, to Haiti, or to Lebanon without getting the approval of this Congress? That is why I argued with my friend Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense, and the Navy combat attack pilot, carrier pilot George Bush. You cannot go to the gulf in a serious major conflict. I do not care if you have 28 nations banded together.

□ 1800

They are all getting the permissions of their Dumas and their congresses

and their Knessets and their various legislatures. You must come here. Dick Cheney used to tell me ''We will lose.'' I said ''You will not lose. You will lose the liberal leadership in the Senate and the House, and if we lost every one of them, but you win enough Democrats, we will have a big victory.'' The victory was 180 saying no, we cannot free Kuwait and protect world oil sources and stop Saddam Hussein from getting biological, chemical, and nuclear warfare terror capability, and on the winning side, how could I forget the winning side and remember the losing side, 253 to 180, a great vote.

Now, we have a scholar at the Library of Congress, Lewis Fisher.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD Lewis Fisher's scholarly treatise on the Barbary wars, with more to come on why the President does not have the constitutional authorities to send young men and women all around the world at his whim.

The material referred to is as follows:

THE BARBARY WARS: LEGAL PRECEDENT FOR INVADING HAITI?

(By Louis Fisher)

SUMMARY

The claim that President Clinton has constitutional authority to invade Haiti without first obtaining congressional authority is often linked to early presidential actions. Supporters of broad executive power argue that a President may deploy troops on his own authority and that Congress can restrain him only after he acts. As support for this position, the Barbary Wars during the time of Presidents Jefferson and Madison are often cited. However, the historical record demonstrates that these military operations received advance authority from Congress. To the extent that presidential initiatives were taken before congressional action, they were defensive in nature and not offensive (as contemplated for Haiti).

BACKGROUND

During the presidencies of George Washington and John Adams, U.S. military action conformed to the framers' expectation that the decision to go to war or to mount military operations was reserved to Congress and required advance authorization. For example, President Washington's military actions against Indian tribes were initially authorized by Congress. Stat. 96, §5 (1789); Stat. 121, §16 (1790); Stat. 222 (1791). Consistent with these statutes, military operations were confined to defensive measures. Offensive action required authority from Congress. The Writings of George Washington (John C. Fitzpatrick ed. 1939).

Similarly, when President Washington used military force in the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794, he acted on the basis of statutory authority. Stat. 264, §1 (1792). President John Adams engaged in the ''quasi-war'' with France from 1798 to 1800. Although Congress did not declare war, military activities were fully authorized by more than two dozen statutes in 1798. Stat. 547–611.

ACTIONS BY JEFFERSON AND MADISON

Elected President in 1800, Thomas Jefferson inherited the pattern established during the Washington and Adams administrations: Congress had to authorize offensive military actions in advance. One of the first issues awaiting Jefferson was the practice of paying annual bribes (''tributes'') to four states of North Africa: Morocco, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. Regular payments were made so that these countries would not interfere with American merchantmen. Over a period of ten years, Washington and Adams paid nearly $10,000,000 in tributes.

In his capacity as Secretary of State in 1790, Jefferson had identified for Congress a number of options in dealing with the Barbary powers. In each case it was up to Congress to establish national policy and the executive branch to implement it:

Upon the whole, it rests with Congress to decide between war, tribute, and ransom, as the means of reestablishing our Mediterranean commerce. If war, they will consider how far our own resources shall be called forth, and how far they will enable the Executive to engage, in the forms of the constitution, the co-operation of other Powers. If tribute or ransom, it will rest with them to limit and provide the amount; and with the Executive, observing the same constitutional forms, to make arrangements for employing it to the best advantage. 1 American State Papers: Foreign Relations 105 (Walter Lowrie & Matthew St. Clair Clarke, eds. 1832).

On March 3, 1801, one day before Jefferson took office as President, Congress passed legislation to provide for a ''naval peace establishment.'' 2 Stat. 110, §2 (1801). On May 15, Jefferson's Cabinet debated the President's authority to use force against the Barbary powers. The Cabinet agreed that American vessels could repel an attack, but some departmental heads insisted on a larger definition of executive power. For example, Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, remarked: ''The Executive can not put us in a state of war, but if we be put into that state either by the decree of Congress or of the other nation, the command and direction of the public force then belongs to the Executive.'' Other departmental heads expressed different views. Franklin B. Sawvel, ed., The Complete Anas of Thomas Jefferson 213 (1903).

After hearing these opinions from his Cabinet, Jefferson chose to rely on statutory authority rather than theories of inherent presidential power. Citing the statute of March 3, the State Department issued a directive on May 20 to Captain Richard Dale of the U.S. Navy, stating that under ''this [statutory] authority'' Jefferson had directed that a squadron be sent to the Mediterranean. If the Barbary powers declared war on the United States, American vessels were ordered to ''protect our commerce & chastise their insolence—by sinking, burning or destroying their ships & Vessels wherever you shall find them.'' 1 Naval Documents Relating to the United States Wars With the Barbary Powers 467 (1939). Having issued that order, based on congressional authority, Jefferson also wrote that it was up to Congress to decide what policy to pursue in the Mediterranean: ''The real alternative before us is whether to abandon the Mediterranean or to keep up a cruise in it, perhaps in rotation with other powers who would join us as soon as there is peace. But this Congress must decide.'' The Writings of Thomas Jefferson 63–64 (Ford ed. 1897).

Insisting on a larger tribute, the Pasha of Tripoli declared war on the United States. Jefferson did not interpret this action as authority for the President to engage in unlimited military activities. He informed Congress on December 8, 1801, about the demands of the Pasha. Unless the United States paid tribute, the Pasha threatened to seize American ships and citizens. Jefferson had sent a small squadron of frigates to the Mediterranean to protect against the attack. He then asked Congress for further guidance, stating that he was ''[u]nauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense. . . .'' It was up to Congress to authorize ''measures of offense also.'' Jefferson gave Congress all the documents and communications it needed so that the legislative branch, ''in the exercise of this important function confided by the Constitution to the Legislature exclusively,'' could consider the situation and act in the manner it considered most appropriate. A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents 315 (James D. Richardson ed. 1897–1925) (hereafter ''Richardson'').

Alexander Hamilton, writing under the pseudonym ''Lucius Crassus,'' issued a strong critique of Jefferson's message to Congress. Hamilton believed that Jefferson had defined executive power with insufficient scope, deferring too much to Congress. But even Hamilton, pushing the edge of executive power, never argued that the President had full power to make war on other nations. Hamilton merely argued that when a foreign nation declares war on the United States, the President may respond to that fact without waiting for congressional authority:

The first thing in [the President's message], which excites our surprise, is the very extraordinary position, that though Tripoli had declared war in form against the United States, and had enforced it by actual hostility, yet that there was not power, for want of the sanction of Congress, to capture and detain her cruisers with their crews.

. . . [The Constitution] has only provided affirmatively, that, ''The Congress shall have power to declare War;'' the plain meaning of which is, that it is the peculiar and exclusive province of Congress, when the nation is at peace to change that state into a state of war; whether from calculations of policy, or from provocations, or injuries received: in other words, it belongs to Congress only, to go to War. But when a foreign nation declares, or openly and avowedly makes war upon the United States, they are then by the very fact already at war, and any declaration of the part of Congress is nugatory; it is at least unnecessary.'' The Works of Alexander Hamilton 745–747 (John C. Hamilton ed.).

Congress responded to Jefferson's message by authorizing him to equip armed vessels to protect commerce and seamen in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and adjoining seas. The statute authorized American ships to seize vessels belonging to the Bey of Tripoli, with the captured property distributed to those who brought the vessels into port. 2 Stat. 129 (1802). Legislators had no doubt about their constitutional authority and duties. ''The simple question now,'' said Cong. William Eustis, ''is whether [the President] shall be empowered to take offensive steps.'' Cong. Samuel Smith added: ''By the prescriptions of the law, the President deemed himself bound.'' Annals of Cong., 7th Cong., 1st Sess. 328–329 (1801).

Congress continued to pass legislation authorizing military action against the Barbary powers. Legislation in 1803 provided additional armament for the protection of seamen and U.S. commerce. 2 Stat. 106. Legislation the next year gave explicit support for ''warlike operations against the regency of Tripoli, or any other of the Barbary powers.'' 2 Stat. 291. Duties on foreign goods were placed in a ''Mediterranean Fund'' to finance these operations. Id. at 292, §2. Further legislation on the Barbary powers appeared in 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1811, 1812, and 1813. 2 Stat. 391 (1806); 2 Stat. 436 (1807); 2 Stat. 456 (1808); 2 Stat. 511 (1809); 2 Stat. 616 (1811); 2 Stat. 675 (1812); 2 Stat. 809 (1813).

Jefferson often distinguished between defensive and offensive military operations, permitting presidential initiatives for the former but not for the latter. In 1805, he notified Congress about a conflict with the Spanish along the eastern boundary of the Louisiana Territory (West Florida). After detailing

the problem he noted: ''Considering that Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force in any degree which could be avoided.'' 1 Richardson 377.

Military conflicts in the Mediterranean continued after Jefferson left office. The Dey of Algiers made war against U.S. citizens trading in that region and kept some in captivity. With the conclusion of the War of 1812 with England, President Madison recommended to Congress in 1815 that it declare war on Algiers: ''I recommend to Congress the expediency of an act declaring the existence of a state of war between the United States and the Dey and Regency of Algiers, and of such provisions as may be requisite for a vigorous prosecution of it to a successful issue.'' 2 Richardson 539. Instead of a declaration of war, Congress passed legislation ''for the protection of the commerce of the United States against the Algerine cruisers.'' The first line of the statute read: ''Whereas the Dey of Algiers, on the coast of Barbary, has commenced a predatory warfare against the United States. . . .'' Congress gave Madison authority to use armed vessels for the purpose of protecting the commerce of U.S. seamen on the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and adjoining seas. U.S. vessels (both governmental and private) could ''subdue, seize, and make prize of all vessels, goods and effects of or belonging to the Dey of Algiers.'' 3 Stat. 230 (1815).

An American flotilla set sail for Algiers, where it captured two of the Dey's ships and forced him to stop the piracy, release all captives, and renounce the practice of annual tribute payments. Similar treaties were obtained from Tunis and Tripoli. By the end of 1815, Madison could report to Congress on the successful termination of the war with Algiers.

LEGISLATIVE CONTROLS ON PROSPECTIVE ACTIONS

Can Congress only authorize and declare war, or may it also establish limits on prospective presidential actions? The statutes authorizing President Washington to ''protect the inhabitants'' of the frontiers ''from hostile incursions of the Indians'' were interpreted by the Washington administration as authority for defensive, not offensive, actions. 1 Stat. 96, §5 (1789); 1 Stat. 121, §16 (1790); 1 Stat. 222 (1791). Secretary of War Henry Knox wrote to Governor Blount on October 9, 1792: ''The Congress which possess the powers of declaring War will assemble on the 5th of next Month—Until their judgments shall be made known it seems essential to confine all your operations to defensive measures.'' 4 The Territorial Papers of the United States 196 (Clarence Edwin Carter ed. 1936). President Washington consistently held to this policy. Writing in 1793, he said that any offensive operations against the Creek Nation must await congressional action: ''The Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.'' 33 The Writings of George Washington 73.

The statute in 1792, upon which President Washington relied for his actions in the Whiskey Rebellion, conditioned the use of military force by the President upon an unusual judicial check. The legislation said that whenever the United States ''shall be invaded, or be in imminent danger of invasion from any foreign nation or Indian tribe,'' the President may call forth the state militias to repel such invasions and to suppress insurrections.'' 1 Stat. 264, §1 (1792). However, whenever federal laws were opposed and their execution obstructed in any state, ''by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the powers vested in the marshals by this act,'' the President would have to be first notified of that fact by an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court or by a federal district judge. Only after that notice could the President call forth the militia of the state to suppress the insurrection. Id., §2.

In the legislation authorizing the Quasi-War of 1798, Congress placed limits on what President Adams could and could not do. One statute authorized him to seize vessels sailing to French ports. He acted beyond the terms of this statute by issuing an order directing American ships to capture vessels sailing to or from French ports. A naval captain followed his order by seizing a Danish ship sailing from a French port. He was sued for damages and the case came to the Supreme Court. Chief Justice John Marshall ruled for a unanimous Court that President Adams had exceeded his statutory authority. Little v. Barreme, 6 U.S. (2 Cr.) 169 (1804).

The Neutrality Act of 1794 led to numerous cases before the federal courts. In one of the significant cases defining the power of Congress to restrict presidential war actions, a circuit court in 1806 reviewed the indictment of an individual who claimed that his military enterprise against Spain ''was begun, prepared, and set on foot with the knowledge and approbation of the executive department of the government.'' United States v. Smith, 27 Fed. Cas. 1192, 1229 (C.C.N.Y. 1806) (No. 16,342). The court repudiated his claim that a President could authorize military adventures that violated congressional policy. Executive officials were not at liberty to waive statutory provisions: ''if a private individual, even with the knowledge and approbation of this high and preeminent officer of our government [the President], should set on foot such a military expedition, how can be expect to be exonerated from the obligation of the law?'' The court said that the President ''cannot control the statute, nor dispense with its execution, and still less can he authorize a person to do what the law forbids. If he could, it would render the execution of the laws dependent on his will and pleasure; which is a doctrine that has not been set up, and will not meet with any supporters in our government. In this particular, the law is paramount.'' The President could not direct a citizen to conduct a war ''against a nation with whom the United States are at peace.'' Id. at 1230. The court asked: ''Does [the President] possess the power of making war? That power is exclusively vested in congress. . . . it is the exclusive province of Congress to change a state of peace in a state of war. Id.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO SAME CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rule, submitted a privilege report (Rept. No. 104–453) on the resolution (H. Res. 342) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON. BARBARA JORDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many fear the future, many are distrustful of their leaders, and believe that their voices are never heard. Many seek only to satisfy their private work wants and to satisfy their private interests. But this is the great danger America faces, that we will cease to be one Nation and become, instead, a collection of interest groups, city against suburb, region against region, individual against individual, each seeking to satisfy private wants.

Mr. Speaker, if that happens, who then will speak for America? Who then will speak for America? What are those of us who are elected public officials supposed to do? I will tell you this, we as public servants must set an example for the rest of the Nation. It is hypocritical for the public official to admonish and exhort the people to uphold the common good if we are derelict in upholding the common good. More is required of public officials than slogans and handshakes and press releases. More is required. We must hold ourselves strictly accountable. We must provide the people with a vision of the future.

Mr. Speaker, that was from Barbara Jordan, 1976, at the Democrat Convention.

Mr. Speaker, last week we lost an American hero. Barbara Jordan died last week on Wednesday, January 17, 1996, a friend to many, a mentor, and an icon. The late honorable Congresswoman, Barbara Jordan, who not only represented the 18th Congressional District of Texas that I am now privileged to serve, was one of the first two African-Americans from the South to be elected to this august body since reconstruction. She was a renaissance woman, eloquent, fearless, and peerless in her pursuit of justice and equality. She exhorted all of us to strive for excellence, stand fast for justice and fairness, and yield to no one in the matter of defending this Constitution and upholding the most sacred principles of a democratic government. To Barbara Jordan, the Constitution was a very profound document, one to be upheld.

The lady, Barbara Jordan, the first black woman elected to the Texas Senate, was born February 21, 1936, the daughter of Benjamin and Arlene Jordan. The youngest daughter of a Baptist minister, she lived with her two sisters in the Lyons Avenue area of Houston's Fifth Ward. The church played an important role in her life. She joined the Good Hope Baptist Church on August 15, 1953, under the leadership of Rev. A.A. Lucas, graduating with honors from Houston's Phyllis Wheatley High School in the Houston Independent School District.

Ms. Jordan went on to Texas Southern University, where she majored in government and history. While at Texas Southern University, Barbara Jordan was an active student and a member of the debate team for 4 years, and a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority. She got her tutelage under Dr. Thomas Freeman, who gave her the inspiration and certainly the training to formulate both her words and her tone, and to make her one of this world's greatest orators.

It was her involvement with the debate team that began for her a series of firsts that will become the hallmark of her professional life. Ms. Jordan was a member of the first debate team from a black university to compete in the forensic tournament held annually at Baylor College University in Texas. On that occasion, she won first place in junior oratory, one of many first place trophies in a career as a debater. We must remember at those times there were not many black debate teams from across the Nation competing in integrated tournaments. This was a first. Ms. Jordan was outstanding.

After graduating magna cum laude from Texas Southern University in 1956, she received her law degree from Boston University in 1959. This Constitution became part of Barbara Jordan's life, and she carried it everywhere she went. We already knew Barbara Jordan before the 1974 impeachment hearings, but her undaunted courage on that somber occasion etched her name in our memories forever.

Those of us who have been honored by having the public place its trust in us know the onerous burden and the weight of passing a vote destined to alter our history forever. We know what it took for Barbara Jordan to say ''yea, aye'' when the House Committee on the Judiciary roll was called on July 30, 1974, and we are still admiring her for it. That was the day we realized that she was much more than the gilded, persuasive voice that always held sway when she spoke.

I remember her talking about this momentous day and her participation in the Watergate hearings. This young woman, newly elected to Congress, took these responsibilities extremely seriously. She was concerned that people across the country felt that this Government was being undermined, that we were in the throes of a potential revolution, that all would be lost.

Barbara Jordan, concerned about the moment, the history, the impact, seriously studied all of the Watergate hearings in review, listened attentively, and indicated to all of us that she viewed this Constitution as a serious document and would not view it and see it be diminished. She took this role seriously, and she was concerned that she speak in measured words and tone, so those who might be looking would still have faith in the Constitution and in this Government. It was the honorable Barbara Jordan that calmed the fears of most Americans, saying that if she was there with her faith in this Constitution, albeit that she had not been included in this Constitution as an African-American when it was written, then they knew that all might be well.

We realize that Barbara Jordan was a tremendous moral force and was calling upon all of us to account to our conscience as a Nation. Her untimely death leaves a great void in our national leadership, and she will be sorely missed as we grapple with the great moral issues of the day.

Barbara Jordan was a lawyer, legislator, scholar, author, and presidential adviser. She was immensely gifted, and used every bit of her talent and skill to address, improve, and dignify the conditions of human life. In the tradition of Frederick Douglass, Martin Luther King, and Thurgood Marshall, she challenged the Federal Government and the American people to uphold the principles set forth in the American Constitution.

Congresswoman Jordan began her public career as a Texas State Senator. Might I say to you, she was a first then, for there had never been an African-American in the Texas Senate, and she stood tall and proud. Her voice, although eloquent and resonating throughout the halls, was full of passion, and she felt compelled to represent those, the least of her sisters and brothers, individuals who might never have gone outside of the realm of their neighborhood, who might not be able to read or write, did not have a job. She has spoken on behalf of small businesses. She was very concerned about civil rights, employment discrimination, equality and justice, even in the Texas Senate. She served her country with great distinction as a Member of Congress and chairwoman of the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform. Her extraordinary impact on our country will be felt for many generations.

She gained national prominence in the 1970's as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary during the impeachment hearings of President Richard Nixon. Again, her eloquent statement regarding her faith in the Constitution helped the Nation to focus on the principle that all elected officials, including the President of the United States, must abide by the mandates of the Constitution.

During her tenure in Congress, Congresswoman Barbara Jordan was a leader on issues relating to voting rights, consumer protection, energy, and the environment. Might I add that she was particularly forceful in including language minorities in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which then covered Texas, and also allowed for Hispanics and others to be included so that they would have equal justice under the law as right, and have full participation in this Nation, and a full part of this Constitution.

Additionally, Congresswoman Jordan played an active role in the Democratic Party. She served as a keynote speaker at the 1976 and 1992 Democratic National Conventions, and constantly challenged the Democratic Party to be a catalyst for progress and make the American dream a reality for all Americans.

After retiring from Congress, Congresswoman Jordan was appointed a distinguished professor at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin. This position enabled her to have a major influence on the next generation of public officials. She impressed her students with her intellect and ability to inspire them to achieve excellence in the classroom, and to be committed to public service.

Mr. Speaker, Barbara Jordan was buried on January 20, 1996. She was buried at the Texas National Cemetery. She was the first African-American in the history of the national State cemetery to be buried there, in her death a first, but making a statement that she was laid to rest among Texas heroes. They benefited because an American hero was laid to rest with them.

As I stood on the burial ground and participated in that ceremony, it was an overwhelming feeling, for it came to me that we lost her too early. This was reinforced when one of her students came up to me, stood next to me and said ''I know you.'' And I said ''Yes? And who are you?'' ''I'm a student. I was taught by the honorable professor Barbara Jordan.''

I said ''How interesting. You have a great experience to cherish.'' She said, ''Yes, and in her classroom, she talked a lot about you.'' Both of us, touched very much at that time, just stood and embraced, for this was a woman who was not afraid of sharing herself and others, and she was not afraid of young people. She loved them. She wanted to give to them, and in them, she saw the opportunity for love and caring and the future.

Congresswoman Barbara Jordan leaves the American people, particularly Members of Congress, a powerful legacy of commitment to freedom, integrity, government, and belief in human progress. She also leaves and is survived by her mother, Arlene Jordan, her sisters, Bennie Jordan Chriswell, Rosemary McGowan, brother-in-law, John Wesley McGowan, aunt and uncle, Mamie Reed Lee and Wilmer James Lee, close friends, Nancy Earle, Angie Taylor Morton, Muriel and Lee Dudley, Evelyn and Walter Harrison, Lonnie and Mary Elizabeth York, Robert and Norma Jones, Anna, Lois, and Carl T. Taylor, Billy Brown and Betty Thomas, Patsy Hurd, Jerry Earl, and Willie Calhoun.

I would simply say to you that she leaves throngs of others, hoping that her words will continue on in our hearts, but most importantly, in our actions. She stated:

America's mission was, and still is, to take diversity and mold it into a cohesive and coherent whole that would espouse virtues and

values essential to the maintenance of civil order. There is nothing easy about that mission, but it is not Mission Impossible.

The Honorable Barbara Jordan. Nothing was too hard for her to accept as a challenge, and nothing was too hard for her to overcome; a great American. We lost her, but not her words and her message.

I am delighted today to be joined by the gentlewoman from North Carolina, the Honorable EVA CLAYTON, who has come from the great State of North Carolina, in fact knows of the great works of the Honorable Barbara Jordan, and is likewise an African-American woman serving in the U.S. Congress.

I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for arranging this special order, Mr. Speaker, and allowing us to participate in it, and to give honor to it.

Mr. Speaker, when I speak of freedom, fairness, justice, and equality—words that compose the very foundation of this democracy—I often quote Barbara Jordan.

Barbara Jordan was more than a leading figure, a great stateswoman, and an oratorical genius. She was the essence of leadership, the epitome of statesmanship, and the embodiment of oratory.

She believed in America, and the principles underlying the creation of this Nation. More importantly, she was not afraid to fight for those principles and to stand up for her beliefs. Perhaps a speech she delivered in 1974, best captured her firmness and her fight. In discussing the meaning of the Constitution, she stated, ''We, the people.'' ''It is a very eloquent beginning.'' ''But when that document was completed on the 17th of September, in 1787, I was not included in that 'We the people.'''

Barbara Jordan continued, ''I felt somehow for many years that George Washington and Alexander Hamilton, just left me out by mistake. But through the process of amendment, interpretation, and court decision, I have finally been included in, 'We the people.'''

All of us can imagine the penetrating way she said those words. With a distinctive style, a commanding voice, in clear, crisp language—there was only one Barbara Jordan. When she spoke—we listened—the world listened.

And, few interpreted the meaning of the Constitution like Barbara Jordan.

It is for that reason that we acknowledge the deep and wide abyss that has been left by a death, too soon, at age 50, on January 17.

Her career of public service began in service.

Never reluctant to do her part, in 1960, she addressed envelopes for the Kennedy campaign.

Her special talents, however, were soon recognized, and she was elected as the first black woman in the Texas State Legislature, and the first black woman elected to Congress from the South.

In many ways, Mr. Speaker, she paved the way for me and for other African-American women. It is also, in many ways, ironic that Barbara Jordan's political interest was first sparked by reflection on the deeds of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Today's Republican Party often discusses its efforts in terms of revolution and makes comparisons and contrasts with the New Deal days of Roosevelt. It is ironic because, it is said that, Barbara Jordan's grandfather never began a meal without thanking God, ''for FDR and the Home Finance Administration, which made this house possible.''

Perhaps that early lesson gave her the clear vision that, indeed, government has a role in our lives. She left Congress in 1978, to assume a teaching position at the University of Texas—of course, she was teaching all along. We shall never forget the stirring keynote addresses she gave at Democratic Conventions 16 years apart, in 1976, and again in 1992. What was remarkable was that neither time, nor space, nor distance had tarnished her devotion to America's fundamentals. ''Won 'em both,'' she said.

The Watergate hearings may have thrust Barbara Jordan across the national landscape. But, it was an unwavering spirit, a daring dedication and an unmatched commitment to this Nation that made Barbara Jordan who she was. It is because Barbara Jordan believed that there is a place for all in America—young and old; black and white; male and female; rich and poor. And, it is because Barbara Jordan has died that each of us must never stop insisting upon that place. That is our challenge.

The Statue of Liberty was closed during the Government shutdowns—an inauspicious symbol of today's America. But, to the end, Barbara Jordan stood fighting for fundamentals. As chair of the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, her most recent public service post, she stated, ''It was immigration that taught us, it does not matter where you came from, or who your parents were. What counts is who you are.'' I shall continue to quote Barbara Jordan.

The pearls of wisdom she shared with us in life, live on through death. Freedom, fairness, justice, and equality—We are far closer, today, than ever before, to those words which, too often, are mere platitudes. And, we will continue to be closer, because the spirit of Barbara Jordan lives.

□ 1815

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina. I applaud and agree with her words that only because of her words and actions are we closer to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Texas, as well as her colleagues. I think if Barbara Jordan were here, she would be proud of the words spoken on her behalf by all of my colleagues, and I commend that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it gives me great honor to be able to yield time to the Honorable LOUIS STOKES, who I know that the Congresswoman enjoyed many good years of service with. I know of his commitment, but also his friendship, and I know how much the family appreciates him being here today to honor the Honorable Barbara Jordan, the senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable LOUIS STOKES.

Mr. STOKES, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I want to express our appreciation on behalf of all of us for her taking out this special order this evening so that all of us might pay tribute to this very great American lady.

Mr. Speaker, we gather tonight to pay tribute to the late Barbara Jordan, an extraordinary individual and former Member of the House. On January 17, 1996, the Nation mourned the passing of this political giant and gifted orator. During her lifetime, she served this Nation with honor and dignity. We join family members, friends and others throughout the Nation in sorrow at her passing. Barbara Jordan was a remarkable American who will never be forgotten.

Some of us who are gathered here today are fortunate to have served in Congress with this great lady. And, as I stand here today, I have many fond special memories of my personal friendship with her in this Chamber. She frequently served in the capacity of speaker, pro tempore during that period. Whenever she was in the Chair, the Manner in which she presided over the entire House was a beauty to behold. Her dignity and elegance was in full bloom at those times.

Those of us who served with Barbara Jordan came to love, admire and respect her greatly. Not only was she a knowledgeable legislator, but she was also someone who was sincere and compassionate. Whatever she did or said, she did or said with fervor. She also had a great sense of time. She respected the time of others, and she demanded that you respect her time.

Barbara Jordan set a standard of excellence and integrity which will remain as a legacy forever. She was a tireless advocate for those who had no voice in the congressional deliberations. She was also a champion of justice and a staunch defender of the Constitution.

A graduate of Boston University Law School, Barbara Jordan was one of American politics' pioneer black women. She began her political rise in 1966, when she was to the Texas State Senate, becoming the first African-American elected to that legislative body.

In 1972, Barbara Jordan again made history when she and Andy Young became the first African-Americans from the South to be elected to Congress since reconstruction. Congress found in Barbara Jordan, a lawmaker of the highest caliber and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, we recall the eloquence of Barbara Jordan in 1974, as Congress debated the possible impeachment of the President of the United States. During the Judiciary Committee deliberations, she stirred the national conscience when she declared, ''My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total, and I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, and the destruction of the Constitution.''

Barbara Jordan was also held in high esteem by the leaders in the White House. On two occasions, in 1976, and again in 1992, she was selected to deliver keynote speeches at party conventions. And, in 1994, we applauded as Barbara Jordan received the Nation's highest honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, from President Clinton. It represented a fitting tribute to a distinguished American.

Mr. Speaker, Barbara Jordan was a giant in the legal profession and one of America's greatest constitutional authorities. Her eloquent voice, impeccable integrity, and legal scholarship, elevated her to the top of the legal and political profession. She will be greatly missed. I and others in this Chamber bid her fair farewell with gratitude for the opportunity to have known her during her distinguished lifetime. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the honorable Congressperson LOU STOKES, for his eloquence and his recognition that this Congresswoman, Barbara Jordan, was good at her work. She was a good legislator. She was a legal scholar, and she took her work very seriously. In so doing, she made us proud and she upheld the Constitution. I thank my colleague for sharing with us and, of course, for being her friend.

It gives me great pleasure now to yield to her colleague who served with her in that momentous time as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary in 1974. He remains a stellar Member of this body. He is, in fact, a senior member of Ways and Means, and I personally could see the anguish in his face as we funeralized this great lady. I welcome to the well the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentlewoman for taking the time out to give us a chance to pay honor to this great lady, a lady indeed of America and the world. My colleagues may not have known Mo Udall, but Mo was a beloved Member of this House, and before he left, once in the middle of the night, when the House was crowded and everyone wanted to go home, Mo came to the well of this House of Representatives and said, all that has to be said about this bill has already been said. And the House just burst out with deep appreciation. But then he added, but not everyone has said it.

I think when we talk about a great person and personality like Barbara Jordan, that once again we find ourselves in the position that most things have already been said. So I thought what could I add, and then that made me think more about Barbara. We sat together on that Committee on the Judiciary, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] pointed out, side by side for the many weeks and months to determine and to deliberate whether or not the acts of the President of the United States, then President Nixon, had warranted us on the Committee on the Judiciary in voting for articles of impeachment, which, as everyone knows, means that it amounted to an indictment and a trial would later be had in the Senate.

Barbara was always more than adequately prepared to hear the testimony, to ask the appropriate question, and you would think that she was chief counsel of the committee if it was dependent on the quality of her preparation. But while some of us, especially those of us who have been former prosecutors, were framing the question in terms of trying to get the answers that we were probing for, I noticed that most of her questions were not to determine whether or not President Nixon had committed any wrongdoing, but whether or not the Members of the House were prepared to distort that Constitution in order to achieve a political goal, as some may think is going on now in the Senate.

□ 1830

Some have said that Barbara was not one to take fools lightly. And sitting next to her, I certainly did not intend to joke with her about the serious task that she had taken on. But as we had seen so many people tear apart the law as we would know it, she was there to defend the system to make certain it would be there for someone who needed the protection and the cloak of innocence of our Constitution.

But most of the time that I raised these questions to her, she would dismiss me, having already made up her mind, by saying, ''There you go, Charles, up to mischief again.''

And so why would I be any different tonight when I loved Barbara then and love her now and miss her now? And if there was anything that I would want her to say to me, it would be, ''There you go again, Charles,'' with a smile on her face, ''up to mischief again.''

And I would be up to mischief tonight to say that this gracious lady will always be remembered in this country as a great American, as she should be.

She also will be remembered as one who wore the flag and the Constitution so close to her heart as if to say that she will take the stones and the arrows, but do not touch her precious Constitution. And as oft cited, reported, she would say that even those that knew that people like she were treated as chattel and property when the Constitution was written, she would dismiss it and say, it was a mistake and she is there to correct it.

But, Congresswoman LEE, the thing has to remain now that she is gone and invested her time, her energy, her eloquence in protecting that Constitution, will the United States of America and those who loved and cherished her allow that Constitution to be broad enough now to give the protection for the people that she loved the most, the people from the poverty-stricken rural areas where she came from that cannot rise to her height in physical, intellectual, or oracle skills?

Would those that pay tribute to her be prepared to say that she never accused them of racism, she never wore her sex or her race on her sleeve. She said, this country was rich enough, broad enough, cared enough that she did not have to say those things, it would work its way out.

At the funeral, so many said that Barbara is not gone, that she lives with us, and this means what she stood for lives with us.

If that is so, why does this Chamber look more like a Congressional Black Caucus meeting than a lady who concerned herself about the Congress only because it was part of the Constitution? When the President of the United States and the leader of the free world goes to Texas to pay tribute, is that not a sign that everybody, especially those in Texas, white or black, Mexican or nutmeg Jew, Gentile, Catholic, Protestant, should be there, because Barbara was not making mischief, she was making history to say that you do not have to make mischief to achieve? And she proved that it could be done, and she did in fact do it.

I do hope that when Barbara is remembered, that she is not thrown into the category of mischiefmakers, because they have a way of saying you pushed a little too hard, you were not sensitive to our political problems, or that sooner or later you would get all of the things that you are entitled to under the Constitution, because Barbara did not take issue with that. She knew it would work out.

I say in tribute to Barbara Jordan, this great American, why can everyone who loved her not take a page out of that book, and whether they come from Texas, they are a politician, a Member of Congress, whether they are black, whether they are a woman, remember that she gave everything she had to protect that parchment, and she did not just protect it for those people who look like her. She was protecting it for everybody in this country, even former President Richard Nixon.

If she could care that much to give up political objectives in order to protect this paper, why can every American who expects that paper to be there for them and their grandchildren not

do a little something that Barbara would want them to do? Be less political, less partisan, less mean-spirited, and be more American, be more caring, be more what the forefathers wanted, and, that is, to work together, to live together, to make this a better country, more productive, and spend our energy and time in getting rid of poverty and disease instead of building up hatred and causing confrontations.

I tell the Congresswoman, in my humble opinion, she liked people to make mischief, but she did not believe that everyone had to do it the same way.

So why do we not pay tribute to her and do it Barbara's way, and, that is, to make certain that no matter where we come from, if we find someone that looks like Barbara, that may not be able to walk like Barbara, that may not be able to speak like Barbara, may not be able to command the presence that Barbara had for all of us, to remember she, too, he, too, they deserve the protection of this great document that she died with, held closely to her bosom.

That is the tribute that I think that you pay to an American. And that is the tribute that we should have all over America, not just in Houston, not just in Austin, not just here, not just with the Congressional Black Caucus, not just with the President of the United States but with every child in every valley regardless of complexion or religion to say, what a great person and how wonderful it was that America had such a wonderful defender.

I thank the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman. If he would just for a moment, you have raised a very solemn challenge. And for fear of anyone perceiving politics being involved, let me add that Barbara would always tell us in Texas that she did not fear being called a politician. She just wanted to be a good politician. And because we are where we are today, am I understanding the gentleman from New York to suggest that we in this great body today, in this era, in 1996, in the midst of our own discussions, might take a page from the life of this legacy, this American hero, about bringing interests together, diverse interests, about working for the common good, about the understanding that the Constitution and the whole American people are more important than the singular?

Am I understanding the gentleman almost instructing through her life that we might take that page, or 10 pages, out of that book and maybe in weeks and months to come, we would see our way clear to follow a cohesive pattern to work for all of America?

Mr. RANGEL. Dear gentlewoman, you have well described our Barbara Jordan and in doing so you described our Constitution and our great Republic.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Let me also appreciate my colleague and certainly in her own right a fighter, an advocate for equal rights and equal justice, a legal scholar herself and now the honorable Delegate from the District of Columbia. But as we all applaud and believe, equal under the law, and we are advocating that for her constituents and we applaud her work on their behalf, and she has come now to honor Barbara Jordan, the Honorable ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON of the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her kind remarks, and I thank her even more for her leadership in taking out this special order.

May I say to the gentlewoman that I think that Members of this body would agree with me that even as a freshman, she is proving herself a worthy successor of Barbara Jordan.

Barbara Jordan was a great American. I intend for my few minutes to be devoted to proving that proposition.

Her presence was so awesome that she is likely to be remembered more for her voice and her style than for her substance. That would be just too bad.

For in this world it is not how you say what you have to say, it is indeed what you have to say. And if you have nothing to say, the most resonant voice should do you no good.

Why is it that when Barbara Jordan spoke, everybody listened? Was it really a matter of style? I submit that it was a matter of substance. To be sure, amplified by a very original and very forceful style. But I hope that we listened to what Barbara Jordan had to say, for here was a woman who had something to say.

We are inclined to look at our leaders in surface ways, especially in the age of television and demonstrations. I think of King and Malcolm. King is remembered today, for example, as the militant leader for equality and God knows he was that and perhaps that first and foremost. But if we look deeper into his life, there are parts of his life that have fallen back, because we look at the surface, we remember the obvious. We do not remember King the intellectual, King the advocate of racial harmony, King the pacifist, King the man who was extremely modest and self-effacing. We remember the marches, we remember the speeches. It is important to remember a person's whole life.

I want us to remember Barbara Jordan's whole life, not just her presence.

In the same way, I chuckle at the way people remember Malcolm X. Because I think most Americans remember Malcolm X as a militant black nationalist. I believe Malcolm would want you to remember him as he was at the end of his life, when he had renounced black racism along with white racism, when he had renounced anti-Semitism, and frankly almost all of his prior life, when he went to Mecca and came back and said, ''I believe in the brotherhood''—and sisterhood, I think he would have had it. What I find awesome about Malcolm is his capacity to grow and change and learn and lead even if it meant his life.

Similarly, Barbara Jordan was not some bold, big-talking black woman who brought us a message of equality. She was that and she was so much more than that.

her Watergate remarks are, of course, most remembered, the famous lines ''We the people,'' ''My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total.'' Those are not lines often spoken by many African-Americans.

And she spoke them not just because she believed she lived in a perfect democracy. She believed just the opposite. In that very speech, she began by saying, words to the effect, ''I guess we can say We The People because now they have included me in We The People. They certainly didn't mean me when we started out.''

Then she said, ''By virtue of amendment, I too am now part of We The People.'' And in effect what she was saying was it took this Constitution a long time to get around to including me in We The People, I feel a special obligation to protect the Constitution, and I am not about to let it be subverted by the actions of even a President of the United States like Richard Nixon.

□ 1845

Her faith in the Constitution was total, because she had seen the evolution to include people like herself, and thus she believed that the country would reach its highest ideals and devoted much of her life talking in that idealistic fashion.

Of course, Barbara Jordan was an advocate for the downtrodden in the tradition of the Congressional Black Caucus. The gentleman from New York will be the first to tell you, she was there on all of those principles. But, as he said, people go at it in different ways, and she had her own special way.

What I will most remember about Barbara Jordan is fearless leadership. This sense of integrity made her rise above the political moment and made her whatever the political lashes on the shores might have been, made her true to whatever were her principles.

Here is a woman that deeply believed in equality across all racial lines and believed she ought to speak to her own people who were black and beyond.

Now, many African-Americans do not believe they should speak beyond, because it is very hard for them to get beyond. Life has been very difficult. So then, perhaps even more now, people speak out of their own experience and do not speak to the larger American experience.

Here is a woman that knew she had the capacity to do it, and felt it her obligation to do it. This capacity to lead is very important, because it means you can say difficult things. People will listen to you and they will be accepted.

About the easiest thing for me to say in my district, and I think it would probably be the case in the district of the gentlewoman from Texas now and

then, would be to talk about equality and to talk about the things that, frankly, I love to talk about. I love to talk about how black is beautiful and I love to talk about black pride. But there are more difficult things to talk about then and now which really relate to the lines that are being drawn so that we increasingly live in isolated worlds.

Look, we can do that. We can do that. But if we do that enough, we are courting danger.

When I looked at her words, I see a constant theme running through everything she said and everything she wrote. It was that here is this black woman, over and over again she said we are all one people. Do not succumb to balkanization and polarization. It is the worst, not the best in America. We have helped America find their way out of this. Do not do it.

She was speaking against the grain of the time, and she continued to speak to that theme to the end of her life. On National Public Radio I heard her words most recently spoken in which she said she was astonished at racial separation, segregation, polarization. Much of it she said was self-imposed. Here was Barbara Jordan speaking at the end of her life in ways that almost no black Americans are speaking today.

I pulled out her remarks from the Democratic Convention in 1992, and let me read a few sentences. Here is Barbara Jordan. Here is how she will be remembered by her country.

> We are one. We are Americans, and we reject any intruder who seeks to divide us by race or class. We honor cultural identity. However, separatism is not allowed. Separatism is not the American way, and we should not permit ideas like political correctness to become some fad that could reverse our hard won achievements in civil rights and human rights.

The fact is Barbara Jordan had the moral authority to say that, without appearing to be any less committed to equality and to the beauty of blackness. She had the capacity to be a teacher, and she insisted upon teaching, she insisted upon leading, she would not simply go with the crowd. That is the kind of leadership we need today in a country where we see less and less of the sense of community, more and more of the sense of I have got mine, you ought to get out there and get yours, less and less of a sense that we are all one big insurance policy. An insurance policy is a vehicle where we are all in it and some of us need it sometimes and some of us never need it. If we are not that kind of community, if we are not that kind of federation, then we are not living in the tradition of Barbara Jordan.

Yes, I feel a special debt to Barbara Jordan as an American black woman in political life. But her debtors are far greater. She was a political pioneer who never stopped changing our country for the better. She was never cynical about her country, and she inspired those who were to reach above the low point of Watergate that they could indeed reach to the ideals that her country had yet to reach.

Her remarks at the Watergate hearings, by far her most memorable, will, I think, be remembered by history precisely because of the skillful blend of criticism and idealism. They were both in that speech.

Barbara Jordan was both a pioneer and a political mentor to thousands of women. She encouraged by example to engage in politics at every level. Through her commanding presence, she taught women, especially black women, that they could take charge. Active until the end of her productive and fruitful life, Barbara Jordan never stopped leading. She never stopped serving. We will not stop remembering.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. Might I just say something, as I indicated to the gentleman from New York: You taught, as many of us are aware. The last years of the congresswoman's life was spent as a professor. Many asked me many times as I traveled around the country, ''How is Barbara? Where is she?''

She was fine. She was absolutely enjoying what she was doing, which was being able to create in reality for students, young people, what the Constitution meant. Many of her friends remember her fondly as B.J., and some of the students, more brave than others, called her that as well.

But you are so right about what she meant to us, how she stood. In her first congressional campaign she said ''Many blacks are militant in their guts, but they act it out in different ways.'' She was that kind of person. I will not say woman or African-American.

She clearly frustrated a lot of the groups, women, minorities, African-Americans, liberals. And I remember that voice saying, ''I do not want to be a symbol for anything.'' Harsh? I think not. It was simply what the gentlewoman said. She had a view of this country, and if there was something right to do, B.J. would be there doing it rightly under the Constitution.

I think we can be so gratified that that kind of person lived, and in fact that she was true to her values to the very end.

I see the gentleman from Connecticut, and I would be happy to yield a moment to my friend from Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. SHAYS. It would be just a moment. I found myself walking through this Chamber and being captivated by your discussion of an extraordinarily great woman. I have found the most patriotic people in our black churches, and it always amazed me how the African-American community could be so patriotic, given the heritage that brought them to this magnificent country. And Barbara Jordan gave me more pride in our country than I think almost anyone else.

You talk about what an extraordinary leader. I consider her an extraordinary teacher. I remember her in my early days, watching her as a new Member, and I was astounded by this woman.

Now, I know the gentlewoman from Texas is from Texas, but people from Texas are different than anywhere else. Finding this black Texan talking, I was not first sure if she was a Texan first, or someone speaking for the black community first, or just someone speaking as a true American.

I resolved my question mark. She was just a true American patriot who wanted to teach this American community a lot, and in the process she taught herself a lot. We learned so much from seeing her life. Her death is a tremendous loss.

I just would conclude by saying to you, sometimes people say who would you have most liked to meet? Who would you most like to sit down with and just have a wonderful conversation?

They are not actors, and I thought they are really not politicians. I remember a few people I would have liked to have had a discussion with. And when I learned that Barbara Jordan had passed away, I thought that was the woman, that was the person, I should have answered, because, boy, I would have loved to have sat down with her, like many of you have for many discussions, and just had that precious opportunity to talk with a great, great, great American.

I thank you for letting me participate in this. I have been listening, and I have been captivated by what you all have been saying. CHARLIE, you always get me. So thank you for letting me participate and express my tremendous admiration for this great American.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. You are very kind for your words. Clearly, you might have been asking me the question of what was the intonation or the accent that the Congresswoman seemed to exhibit.

I will tell you she was most proud of the fact that she debated the Harvard debate team and brought them to a draw. I think maybe she might have brought a bit of that tone from Boston University, but she was most proud she put Harvard in a draw, and she said ''That is a win.'' Maybe that is when she adopted that intonation from the New England States.

Clearly she was a person who had a sense of humor. She had a deep belly laugh, as many said at the memorial service at Texas Southern University on Sunday. She clearly had a purpose. I am glad to hear you offer your admiration for her.

I will add one point, as I bring the chairman of the Black Caucus to also commemorate and honor her, she said something quite humorous. We were in the midst, Congressman RANGEL, of waiting on the Supreme Court's determination about these redistricts or districting. One of those seats happens to

be one that the Senator Barbara Jordan drew. It is the 18th Congressional District. She was proud to say that she knew the law and she drew it within the law; and she drew it not to exclude, but to include.

I would think if we just carried that message forward, we would settle all these lawsuits, because no one could deny anyone being included. She did it with the aplomb and the humor, but as well the points that you have offered as points of admiration.

So I think she is a national hero for all of us, no matter what walk of life we came from, no matter if we were in the suburbs or urban centers. She also deflected anyone saying she was from a black ghetto. She said, ''When we grew up, we did not know we were poor and we didn't act like it.'' That is a challenge for our young people today in this country.

So I appreciate you being here.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Barbara Jordan, our distinguished colleague who recently passed. I had the privilege to serve with her in this body, and on the Judiciary and Government Operations Committees. The 6 years we served together gave me the fortunate opportunity to work with a true leader. I also want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, for calling this important special order.

Barbara Jordan was one of the few Members of Congress whose influence was felt from the moment she arrived. Her powerful intellect and her logical approach to the legislative process made her formidable throughout her career. It is easy for me to remember that she influenced my decisions more frequently than I hers. I know many of my colleagues here tonight would agree with that statement.

In addition to her incredible gift of oratory, she carefully reasoned her way through the end to what Government policy might best be for our country. Barbara dedicated her career to fighting for those who couldn't fight for themselves. As the first African-American woman elected from the South in the 20th century, she worked hard to continue the Federal protection of civil rights. She worked to improve the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by extending its merits to Hispanic-Americans, native Americans, and Asian-Americans. She was also the author of the Consumer Goods Pricing Act of 1975.

Many will remember Barbara Jordan from her role in the Watergate hearings. Barbara's remarkable oratory, her passion for the Constitution and public service, and her commitment to the democratic processes helped guide the Nation during some of our most troubling and soul-searching days. She was a critical figure at a pivotal time for our Nation and for the House. She helped us see the way through a turbulent time.

We cannot forget that Barbara Jordan was the first African-American and the first woman to serve as a keynote speaker at a Democratic National Convention when she spoke in 1976. She served as a keynote speaker again in New York at the 1992 Democratic Convention. Her words helped remind us, both times, why we were Democrats and what we needed to do to fulfill our commitment to working Americans.

I will never forget Barbara Jordan. She did everything with unlimited passion and commitment and was one of the most thoughtful Members of Congress I have ever worked with. She touched the lives of thousands of Americans, and was a wonderful source of strength to everyone that met her.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my dear departed friend and former colleague, the Honorable Barbara Jordan.

Barbara will be remembered as a vibrant, dynamic force for good who touched our lives in a special way. Her sense of common decency and search for simple justice was heard everywhere she went and felt by the millions she met. Her overpowering self consumed our minds, our inner thoughts, and our consciences, and indeed inspired us onward and upward.

Many who did not know Barbara, as some of us in Congress, will say that the world will never be the same without her. But I must admonish them that the world is not the same because of Barbara. She truly was a person who did make a difference.

The Congressional Black Caucus honored Barbara Jordan for her devoted service in 1978. I had the privilege of paying tribute to her at the CBC Eighth Annual Awards Dinner. In my salute, I said:

Tonight the Congressional Black Caucus presents its Special Awards to two outstanding members of our organization. My privilege, indeed my honor, is to acknowledge the contributions of one of them, Barbara Jordan. Barbara Jordan has been to the Congressional Black Caucus what Hubert Humphrey was to the Democratic Farmer's Labor Party in Minnesota, what Susan B. Anthony was to the suffrage movement, what Jackie Robinson was to baseball, what Sojourner Truth was to early freedom fighters. She has been our guiding light, our trailblazer.

Barbara is what the E.F. Hutton commercial says—when she speaks, people listen. They listen not only in the halls of Congress and the inner sanctums of the Oval Office, but also in the towns and hamlets of America. They listen in the cities and the urban areas. They listen in the corporate board rooms and the living rooms. But even more important, they listen in the school rooms and the pool rooms. And what they hear is a beautiful black woman with pathos and passion, brilliantly articulating the omens of ill-fated clouds which hang so ominously over Western culture. They hear a voice so powerful, so awesome, so imposing that it cannot not be ignored and will never be silenced. What they hear is a voice verbalizing the hopes, frustrations, aspirations of millions who have no way themselves to effectively communicate with those who dictate the social, political and economic order.

Barbara Jordan is Barbara Jordan because she refused to let modesty prevail over truth, because she has refused to accept this nation as it is, because she has demanded it become what it ought to be.

In the words of Marvin Gaye, Barbara is devoted to an idea of ''saving the children and saving a world destined to die.'' In the words of Gladys Knight, Barbara is the ''best thing that ever happened'' to the Black Caucus. In the words of the Commodores, Barbara is ''once, twice, three times a lady.''

Tonight, we, the members of the CBC, proudly recognize a person who carved a niche in the hearts of the American public by her probing, penetrating questions during the impeachment hearings, a person who lifted the hearts of those Americans with her sterling oratory at the Democratic National Convention. Tonight, we pay homage to the drum majorette of justice and equality, the Black Rose of Texas, Barbara Jordan.

A young girl lying on her death bed wrote a testimonial to her mother. She said, ''Try as we may, we cannot number our days. The best that we all can do as children of God is do our part to fill our days with things that count.'' Barbara, in that short interval between birth and death, filled those days with things that counted.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored now to be able to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, someone who in his own political career certainly has exuded the principles of the late Barbara Jordan, and that is the chairperson of the Black Caucus, DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Let me commend the gentlewoman from Texas for bringing this special order tonight, and also to say that your leadership here in your year in the House is, I think, something in the tradition of Barbara Jordan. I know those are big shoes to fill, but you have brought a great deal of dignity and self-respect, a great deal of knowledge into our House, and you should be commended for that.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am very pleased to participate in this special order, to join in this tribute to a very extraordinary American, whose service here in the U.S. House of Representatives earned her a national reputation, the Honorable Barbara Jordan.

□ 1900

A graduate of Boston University's school of law, Ms. Jordan served as administrative assistant to Harris County Judge Bill Elliot in the early 1960's. In 1966, she made history through her election as the first African-American since 1883 to serve in the Texas Senate and did an outstanding, credible job there. After winning reelection to that office, she achieved another historical first for the State of Texas in 1972, when she captured the seat to serve in the 18th District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Although she was a newcomer, a freshman, a Member of the House of Representatives during the tumultuous 93d Congress when the Watergate scandal unfolded, as you heard earlier, she gained national reputation and respect through her eloquent performance during the House Committee on the Judiciary impeachment hearings, which was chaired by my predecessor, Peter Rodino.

Peter Rodino used to talk many hours about the Watergate investigation, but any time he would lecture about Watergate. He is currently a professor at the Seton Hall School of Justice, the law school in Newark that is named after him, the Peter Rodino School of Social Justice.

He would talk about Barbara Jordan and her interpretation of the Constitution, her eloquence, the way when she spoke everyone listened, and I felt that

I knew Barbara personally because of Congressman Rodino and his experience there with her.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is ending, and I am interested in the gentleman having the opportunity to conclude his remarks, and I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON, my dear friend, as his hour begins, might he yield a few minutes for Chairman PAYNE to conclude and for me to conclude with one or two sentences?

RECENT VISIT TO RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as our friend may consume for the purpose of continuing his remarks.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA JORDAN

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Thank you very much, and I will be brief.

Representative Jordan's passion for a more just world was unsurpassed. She confirmed her vision in support of civil rights laws that would make our society a more equitable society. In June of 1975, when the House was extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965 for 10 additional years, she sponsored that legislation that broadened the group that would include Hispanic-Americans, Asian-Americans, and native Americans. In 1976 she was the first woman and the first African-American to deliver a keynote address at the Democratic national convention.

She left the Congress to pursue her teaching career as a professor at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas in Austin to teach and to work with students, young people whom she loved.

Barbara Jordan will be remembered as a tower of strength whose unshakable strength saw us through a national crisis. She will forever remain a shining example of integrity, of courage in public service.

I know that my colleagues join me in extending our condolences to her family and her friends. No doubt it is some comfort to know that future generations will continue to draw on the inspiration from her remarkable life and work.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow Members to have 5 days to revise and extend, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] for allowing us to honor this great American and great lady.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to yield to our good friends in continuing the special order in honor of one of the Nation's great leaders. I join with them, as a Member of the Republican Party, in paying tribute to the late Barbara Jordan for all the fine work she did, not just on behalf of the constituents that she represented in Texas, but for people all over this country who had the highest respect for her leadership in this Congress and after she left this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my special order this evening is going to focus on a recent trip that I took last week to the former Soviet Union, to Russia, to talk about events that unfolded there; some special initiatives that I was able to convey to the new speaker of the Russian Duma, and to an assessment of what is happening politically inside of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was on the House floor in a very emotional speech discussing the recent efforts by the Committee on National Security to remove National Missile Defense considerations from our defense authorization bill. As the chairman of the research and development subcommittee, I fought hard to include language in that bill originally, that was vetoed by President Clinton, that would have allowed this country to move forward in terms of developing an allowable missile defense capability similar to that the Russians already had under the ABM treaty. Unfortunately, and I think largely because of misinformation, we were never able to accomplish that, and had to pull that section from the bill.

In my discussions, I talked about some of the problems that exist between our country and Russia. With that in mind, I rise tonight, Mr. Speaker, to talk about a recent trip and the broader efforts that I have undertaken to build a base, a foundation, if you will, between the people of Russia, between members of the Duma and the Federation Counsel in Russia and Members of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in Russia goes back to my college days where my undergraduate degree is in Russian studies. Twenty years ago, I spoke the language fluently and studied the culture, the people, the history, the government, and all the various aspects of Russian society. My language skills are not so competent today, but I can still communicate fairly well with Russian leaders.

Over the past 20 years, I have been able to host a number of visiting Russians on trips to this country, and I have had the opportunity to travel to the former Soviet Union, and Russia in particular, on six or seven occasions.

During my tenure in Congress, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on National Security, I would characterize myself as a hard-liner when it comes to military and foreign policy relations with the former Soviet Union, now Russia. However, I take great pride in the efforts to reach out and establish a solid base of understanding and a cooperative effort at working with the Russians to achieve the common objective of stability for the people of Russia and the surrounding former Soviet republics.

As a matter of fact, 3 years ago Congressman GREG LAUGHLIN, then a Democrat, and I formed the FSU American Energy Caucus. The purpose of this caucus is to foster improved relations in our Congress, we well as in the Russian Duma, to support joint venture agreements with American energy companies wanting to do business in the former Soviet States.

Over the past 3 years, we have worked with the major energy corporations and have helped complete agreements on both Sakhalin I and Sakhalin II, the two largest energy deals in the history of the world that are currently underway in the area around Sakhalin Island in Eastern Siberia in Russia. Those two projects, along with Sakhalin III which is now under negotiations, will see between 50 and 70 billion dollars worth of western investment go into Russia to help them develop the one resource that they have significant amounts of, and that is their energy resources.

Mr. Speaker, these deals are not just good for Russia in helping them bring in the hard currency they need and create jobs they need and helps them stabilize their economy, but it is also good for America. It reduces our dependency on Middle Eastern crude and allows us to create joint ventures to obtain new sources of energy that we can use in this Nation.

The energy caucus has also allowed us to form direct ties with elected members of the Russian Duma as well as elected parliamentarians in the other energy-rich republics, namely Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan and Tajikistan and some of the other republics where there are valuable energy resources.

Two years ago, in an effort to reach out to the Russians on another issue, I joined the GLOBE, Global Legislators for a Balanced Environment to focus on energy initiatives with the elected leaders inside of Russia to show that we can work together for common environmental problems.

In fact, we have focused particularly on our concerns relative to the practice of the Russians over the past 30 years of dumping their nuclear wastes in the Arctic ocean, the sea of Japan, the Bering Sea, and other coastal waters that border various parts of Russia and the former Soviet States.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, GLOBE has established a working group, which I chair, on the oceans involving legislators from the Russian Duma, the Japanese Diet, and the European Parliament. We meet on average twice a year and look to find ways that we can work together, again, on environmental issues, but again bringing elected parliamentarians together so that we can establish a base of understanding and cooperation that can help us deal with some of the more difficult issues that confront our two nations.

Just last spring, a group of Russian Duma members visited Washington who belonged to the Duma defense

committee and along with my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPENCE, and my colleagues, the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, and the gentleman from Louisiana, BOB LIVINGSTON.

We met behind closed doors for about 2 hours to discuss relations with Russian Duma members who are involved in defense and foreign policy issues with members of our defense and foreign policy concerns. We had very frank and candid discussions about everything from the ABM Treaty to the START II Treaty to conventional weapons to NATO expansion, missile treaty issues and anything you could think of in that realm. They were very worthwhile discussions.

I proposed at that time that we establish a formal process that Members of Congress meet regularly with members of the Russian Duma defense committees. Mr. Speaker, there were three areas that we focused on in an effort to build a stable working relationship with members of the Russian parliament, the Duma.

Especially with the elections just occurring in December, it was all the more reason why we in this Congress have to work to better understand where Russia is going and the mind-set of the Russian people and its leadership.

With those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I approached you back in December of last year and suggested that you take a leadership role and write to the new speaker of the Russian Duma, who would be elected in January of this year, offering to establish a formal Russian Duma to Congress study group modeled after our Congress-Bundestag study group that works so closely with the German Bundestag.

The purpose of this effort would be to have the Speaker to our Congress and the Speaker of the Russian Duma agree that it would be in the interests of both countries to have our elected parliamentarians work together in a very close way on a number of issues, namely, energy, the environment, business issues, defense issues, foreign policy issues, but even going beyond that to issues involving perhaps domestic policy considerations. Not only can we discuss particular issues and try to find common solutions, but work to develop relationships that can allow us to understand each other and also to deal with these tough issues where we, in fact, are going to disagree: Some of the treaty issues for instance, that we discussed on the House floor earlier today.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, you drafted a letter that I was able to hand deliver to Moscow as a part of my trip last week. I will document the process that we went through to deliver what I think is one of the most innovative initiatives that has come out of this Congress in terms of working to stabilize relations with the elected officials inside of Russia.

We also, in that letter, carried your suggstion, Mr. Speaker, to establish a new direct computer linkage between Members of the American Congress and Members of the Russian Duma, ultimately elected parliamentarians around the world, so that we have access through a worldwide web of communication instantly to knock down some of the misconceptions, some of the half-truths, and some of the problems that occur from time to time when misinformation gets into our hands and perhaps when misinformation gets into the hands of the Russian elected officials.

Those were the suggestions that were contained in your letter that I delivered on your behalf, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the response that I got in Moscow last week was extremely positive to both of the suggestions. Hopefully, very quickly, we can work to turn those into reality.

But let me backtrack a minute, Mr. Speaker, and talk about the first part of the trip and what we set out to accomplish. Arriving in St. Petersburg on Sunday, the small group that was traveling with me, which included Air Force liaison Steve Bull, Colonel Bull, and full committee staff member Dave Trachtenberg. We were to become participants in the conference sponsored by the ACPS organization. ACPS is the Advisory Council on the Protection of the Seas.

This assemblage of approximately 175 leaders from most of the nations that border the seas of the world was designed to provide a particular focus on the problem of Arctic nuclear waste dumping. As the Vice President of ACPS for the United States, my job was to represent our country and to convey the message that we in this Congress not only wanted to work with our colleagues and other nations involved with ACPS, but that we felt it of the highest urgency that Russia deal with this issue of disposing of their nuclear waste in a safe manner.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the Yablakov report. It was developed written and released by Alexi Yablakov, a friend of mine and perhaps one of the most outspoken Russian activist on environmental issues in the country. He has been a member of President Yeltsin's National Security Council and a key advisor to Yeltsin on environmental issues and prior to that was an advisor to Gorbachev.

It was under President Yeltsin's leadership that Yablakov was able to document for the first time the worst fears about what Russia and the former Soviet Union had been doing in terms of dumping its nuclear waste into the open seas.

□ 1915

The conference in St. Petersburg, Mr. Speaker, allowed us to focus in a positive way with the Russians. Two-thirds of the attendees there were Russian leaders, including leadership of the Russian Navy, to focus on a common solution working together to allow us to convince the Russians to stop dumping their waste in the oceans and to stop the uncontrolled pollution, especially from their nuclear waste that has occurred for the past three decades.

While there were a lot of technical sessions that were held during the three-day conference, the end result was that we received some limited assurances from the Russians that for the time being they will in fact abide by the London convention. They did not say they would actually sign the London convention, which would allow them to take a formal step to acknowledge they would no longer dump, but they agreed to as much as possible hold off on dumping of nuclear waste.

Also at the conference, Mr. Speaker, we outlined steps that we are taking in this country, through the cooperative threat reduction program, to assist the Russians in disposing of their nuclear waste. They do not have the technology. They do not have the resources. And part of what we have done through the Navy over the past 3 years is that we have provided approximately $30 million that we have controlled that has allowed the Russians to assess the impact that the disposal of that nuclear waste has caused on the seas, both in the northern area where the northern fleet is headquartered and out in the eastern part of Siberia in the Sea of Japan.

The leverage that we were able to obtain by putting that relatively small amount of money up to help deal with a very serious world problem has now seen the Japanese and the South Koreans come forward with money that is allowing them to help finance a similar solution for Russia's nuclear waste out on the Pacific fleet and in the area of Vladivostok. And the Pacific fleet itself. So the good news coming out of the ACOPS conference was that we have a working relationship with Russia that we can build on, that the leadership of the Russian Duma, that the leadership of the Russian military understands that it is in both of our interests to work together to find common ways of preventing additional dumping of this raw material into the seas of the world.

Why is this so important to America? Obviously for those who live in Alaska and Hawaii, the potential threat from polluted materials and polluted marine environment from coming into the waters off Alaska is real and it is significant. That is why over the past several years Senator TED STEVENS and Congressman DON YOUNG and Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI have been outspoken leaders in both houses of this Congress on the issue of working with the Russians to help deal with this problem of nuclear waste disposal.

So all in all, our efforts in St. Petersburg, I think, were worthwhile and will lead to further efforts to assist the Russians in acknowledging the past practices that have caused worldwide environmental problems and to keep

their feet to the fire in terms of helping them find solutions that will prevent these kinds of shortsighted actions taking place in the future.

While in St. Petersburg, Mr. Speaker, we visited the Baltic shipyard. The Baltic Shipyard is the largest shipyard in St. Petersburg, currently employing about 8,000 workers. It is the shipyard where much of the construction of the Soviet Navy took place. In fact, it is where all of the *Kirov*-class warships were built.

While we were there, we were able to go up and stand next to and see the latest warship built by the Russians, the Peter the Great, which is a nuclear powered cruiser, very capable ship that is the newest ship in the Russian fleet, just launched this past year, and which has just completed its first sea trials.

We had some very frank discussions with the management of the Baltic Shipyard about their capabilities. We were given a comprehensive tour of that shipyard, both inside and out, propeller shop, inside construction facilities, to see firsthand what is taking place there.

In addition to those visits, in a meeting that we held with the leadership of the Baltic Shipyard on Tuesday, we delivered a report that was the result of an effort a year earlier where Members of this Congress went to Russia with the idea of helping to find a way to convert that shipyard away from building warships and into the field of environmental decontamination so that the Russians could take all of their surplus navy vessels that are heavily contaminated with PCB's, with ozone-depleting gases, with carcinogenic paints, with sludge material on the bottom of their hulls, to show their workers, who used to build these ships, that we could employ them or they could be employed in new technologies to clean them up. Then once the ships were clean, that the scrap value of those ships would allow them to be taken apart in Russian shipyards, perhaps the Baltic shipyard itself or in shipyards in America that have been hurting for work.

We delivered the report to the Russian leadership and with it came the recommendations for the next step in helping to move that project forward. I am optimistic, Mr. Speaker, that we can work with the Russians to help continue to convert that Baltic shipyard into more nondefense uses, especially in the environmental decontamination area.

Leaving St. Petersburg, Mr. Speaker, dealing with environmental issues, we traveled to Moscow and the second part of our trip focused on relations with the new Russian Duma members and to assess the situation as the Duma met in fact on that Monday that we arrived there for the first time ever.

Mr. Speaker, the election results in terms of who won the Duma were quite interesting and certainly point up the fact that we in this Congress need to understand which parties in fact are in control right now in Russia.

While we were in Moscow, I was able to meet with leaders of the four major parties who were successful in the December elections. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the Russian State Duma has 450 elected officials. Control of that entire Duma was up in the December elections. And even though Boris Yeltsin made a very impassioned plea to maintain the control of the Duma with that party most aligned with his position on key issues, that in fact was not the case. It was not the outcome of the elections.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the Communist Party, making a resurgence in Moscow, dominated the local elections and, in fact, were able to elect 158 members to the new Duma, far and away more than any other faction politically in Russia. Coming in second was the Liberal Democratic Party, that party headed by Vladimir Zhirinovsky, someone with whom the West has got to interact and understand because of some of the radical positions that he has taken in the past. Zhirinovsky's party, Mr. Speaker, did not do as well as he had hoped and certainly that is good news for us, but in fact did garner 51 seats in the new Duma.

In addition, another major party winning significant support in the Duma was the Our Home is Russia Party, which is the party of Viktor Chernomyrdin and the party most closely aligned with Yeltsin. That party was only able to secure a total of 54 votes in the Duma elections.

And finally, the fourth major party getting a significant seat in terms of the Duma and in terms of the factional interests was the Yablakov Party, headed by Grigory Yavlinsky. That party is also more of a mainstream party, and they only achieved 45 seats in the Duma.

Following those four key parties, a number of smaller parties, the Agrarian Party, the Women of Russia Party received lesser votes, but because of the requirement in the Russian constitution that for full recognition a party had to achieve 5 percent of the electorate in the Duma elections, none of them were able to make that cutoff. So while they have Members in the Duma, they do not have the status that the four major parties that I just mentioned have.

In fact, the Independents, with 77 members, are a very large bloc but they are not organized and they are not recognized because they represent various independent factions.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that with your effort in mind, with the two-page letter that you gave me to hand deliver to members of the Russian Duma, I was able to meet with each of the various political factions to discuss with them your ideas and the notion that I put to you back in December about establishing this new interactive network between members of the Russian Duma and the major political factions and Members of our Congress, both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, we met with Zhirinovsky's top aide, Mr. Mitrofanov, who is a member of the Russian Duma and in fact is now chairing the party dealing with worldwide issues. We had a very frank and candid discussion with him. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the response that he brought to us from Zhirinovsky's party was extremely supportive, wanting to reach out and work in a positive way with both of the suggestions that were contained in your letter.

The suggestion about the permanent Duma to Congress forum and the suggestion about the worldwide internet we would establish starting off with our Congress and their Duma.

The second meeting with Mr. Averchev, Vladimir Averchev, who is a member of the Yablakov party, a close associate of Mr. Lukin. And Mr. Averchev was very enthusiastic about the suggestion you made and offered his personal support to help build the coalition of members of the Duma from the various political factions to turn your suggestions into reality.

And on the following day of our visit to Moscow, I had a chance to meet with Aleksey Arbatov, a leader on the Duma defense establishment. He, too, was extremely excited about the possibility of implementing both of your suggestions.

I also had a chance to visit the Kremlin and to meet with President Yeltsin's key advisors on defense issues, particularly treaty issues, ABM, START II. And each of those key advisors, in particular, Mr. Kortunov, were extremely excited about the initiative that you have put forth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you today and report back to you and to our colleagues in this body and to the people of America that you have, I think, created a landmark effort, very early on in this new Russian Duma, to reach out in a clear way to establish a working relationship that will help us establish a base of operation and understanding between our parliamentarians but, more importantly, to be able to deal with the difficult issues where we will not be in such agreement, and some of those were discussed on the floor of the House today relative to our defense bill.

So the ball is now in the Russians' court. We anticipate a response from the new speaker in a matter of weeks and, Mr. Speaker, we hope that that response will be very positive.

A word about the new speaker. While we were in Moscow, we had a difficult time delivering your letter, Mr. Speaker, because it was not until Thursday evening that the Duma could, in fact, agree on who the new speaker should be. As you know, Mr. Rybkin has been the past speaker in the Russian Duma. Mr. Rybkin represents more of the traditional political groups that have supported President Yeltsin's policies.

In the first vote, Mr. Rybkin only achieved a total of 116 votes. Mr. Seleznyov, who was the candidate for

the Communist Party, Gennadi Seleznyov received a total of 216 votes, and the third party candidate, Mr. Lukin, from the Yablokov Party, received 56 votes.

No one achieved the required number of 226 votes to be named Speaker of the new Russian Duma. Therefore, it was impossible on Wednesday to deliver your letter.

On Thursday evening, after a lot of political give and take and a lot of horse trading in terms of committee leadership assignments, the various factions were able to come together and in fact elected a new Speaker for the Russian Duma. By a vote of 231 for the Speaker of the Russian Duma, Gennadi Seleznyov is in October the new Speaker, someone to whom your letter was delivered and whom I hope you will have an ongoing relationship with.

Now, it scares many in this country that the new Speaker of the Russian Parliament is a Communist. And it certainly is something that we have to look at. But the word that I got from those who know him and from those around him is that he is someone that we can deal with. I think it is going to be very difficult for him to revert back to the pre-Russia days and the days of the former Soviet bloc status, but he is in power. He represents the largest party faction, and we need to make sure that we work with him and, as we have done on your behalf, Mr. Speaker, reach out to him in a hand of friendship to say, let us work together.

Coming in second in that vote again was Mr. Rybkin with 150 votes and in third place again was Mr. Lukin with 50 votes. As a matter of fact, I was with Mr. Lukin as he went down to cast his vote. He knew he would lose. But in working a deal, the Yablakov Party was able to preserve two of the most powerful committee assignments in the Russian Duma.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, they were able to keep control of the Committee on International Relations, and they were also able to keep control of the Committee on the Budget. So it was, in fact, a brokered election. Mr. Seleznyov is, in fact, the new speaker. In fact, I wished him well and gave him your letter, and we now await his response.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, the response from the Duma members that I met with was extremely positive. I had a chance to travel the halls of their Duma, much like our halls around our Congress, to interact with members and their staffs, to see firsthand the early days of the Duma organization. I implore you, Mr. Speaker, as soon as we get the official nod, to allow us to begin this process of aggressive interaction.

Mr. Speaker, what I envision are a series of subgroups focused on energy issues, on environmental issues, on defense and foreign policy issues, on issues involving adoption. One of our meetings was on that very subject with Mr. Lukin's top aide, to try to clarify some of the adoption laws for those Americans who want to adopt Russian native children but who are prevented right now because of the laws in their country; working on issues involving education, issues where we can find common ground, not necessarily to reach full agreement but, in the end, to build better understanding and a better foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I had some other meetings I want to briefly highlight while we were there. In terms of the energy caucus, we did meet with the major energy companies who have a presence in Moscow. I spoke to them at our breakfast meeting. They are very excited about the production-sharing agreement that was just approved by the Russian Duma in December that is allowing us to move forward with joint ventures.

The only thing I would say is that the Russians have to understand that they cannot keep changing the rules of the road while these deals are being developed. In face, Mr. Speaker, I will submit a chart for the RECORD showing that much of the efforts that we have put forward to establish these joint initiatives have been hampered by the Russian legislature changing the rules along the way, resulting in significant increases in taxes that have caused some of our American companies to have second thoughts about this Western investment of private sector dollars.

We also had a chance to meet with Ambassador Pickering to discuss a wide range of issues involving our joint relations. Then I had a chance to meet with the leading defense experts and think-tank leaders in Russia to talk about issues involving the ABM Treaty, START II, and Russian-American relations.

Along that line, as I mentioned, I met with 3 of Yeltsin's top advisors on defense and foreign policy issues, headed up by Mr. Kortunov, who, in fact, is going to be the executive secretary of a new 20-member panel that Mr. Yeltsin is convening to review all the nuances of the ABM Treaty for the Russian side.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we ask President Clinton, along with you and Senator DOLE, to convene a similar 20-person panel to look at our concerns with the ABM Treaty and to interact with this effort that is going to be headed up from the standpoint of actual operation by Mr. Kortunov.

Let me get into a couple of issues involving the treaty. Mr. Speaker, I have given you all of this documentation about relations because I want our colleagues to know that we are not about sticking it in the eye of the Russian leaders and people. In fact, we are doing more to reach out to the Russians and the members of their Duma than any other Congress has done in recent history in the area of the environment, in the area of energy, defense, foreign policy, and each of these other relationships.

But we also, Mr. Speaker, have a common agenda that says we cannot overlook the reality of what is happening with those leaders in the Russian military who, in many cases, were there when it was the Soviet military, and whether it comes to treaty compliance or whether it comes to nuclear weapons or whether it comes to conventional arms sales, we need to understand the mindset of what is occurring in that country.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, I had some very serious discussions with both the think-tank experts, the policy people from the USAK Institute, as well as Yeltsin's key advisors. I related to them the concern in this Congress, in this country, that Russian right now has a distinct advantage. Under the ABM Treaty, each country is allowed to have one missile defense system, and as they reiterated to me, Russia has the world's only operational ABM system. Even though we are allowed to have one under that treaty, we do not have one. They have one that protects 80 percent of the population of Russia.

That treaty is operational, it has been upgraded three times, and in fact, I tried to visit one of the ABM sites. I was told if I stayed over a second week they would take me to one of the ABM sites, but could not fit it into their schedule the week that I was there. I also tried to meet with General Sergev, who was the chief of strategic rocket forces, who heads up their missile capability. I also could not get a meeting with him, but I will return to Russia at some point in time, and I will meet with him. He is the equivalent to our Mal O'Neill, General O'Neill who heads our BMDO.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that I conveyed to the Russians that I am not about sticking it in their eye, that I want to work with them to convince them that missile defense is as much in their best interests as is ours, because the threat of attack from a rogue nation is probably more against them than it is us because of who borders their country.

They expressed a desire that we cannot get away from the theory of mutually assured destruction, and I convinced them that we have, in fact, the capability, under the existing treaty, to build a system, just like they have in Moscow. The American people do not even realize that. When you ask the American people if we are allowed to have a system to protect us against a launch of an incoming missile, they would think we did, and frequently I have to tell them no, we do not have any such system, because our leadership, primarily our liberal leadership in this Congress and in the White House right now, will not allow us to implement what Russia already has, which I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker. I cannot understand that notion.

Again, I say, this as not someone who is attempting to tweak the Russians,

but as someone who devotes a good part of his time to building strong relationships with the Russian people, with their leadership and their Duma.

I would tell you this, Mr. Speaker, despite the rhetoric we heard coming out of the White House this week, the leaders that I have met with in terms of the Russian think-tanks and the advisors to Yeltsin were more concerned from a START II standpoint, with President Clinton's goal of expanding NATO, than they were with the prospect of America developing a treaty-compliant missile defense system much like they have around Moscow, but you never hear President Clinton talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, he only talks about what we want to do in the Congress of a date certain system as being something that could jeopardize START II. I think that is a red herring. I do not think that is the case. We are going to make that case this year politically, as Mr. Clinton attempts to prevent us from moving forward with what I think we need, and that is the capability much like the Russians have today.

Mr. Speaker, besides the issue of the existing ABM system in Moscow and the treaty, I raised the notion with the Russians that I understand the importance of the ABM treaty politically to them, but that we now have a responsibility in a world that is no longer bipolar of protecting our people against a rogue attack. This is extremely important, Mr. Speaker. Some in our Congress, particularly on the Democrat side, the more liberal Members, would say that, ''The intelligence community says there is no threat in the next 15 years.''

I wrote to Gen. Mal O'Neill today to get his views on the most recent intelligence estimate, which I had a classified briefing on about a month ago. I think I was the first Member to have that. I walked out of the briefing, because it was so poor.

Mr. Speaker, our intelligence community, in the most politicized effort I have seen in my 10 years here, has said that Russia has not changed in 5 years. Despite cutoffs of power to their strategic nuclear force headquarters, despite no housing for the military, despite military personnel not being paid for months, despite tremendous morale problems, and despite the leakage of technology, both deliberately and accidentally, out of Russia, our intelligence agency comes forward and says that nothing has changed. That to me is unbelievable. In the first quarter of this year, Mr. Speaker, I will chair hearings in the R&D committee, and we will expose what I think is a consistent pattern of sanitizing intelligence data.

This, to me, is outrageous. As someone who spends the bulk of his time working on building and improving Russian-American relations, I find it unconscionable that anyone would attempt to sanitize information that would allow us to make an objective decision about what the threat is. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, while I was in Russia, while I met with the embassy staff in Moscow and then had a private meeting with Ambassador Pickering for an hour and then met with the leading advisors to President Yeltsin, I asked them about an incident that occurred in early December of last year.

The Jordanians, Mr. Speaker, as documented by the Washington Post on December 15, confiscated the most advanced telemetry equipment that would only be used in a long-range ICBM, intercontinental ballistic missile. These accelerometers and gyroscopes only could be used in a long-range missile. They were from Russia and they were heading to Iraq. The Jordanian and Israeli intelligence confiscated them. We now have in our possession some of these items that have been photographed by the Washington Post.

I asked everyone I met within Moscow, ''How do you explain, if there is stability here, how do you explain the most advanced technology that can help the Iraqis develop a long-range missile that could threaten any American city, how do you explain that leaving Russia?'' Because either answer is a problem for us: If the Russians say they know nothing about it, that is a problem, because it means they do not have control of their technology base; and if they say it was a legitimate sale, that is a problem, because it means they are exporting technology that, down the road, in Saddam's hands will threaten American interests.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about pie-in-the-sky ideas. We are talking about reality. Mr. Speaker, what bothered me most was when I talked to the Russians who advise Yeltsin. One, by the way, is a good friend of mine. I have been on three or four delegations with him over the past 10 years. I was active with him when he was a member of the Young Communist League, the Comsomol; he is a member. He just wrote a book on missile proliferation.

When I asked him, ''How do you explain this incident,'' he said to me, ''We don't know anything about it.'' That was reported in the Washington Post. I would invite any Member of this Congress to request a classified briefing they can receive as a Member of this body on the evidence that we have in our hands on this advanced technology going to Iraq for a long-range ICBM, not just one delivery, but evidence of other deliveries coming out of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the ABM Treaty does not protect us against Iraq having a long-range missile. It does not protect us against China's CSS–II. It does not protect us against North Korea's No Dong or Taepo Dong–II missile, which now has ranges close to Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, we have to address these issues up front and candidly with the Russians. They respect that. In all of my dealings with Russia over the past 20 years, in hosting over 100 Members of the Duma in my office last year, the one thing Russians respect, including my good friends over there, is when you are honest with them. That is why they, in the end, liked Ronald Reagan. They always knew where he was coming from.

But if, in fact, they see that our policy is set first and then we sanitize all of the information we get so it does not undermine the policy, that is not something they will respect. It is not something that is going to be in our best interests.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I sense that is beginning to happen now. It scares me. In the hearings that we will hold this year, we will look at that issue. We will look at the intelligence relative to Russian command and control.

Let us get back to the issue of the technology being transferred. Is it not strange, Mr. Speaker, that no one would even tell me that we had questioned the Russians on how this material was being transferred? I think I know why, Mr. Speaker: Because when we expose the facts and when we get on the record that Russia has, either directly or indirectly, legally or illegally, transferred this advanced equipment to Iraq, it is going to be a violation of the missile control technology regime, which Russia just entered this past fall. Guess what, Mr. Speaker? When Russia is in fact in violation of the MTCR, this country must take actions. Those actions could lead to sanctions.

Is this administration so naive that it would ignore what the Russians are doing, so we do not have to impose sanctions or even discuss it, so we do not talk about this? Mr. Speaker, I am not going to let that happen.

I raised this issue with the Russians directly at the same time I talked about helping them with their energy, with their environment, with their defense, with adoption and all the other issues I talked about. But I am not going to ignore reality when it comes to what people in the Russian military may be doing on their own.

We have got to understand that, Mr. Speaker, because this administration does not want to confront reality. They are so bent on bolstering up Yeltsin, whom I support and whom I hope succeeds. Even though the most recent polling data in Russia shows he only has 8 percent support in the entire Russian electorate, I want to see Yeltsin succeed. I want to see democracy succeed. I want to see economic reform succeed. But I do not want to do it in a vacuum, and not protect the people of this country.

I also proposed the question to those that I debated from the think-tanks and from Yeltsin's key advisory group on defense and foreign policy issues, how they would explain to me their concern with any treaty without them

understanding our mindset, and our mindset is very important, that they have to understand as well as we understand theirs.

I related a story to them, Mr. Speaker, of my first session in this Congress, in 1987. My first amendment on the floor of the House was an amendment offered on the defense authorization bill that was very simple. It was offered at the time that the liberals were telling then-President Reagan that we should adhere to the strictest possible interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

My amendment was very simple and said, ''The Russians,'' at that time the Soviet Union, ''had violated the ABM Treaty by the installation of the Krasnoyarsk radar system where it was installed.'' My amendment passed the House in a recorded vote 418 to 0. No Member disagreed with me. But the liberals said, ''It is not an important violation. It is a trivial violation.''

□ 1945

That radar is really being used for space-tracking purposes. It is not for missile defense, and it is not for a national missile defense system. I argued and many of our colleagues argued that, in fact, it was deliberate, and it was being placed there so that Russia could eventually have the option of breaking out of the ABM Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, last year I read the Russian media every day as a student of Russian relations. Last year I read the Journal of Russian Military History, and an article in it written by General Voitinsev. General Voitinsev for 18 years was the leader of the Russian Air and Space Command effort, the top guy. General Voitinsev in his article, his memoirs, on the record publicly said he was ordered to leave Krasnoyarsk radar where it was, knowing full well it was a deliberate violation of the ABM Treaty, knowing full well its ultimate purpose was for a tracking system to develop a capability to break out of the ABM Treaty.

Now, this is not a Republican conservative saying this, this is not some think tank expert in America; this is the Russian general responsible at the time for overseeing the placement of the Krasnoyarsk radar system.

He went on to further state, and I will provide this to any Member of this body who wants the detailed wording from the article, he further said he was ordered to place the radar there by General Ogarkov, General Ogarkov was being ordered by the Politburo, and told Voitinsev that if you do not place it where we tell you, which is the Krasnoyarsk, in direct violation of the ABM Treaty, you will be removed from your post.

I confronted the Russians with that, and they did not deny it, because they know it is true. But the important point is, Mr. Speaker, that both sides have to approach these issues in a frank, open and candid manner. Neither side should bury their head in the sand and ignore reality. And I say that not as an alarmist, but as somebody who delivered your letter to the new speaker of the Russian Duma, Mr. Seleznyov, who met with the Duma leadership, who met with Zhirinovsky's party, who met with the Yablakov party, the Russia Is Our Home party, and the Communists, to convince them that we want to work with them, but we cannot do that in a vacuum.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the intelligence community of this country to be sanitized by anyone in the White House. I am not just talking about the President; I am talking about key policy advisers or anyone else who may have an ultimate objective and who says we can't allow anything to get in the way of that objective. That is not the purpose of the intelligence community.

We who are the elected representatives of the people of this country need data based on fact, and we are going to get that data.

It really bothers me that as the chairman of the Committee on National Security, Subcommittee on Research and Development, that I have to go out and establish an ad hoc advisory group made up of former intelligence officials, and Russian experts and Soviet experts to advise me, because I questioned some of the data I am getting and the lack of answers I am getting from our own intelligence community. Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous.

Is it not outrageous that we have an incident that we cannot even get detailed response from what the Russians' position is on transferring sophisticated technology and equipment to Iraq? Is it because we do not want to jeopardize their membership in the MTCR? That is outrageous, Mr. Speaker.

I again invite every Member of this body to ask for the classified briefing that is available today on what happened in December and what the results of the evidence that we have are in terms of this material being transferred to Iraq and the implications that has for Iraq's capabilities of developing one long-range missile.

Furthermore, I also, Mr. Speaker, had a chance to meet with a Russian company, Rosvoorouzhenie. We talk about arms sales. This is the new company that has been formed in Russia; this is their slick marketing brochure. They gave me all of their copies of them, of anything I wanted. I met with the leadership of this company that has as its total purpose the marketing of arms all over the world, and where basically we can buy anything and everything that the Russians are making today.

What concerned me most is not their ability to sell their helicopters and their guns and these other armaments, because companies do that in this country, even though we can limit that. It is the fact, where does it stop, Mr. Speaker?

One SS–25 with a range of 10,000 kilometers on a mobile launch system pulled by a tractor, basically pulling the back of a truck, can reach any city in America, one SS–25; and the Russians have probably 500 SS–25 launchers. One SS–25 removed from Russia and taken to a Third World nation presents an immediate threat to this county. That is a possibility, Mr. Speaker.

In hearings that I chaired last year, the CIA said on the record it would be possible to take one battery out without us knowing it. I am not talking about a nuclear weapon being on the tip of that missile. I am talking about a conventional weapon. It could be a chemical or biological weapon, or it could be just the threat itself.

Mr. Speaker, these are the threats that are there. This is reality. And for us to have a lasting relationship with the Russians that works in both of our interests to build trust and understanding, and help them economically and socially, we must base our discussions on factual information and we trust be willing to share the bad stories.

When I was in St. Petersburg speaking at the ACOPS conference, talking about the Russian dumping of nuclear waste, I started off by saying, you know, we come from America and we are quick to criticize you for problems that we think only you have.

I remember a hearing that I called for in the last session of Congress when I was the ranking member of the Oceanography Subcommittee, and I was listening to a Navy official testify about the problems of the *Komsvolez*, a Russian submarine that went down off the coast of Norway, that is sitting on the bottom of the sea, that has nuclear missiles and also has a nuclear rector on board.

And I said to that Navy official when he was done, I am concerned about the *Komsvolez*, but let me ask you a question. Can you tell me about the *Thresher* and the *Scorpion*, the two American submarines that are on the bottom of the ocean, nuclear power with nuclear weapons.

He said to me, Congressman, we cannot discuss that in an open session.

I said, you expect us to be critical of the Russians for accidents they have had, but not to be critical of ourselves for accidents that perhaps we have had.

Mr. Speaker, in this era of a new dialog with members of the Russian Duma, above all, we have got to be candid. When we have problems, we have to acknowledge them, and when they have problems, we have to confront them. To do anything less is a disservice to our country and to the people of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, Russia has changed a lot. The Duma is in place now; the Federations Council largely appointed by Yeltsin is in power. Yeltsin is having a terrible problem right now as he is appointing a lot of reactionary leaders, Kremkov to replace the most recent foreign minister. He is changing and checking up his cabinet to try to get

back support from the nationalists who won the election in December. But, Mr. Speaker, in the end, for us to maintain solid relations, we have to be candid with one another.

The Russian military is still led by some of the same leaders who were in the leadership positions when it was the Soviet military. I read a series of articles recently by one of the commanders of one of the major Russian fleets. I believe it was the North Fleet, where he talked about Russia being involved in world war III. This is just a recent article that appeared 3 weeks ago. I will be happy to provide it for any of our colleagues.

This Russian admiral, who is now in a key position of the Russian Navy, talked about Russia already being involved in world war III with the West, that it was not the traditional war, it was a velvet war where America was attempting to undermine Russia, and that the only way Russia was going to eventually succeed was to eventually have the use and capability of its nuclear arsenal. As much as we want to brush away those kinds of statements and those kinds of positions, we have to confront them head on, Mr. Speaker. We have to confront the elected officials in Russia head on.

If they have problems with us and what we have done, then they should be able to confront us and we should openly discuss it and debate it. But we should never allow anyone in Russia to give us false information or, worse yet, to give us no information about problems and concerns that we have with events that are unfolding in terms of defense policy and foreign relations in particular.

I think the Russians will ultimately respect us for that position, and hopefully, this process that we have established will allow us, through your good efforts, Mr. Speaker, to have an ongoing relationship, and open dialog will occur in both countries. That is the only way that, down the road, irregardless of who the President of either country is, that we can build long-term trust and understanding.

We have key concerns. We have a need to protect our people, and we ought to be able to address those issues directly with the Russian leaders. The Russians have concerns with perhaps where we are going. They may think that our purpose in trying to get rid of the ABM Treaty is just to gain an advantage with them, when in fact our major purpose is to protect us from another rogue launch; not necessarily an all-out attack from Russia, it is from the peril of an Iraq getting a long-range missile, or from China, or North Korea or from some other rogue nation. The ABM Treaty does nothing to protect us from those instances.

With the Russians offering to sell the SS–25 as a space launch platform or from a variation of that, with the Russian marketing efforts underway to market their missile systems around the world, we need to be more vigilant than ever.

I would make the case, Mr. Speaker, that Russia today militarily is more destabilized than it ever was under Communist leadership. Central command is not what it was. During our hearings in the first quarter, we are going to look at the central command, we are going to look at the command structure; we are going to look at the potential for a breakdown in the control of that nuclear arsenal, and we are going to confront it in an intelligent manner.

It really galled me last night to see President Clinton stand up right behind us, right behind me in this podium, and tell the American people for the second time that he can say no longer are Russian missiles pointed at American children. That is the most outrageous statement this President has made, among many outrageous statements.

Any expert who knows anything about missiles, including the Russian military expert who controls those missiles, as he said on ''60 Minutes'' when he was interviewed, those missiles can be retargeted in a matter of seconds and minutes, and that is exactly what can occur. And to the American people some kind of false sense that all is well and there are no problems is the absolutely worst thing that this administration could be doing.

We in the Congress are not going to let that happen. We are going to be vigilant, we are going to be aggressive; we are going to pursue issues that we want answers to like the transfer of this technology to Iraq and why it occurred and how it occurred. We are going to pursue questions about the sale of sophisticated weaponry, the leakage of nuclear materials, the breakdown of command and control in the Russian military, but we are going to do it openly and honestly; and we are also going to work with the Russians to stabilize their economy, to help them environmentally with their energy issues and every other area where they have common concerns. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, we can achieve ultimate success.

I applaud you for the leadership role that you have taken in this new initiative with the speaker of the Russian Duma. For those who would be critical of you, I would say, here is another example where you have created a new effort in the Congress and in Washington to achieve a new level of relationship with Russia that we have never had before. I am optimistic it will be successful, and I am optimistic that in the end, we can in fact peacefully coexist if we are both honest and candid, one with the other.

I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert support documentation of my trip in the RECORD, as well as the letter itself from you to Speaker Seleznyov, and would invite my colleagues to follow up on this issue if they have particular issue areas they want to focus on, to let them know that we will be trying to form these focus areas once we get the word from the Russian Duma that they are ready to proceed with this exciting new opportunity.

I thank my colleagues for bearing with me as I provide this report on the trip and our relations with Russia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
Washington, DC, January 17, 1996.

Hon. GENNADY SELEZNYOV,
Speaker, State Duma, Russian Federation.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to seek your assistance and support for a project that I feel will have long-term benefits for both Russia and America and our respective legislatures. I propose that we establish a standing Duma-Congress Study Group composed of members of the Russian Duma and U.S. Congress to develop an ongoing relationship between our legislatures.

I have asked Congressman Curt Weldon, who first brought this proposal to my attention, to personally deliver this letter to you and brief you in greater detail on the Study Group. Congressman Weldon has focused much of his work in the Congress on a range of Russian-American issues, including energy development, the environment, and arms control.

These are just a few of the many important issues that confront our two nations, and I am convinced that an effective way to develop greater understanding between our two nations and make real progress on these issues is to establish a mechanism for a long-term dialogue between our two legislatures. Many formal linkages already exist between our two Presidents and executive branches, but no formal organization exists to facilitate communication between our legislators. I believe such a legislature-to-legislature organization would complement, rather than hamper, the bilateral activities of our executive branches.

The Study Group, as I envision it, would consist of eight to ten members from each of our legislatures who would meet for three to five days two times each year, once in Russia and once in the United States, to discuss a range of key Russian-American issues that would be agreed upon in advance. The goal would be to make the sessions somewhat informal so as to develop the sort of personal relationships that lead to frank and candid discussions.

In a related area, I am very enthusiastic about a larger project to link legislators around the world via a computer network. This effort, called the 21st Century International Legislator's Project, under the directorship of General Charles Boyd (USAF Ret.), will produce information transfer among legislators around the globe at an unprecedented rate. Participation by Duma members will be important to the success of this project, and I will provide for you by separate communication the details of this historic effort to share with your fellow members as the initiation date nears.

I would appreciate your careful consideration of the proposal to establish a Congress-Duma Study Group. If you agree that such an organization should be established, I would ask that you appoint a member of the Duma to serve as a point of contact for Congressman Weldon to work with in developing the Study Group.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOGGETT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KILDEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VENTO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NETHERCUTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today and January 25.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWNBACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHAYS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. WARD.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida in two instances.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. VENTO in two instances.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Ms. LOFGREN in four instances.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

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

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. TORKILDSEN.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut in two instances.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

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

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. REED.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. HILLIARD.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 23:

H.R. 1606. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 24 Corliss Street, Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Harry Kizirian Post Office Building.''

H.R. 2061. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1550 Dewey Avenue, Baker City, Oregon, as the ''David J. Wheeler Federal Building.''

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 25, 1996, at 10 a.m.).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1959. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2000 resulting from passage of H.R. 1655 and H.R. 2627, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–582); to the Committee on the Budget.

1960. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year—if any—and the budget year provided by H.R. 1643, H.R. 1358, and House Joint Resolution 134, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–578); to the Committee on the Budget.

1961. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a copy of the annual report on the Coke Oven Emission Control Program for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to Public Law 101–549, section 301 (104 Stat. 2559); to the Committee on Commerce.

1962. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 1996 annual report to the Congress on foreign policy export controls, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2413; to the Committee on International Relations.

1963. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning the unauthorized transfer of U.S.-origin defense articles, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2753(e); to the Committee on International Relations.

1964. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the Comptroller General's 1995 annual report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1965. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the activities of Federal agencies in implementing the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act for calendar years 1992 and 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(r); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1966. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Parole Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1967. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting the High Plains States Groundwater Demonstration Program 1995 interim report, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 390g-2(c)(2); to the Committee on Resources.

1968. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the annual report for fiscal year 1994 covering the Outer Continental Shelf [OCS] Natural Gas and Oil Leasing and Production Program, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1343; to the Committee on Resources.

1969. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Medicare Alzheimer's Disease Demonstration Evaluation,'' pursuant to section 9342 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, as amended: jointly, to the Committee on Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2100. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to maps relating to the coastal barrier resources system, with an amendment (Rept. 104–452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 342. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 104–453). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2872. A bill to authorize substitution for drawback purposes of certain types of fibers and yarns for use in the manufacture of carpets and rugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2873. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the collection and use by the Department of Defense of individual genetic identifying information to the purpose of identification of remains, other than when the consent of the individual concerned is obtained; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 2874. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary steps to negotiate with the members of NATO to ensure that the European members of NATO assume the costs of supporting U.S. participation in

the NATO Implementation Force [IFOR]; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 2875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a breast and prostate cancer research fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FRAZER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 2876. A bill to provide for a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives to represent the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCHALE:

H.R. 2877. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for the payment of tuition for higher education and interest on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOKE:

H. Res. 341. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to require that no object or activity for which Federal money is provided shall be named for a living individual who is or, within the last five Congresses, has been a Member of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

195. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Americans captured or missing during the Korean War; to the Committee on International Relations.

196. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the Federal courts from ordering any State or political subdivision thereof to levy or increase taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal Federal laws and rules linking food stamp eligibility with heating assistance; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Commerce.

198. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

Mr. HOKE introduced a bill (H.R. 2878) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade and on the Great Lakes and their tributary and connecting waters in trade with Canada for the vessel *Morgan*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 38: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 138: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 143: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 218: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 359: Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 761: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 957: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1023: Mr. COX and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1078: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1496: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1619: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1620: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1706: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1711: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1776: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SCOTT.

H.R. 1889: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1933: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1948: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 2044: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2065: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2092: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 2184: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2202: Mr. COOLEY.

H.R. 2245: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 2276: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2281: Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 2374: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 2429: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 2480: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. BURR.

H.R. 2508: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 2540: Mr. COX, Mr. NEY, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 2566: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 2579: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 2598: Mr. BALLENGER and Mrs. SEASTRAND.

H.R. 2607: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2608: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2610: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2625: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 2639: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 2646: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 2654: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2674: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 2682: Mr. WALSH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2707: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 2740: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 2748: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STARK, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2779: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2785: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MINGE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 2789: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2795: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FOLEY, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 2823: Mr. FARR, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 2867: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.J. Res. 121: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. CRANE.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. MARTINI.

H. Res. 49: Mr. MFUME, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H. Res. 285: Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 2072: Mr. HERGER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

52. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Inkster, MI, relative to requesting the Federal Government to provide the city of Inkster all of the necessary financial resources in order to meet its federally mandated obligations under the current NPDES permits; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1996 No. 9

Senate

The Senate met at 5 p.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Give to the Lord the glory due His name, bring an offering, and come before Him. Oh, worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness!—I Chronicles 16:29.

Sovereign God, gracious Father, blessed Redeemer, inspiring Spirit, we worship You for Your faithfulness, loving kindness, justice, and mercy. The offering we bring to our worship of You is ourselves. Nothing in our hands we bring; simply to Your grace we cling. We worship You in awe and wonder, joy and gladness, delight and dependence. The blessing of belonging to You is the only beauty of holiness we have to offer. All that we have and are belongs to You. The Nation that You have called us to lead is Your Nation. Our greatness in the past is because of Your goodness; our triumph in the future is assured only as we trust in You.

May all of life express our worship of You. We seek to express our worship of You in our work, our relationships, our responsibilities. We commit ourselves to practice Your presence in the sublime and in the simple, with people of great and of no reputation, in duties that bring us recognition and those only You can see. To God be the glory. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader, Senator LOTT, is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. This afternoon, the Senate will be in session for a period of morning business. There will be no rollcall votes during today's session. The Senate may consider any legislative items that can be cleared for action by unanimous consent. All Senators should be reminded the continuing resolution expires Friday of this week. It is therefore expected the Senate will consider a new continuing resolution when one becomes available from the House. The Senate may also consider the Department of Defense authorization conference report as well as the START II Treaty.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the President.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to compliment the President of the United States on his State of the Union Message last night. I think the reaction today is certainly an indication of the degree to which the President succeeded in articulating his message last night. He discussed, as he can so ably, his record for the last 3 years, reminding us that the economy is much stronger than it was when he took office, reminding us that we have reduced the Federal work force by 200,000 personnel, reminding us that the growth in the economy itself is as strong as it has been in the past 30 years, and recognizing that we have made substantial progress in reducing the deficit.

So, indeed, from the perspective of the Government, as well as from the point of view of the economy, America is strong and the State of the Union reflects that strength, as he reminded us last night.

He also sought to challenge us in seven very specific ways. I think his challenge was appropriate. Indeed, our country expects us to meet the challenges of education, a stronger economy, the need for health care reform, and a whole range of issues that the President addressed so ably and articulately last night.

Most importantly perhaps, he reminded us that the effort over the last several weeks to achieve meaningful deficit reduction has indeed, to at least a certain extent, succeeded. The fact is, as the President indicated last night, if you take the lesser of the amounts agreed to on either side in the most recent offers by both the Republicans and the Democrats, we could achieve deficit reduction totaling more than $700 billion.

Mr. President, that is a very significant achievement. He challenged us last night, to continue the effort to find common ground, to reach out across the aisle to establish a meaningful dialog, to continue to build on what we have already achieved, and to continue to find ways in which to make the common ground more meaningful. In so doing we can realize a balanced Federal budget in 7 years using the Congressional Budget Office figures.

In that regard, Mr. President, I was extremely pleased with the announcement this morning by the Speaker that he, too, felt that common ground efforts ought to be sought, and that we ought to continue to find ways in which to build upon the common agreement that we have reached thus far in achieving a meaningful balanced budget.

In my view, that is a breakthrough. When you have the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House, the most prominent Democrat and one of the most prominent Republicans, agreeing in public that indeed

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

Printed on recycled paper.

there is a real possibility of achieving meaningful progress in this effort to reach common agreement on a balanced budget, that is a breakthrough.

This is no time to abolish or to abandon our goal of attempting to reach a balanced budget. A piecemeal approach, Mr. President, is unnecessary. We can do it now. We can take that $711 billion in mutually agreed to savings and find the kind of long-term resolution to this balanced budget challenge that we have now faced for many months.

So it is our opportunity. Apparently the Speaker now agrees that achieving that in a meaningful way is possible, using the common ground approach. Let us not abandon that goal. Let us not take anything less than a balanced budget over that 7-year period. Let us do it now.

I think it is very important that we also recognize that to do it in the context of either a debt limit or a continuing resolution is not practical. We recognize that by encumbering and perhaps endangering either the continuing resolution or the debt limit resolution we may again find ourselves in a complex series of difficulties and crises that neither side wants.

We need a clean continuing resolution. We need a clean resolution on the debt limit. And we can work simultaneously in continuing our negotiations to find a clean budget agreement that achieves the meaningful deficit reduction that we want using the common ground proposals that both the Speaker and the President have now accepted.

Mr. President, I think the last critical issue to recognize is the importance of the next several weeks. It is very important that we not let this opportunity slip, that we not wait until the last moment to resolve these issues. We cannot afford to wait until the 27th or 28th or 29th of February. We cannot wait until that very crisis moment to resolve all these issues relating to the debt limit.

Let us use the 28th and 29th and 30th of January. Let us use the first few weeks of February to resolve these issues. Let us, in other words, stay here and do our work. Let us not take the chance that we will not be able to solve these problems at the end of February when the crisis truly looms.

So let us stay here, let us do what we must, let us recognize the opportunity that is before us, let us accept the challenges the President has now laid out so articulately and so clearly last night. Let us do that, recognizing that there are common goals and much common ground upon which to base our progress. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Mississippi.

CONSIDERING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LOTT. First, Mr. President, if I might expand just a bit on the opening announcement. I understand now that we are in the process of receiving the House-passed Department of Defense authorization conference report that passed overwhelmingly, I believe something like 287 to 129, something of that magnitude. So we hope that we will be able to get an agreement to get the Defense Department authorization conference report up shortly, tomorrow or Friday.

I know the chairman is very anxious for us to get that done tomorrow if at all possible. We will be working to see if we can come to an agreement on that. We have worked across the aisle with the distinguished chairman from South Carolina and the distinguished ranking member from Georgia, Senator NUNN. I believe he would like to see us get that done as soon as possible, and we will continue to work in that effort.

BALANCED BUDGET AND DEBT CEILING LIMIT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in response to the comments from the distinguished Democratic leader, certainly we should continue to find a way to move toward a balanced budget agreement. The President said last night he wanted to do that, and even though he vetoed the balanced budget when we sent it to him, that should not deter our efforts.

I believe from what I saw last night that the majority leader, Senator DOLE, indicated we are, in fact, going to continue to pursue this, and he intends for us to send balanced budget legislation to the President.

So we need to think about how we do that. The Senator from South Dakota mentioned, even though we want to avoid, if we can, a protracted, cumbersome process, perhaps we can have an agreement that would allow us to avoid that. But we will continue to have that as our goal. We are going to work to give the President an opportunity to, in fact, sign bills along the lines of what he said he wanted to sign last night.

I know that the House, where continuing resolutions must begin, is in the process of developing a continuing resolution, or a balanced budget downpayment is the way I think it should be appropriately described. They will be acting on that, I believe, on Thursday, and then we will have that legislation before us. I certainly hope and expect it is going to be legislation that the Senate will be able to pass and that will go to the President.

With regard to the debt ceiling extension, there, again, I believe the history of that has been the House will act first. I know the House is thinking about that and is working on it.

With regard to it being a clean debt ceiling, I went back and checked the record in 1990 and 1989 and 1987, back to 1984, and found that in most years debt ceilings did, in fact, have riders on them. Those were put on by a Democratic-controlled Congress when we had a Republican President, so it would not be anything out of the ordinary if it worked the other way this time.

I must say, as a Senator who has voted in the Senate and in the House both ways on debt ceiling—sometimes for them, sometimes against them, and not just when there was a Republican President, sometimes Democratic Presidents—sometimes my vote has been influenced by the riders. Quite often, they are agreed-to things, things that need to be done. I hope that we will wait and see exactly what will be the best way to proceed on that, keeping in mind the House will act on it, and we will certainly be communicating with them.

I have said publicly that I think we should do that, and I fully expect that we will. The timing, of course, will be determined by a whole series of meetings that will be underway. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that we are going to be very busy during the next few days and weeks, and we have a lot of work to do. We have to begin on the next fiscal year. Hearings must begin soon on budgets and appropriations bills and even authorizations. We certainly intend to begin that process.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor for others who might have comments.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

BALANCED BUDGET AND THE STATE OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I feel like we ought to start negotiations again in regard to the budget. I think there is an opportunity to get a balanced budget now and in the immediate future. I think if we have a long recess that we will stand a chance of losing what momentum there is, and it may well be that in the near future, we can narrow the issues by adopting some of the various issues that have been agreed upon.

Mr. President, for the first time in over 40 years, farm programs have been allowed to expire. As of December 31, with a few exceptions, the authority for farm programs has run out.

It is the responsibility of this Congress, to pass a farm bill every 5 years or so, and create stability and certainty in rural America. Instead, with the failure of passing a farm bill, there is uncertainty, frustration and confusion in the agriculture producing areas of the country. Congress has failed in its responsibility to rural America and we must, therefore, act now to resolve this situation.

What can be done at this late date, what are our options? As I see it, we have three options: First, we can do nothing and allow the Secretary of Agriculture to implement the Agriculture

Act of 1949, second, we can pass a stand-alone farm bill, as we should have done in the first session, or third, we can pass an extension of the 1990 farm bill, thus providing rural America with much needed certainty and allow Congress more time to write a farm bill this year.

If Congress does not act, then the Secretary of Agriculture will have to exercise his responsibility to implement the Agriculture Act of 1949. Currently, market prices for wheat, corn, feed grains, and cotton are at all-time highs. However, under the 1949 act, the Secretary will be forced to implement parity prices for wheat, corn, and feed grains. For instance, wheat prices which are currently trading at $4.92 per bushel, the support price would jump to $7.82 a bushel. For corn, which is trading at $3.60 per bushel, the parity price could go as high as $5.30 per bushel.

Alabama's primary crops do not include wheat or corn. However, if parity prices are implemented, Alabama and the whole Nation will also be greatly effected. Alabama is one of the leading States in poultry and catfish production. With corn and feed grain prices potentially rising as high as they are projected, it will have the effect of sending livestock feed prices through the roof. Also at stake in Alabama are dairy, beef cattle, and hog producers who will be forced to pay higher prices for their feed. This increasing cost of production does not stop with the producers. Consumers will shortly feel the effect of the failure to pass a farm bill in the form of much higher beef, poultry, pork, and fish prices at the supermarket. These examples do not even address the effects that the 1949 act and parity prices will have on the Federal Treasury. As a result, I do not support this course of action, despite its very real possibility given Secretary of Agriculture hands being tied.

The second option that we have before us, is to pass a stand-alone farm bill. I am still puzzled as to why we did not pursue this course of action this time last year, rather than allowing farm policy to become embroiled in the budget reconciliation bill. I, along with my Democratic colleagues have sent a letter to the majority leader, Senator DOLE, requesting that farm policy come to the floor and be debated on its own merits so that we can pass a farm bill without getting caught in the web of budget politics. I have long stated that I believe that the current structure of farm programs have served rural America, and consumers everywhere, extremely well. Therefore, it is my belief that farm programs should only be fined tuned. I do recognize that some of my less fortunate regional colleagues feel that farm programs that effect their States need greater changes than those that effect the South. The ability to resolve these differences is the purpose of debate on farm programs, which to this point there has been very little in committee, and virtually none by the full Senate. Therefore, I recommend that we return to committee and discuss the farm bill as we always have in the past. We would then be able to bring a bill to the floor that addresses all of our needs and concerns, and pass a bill that serves our agricultural producers, rural America, and consumers alike.

The budget reconciliation bill contained agriculture provisions. However, the provisions contained in the reconciliation bill were never debated in committee, were not passed as part of the Senate reconciliation bill, but instead were approved in conference. Furthermore, the provisions known as freedom to farm, that ultimately ended up in the reconciliation bill, were defeated in the House Agriculture Committee.

I believe that the provisions of the so-called freedom to farm bill are seriously flawed. The freedom to farm bill makes guaranteed payments to farmers whether they produce a crop or not. The freedom to farm bill offers producers a bonus check in times of high market prices, and then is not sufficient in times of low market prices. It is unconscionable to make payments to producers in times of high market prices, such as we are currently experiencing, when at the same time, we are reducing school lunches and other essential nutrition programs. Essentially, the freedom to farm bill as a phase-out of farm programs. By repealing the permanent authority for farm programs, the freedom to farm bill ends all farm programs after 7 years.

I strongly believe that the core component of sound farm policy should be an adequate and certain safety net, one that provides support when market prices are low, and one that does not need to make payments when the market is up. This is how current farm programs are structured, and they work. For evidence of this, we need look no further than the recent CBO adjustment of its agriculture baseline. The CBO, after analyzing what they believe to be the future trend in agriculture prices, has determined that they expect commodity prices to remain high for at the least the next few years. As a result, the CBO has adjusted its baseline downward by $8 billion. I believe that this is evidence that farm programs work as they are designed to: provide support at times of need, and no support when it is not warranted.

Therefore, while there may be an effort to resurrect the freedom to farm bill, I believe the policy contained within is inherently flawed. However, a full and open debate on farm policy will allow us to debate, consider and resolve these outstanding issues pertaining to the farm bill. This is the course of action that I strongly support.

To this point in time, however, we have not been allowed to debate farm policy. Yet, farmers do not stop when the Government shuts down; they rely more heavily on Mother Nature's timetables than they do Congress' continuing resolutions. However, despite the failure to pass a farm bill, farmers must continue to prepare for the upcoming planting season. Farmers, bankers, and other support industry such as fertilizer and seed suppliers, farm implement dealers, and processors must have some certainty as to the laws that they will be farming under.

In the event that we are not allowed to consider and implement a farm bill this year, and time is quickly running out, I then support the third course of action that Congress has before it: a 1-year extension of current farm policy. Extending farm programs for a period of 1 year will give rural America the much needed certainty that it deserves and allow time for Congress to act responsibly and write a farm bill this year. It is the responsibility of this Congress to let America's agriculture producers know what the program is for 1996, and we must not delay action.

Cotton and peanut producers in my State of Alabama can take comfort in knowing that they will not be held hostage to the ongoing budget negotiations and Government shutdowns. The cotton and peanut programs were extended for the 1996 and 1997 crops. While I support some fine-tuning of these programs, these commodity programs will work essentially the same as they have over the past 5 years. This is certainty that producers can take to the bank. Now, all producers should quickly be given the same measure of certainty.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to visit about the agricultural issue, but I have two friends from agricultural States and members of the Agriculture Committee on the other side of the aisle. I am not here to counteract anything they have said. I want to make that very clear. I want to make it clear, though, that while there is from the other side of the aisle admonitions of what we ought to do to solve the agricultural bill problem that we have before us, there are other approaches that ought to be used.

I am here to advocate a position that is not favored on the other side of the aisle. I will also bring to the attention of the agricultural community, who is concerned about this issue, that yesterday the majority party of the U.S. Senate offered a unanimous-consent motion to bring up the very provisions that were in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, which the President vetoed, and if he had not vetoed that, we would not have any commodity policy problems for this Congress to settle for the next 7 years. We would not be here today talking about what ought to be done for the 1996 crop year as we get up to the very planting deadlines that are so close and are probably already in place in the State of Alabama and other areas of the South.

Every farmer of the United States would know what the policy for the next 7 years would be if the President had not vetoed that bill. Every farmer would know the amount of money that would be spent on agriculture from the U.S. Treasury over the next 7 years—that would be $43.5 billion—with $6 billion being spent in 1996. Without this legislation this money will not be spent and if the proposals from the other side of the aisle were adopted, there would not be $6 million going into agriculture in 1996. So the certainty of the money going there, it seems to me, ought to be pretty enticing to everybody on the other side of the aisle to back our proposal, plus the fact that there would be certainty in agriculture policy for the next 7 years.

Somewhat unrelated to the immediate problem we have before us but directly related to the fact that the other side is, in a sense, rejecting $6 billion going into agriculture in 1996 and rejecting the proposal of this side of the certainty of $43.5 billion going into agriculture over the next 7 years is the fact that—this may not apply to my three friends who are sitting over there from agriculture states, there are some prominent people on the other side of the aisle who have voted against past farm bills because they did not put enough money into agriculture. I am speaking specifically of the 1990 farm bill and the 1985 farm bill.

How ironic that those very same people are going to oppose what we are trying to do because somehow it puts too much money into agriculture this crop year. Is that not ironic. People on the other side of the aisle who voted against the 1990 farm bill, the 1985 farm bill because it did not put enough money into agriculture, are objecting to Republican efforts that has a farm bill that would put $6 billion into agriculture and a certainty of $43.5 billion over the next 7 years. And $43.5 billion might sound like a lot of money. But it is less than half what has been spent on agriculture in recent years. The farm bill is about the only program in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that actually was cut. Most of the other programs in that Balanced Budget Act were slowing the rate of growth.

I want to move on and say it would have also given—what we proposed to do yesterday, and the very same thing that the President vetoed in December would have set a policy that every farmer in America would have the opportunity to plant according to the marketplace, not according to policy decisions made in Washington. Furthermore, every acre would be planted. I think that is a sound agricultural policy, and it was rejected by the other side yesterday.

When we are up to these planting deadlines you may not get exactly what you want, I may not get exactly what I want, but let me say this: Every major farm organization in the United States supports the Freedom To Farm Act. Every major commodity group in the United States supports what was in that bill. Yet there are some who would take the view that at this last minute that is not good enough for them. Or in some cases, ironically, it might be too much. But what is ironic about that, some of the very same people said in past years we were not doing enough for agriculture.

I will yield the floor, although I hope we can have some more discussion on this if the people want to discuss it. I think it is such an important issue that we have to proceed and we have to reach an agreement on this.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to my colleague from Iowa and I want to make a couple of rejoinders and a couple of other additional comments.

I was on the floor yesterday, as a matter of fact. So, I well understand what happened yesterday. The Senator from Idaho brought a bill to the floor by unanimous consent to take the so-called Freedom To Farm Act out of the budget reconciliation bill and deem it passed by itself on the floor. I objected to that.

I then offered a unanimous-consent request on the floor to take the piece of legislation I had introduced extending the current farm program for 1 year. It would also provide enormous planting flexibility so farmers can plant any crop within their base acres, and provide some forgiveness of the advance deficiency agreement. And, the majority party objected to that.

Then the majority party, by the Senator from Idaho, offered a unanimous-consent request to abolish the 1949 Permanent Farm Act. I do not understand why the majority party would put itself in a position of coming to the floor of the Senate to say ''We would like to go on record saying we want no farm policy.'' I puzzled over that last evening, wondering why would the majority party be out here with that message? Why would they say, ''If we cannot get the Freedom To Farm Act, we want nothing. We want to abolish the 1949 act.''

Then I offered a second unanimous-consent request in which I said, ''Well, if you do not agree with extending the program for one year with the other provisions I included, then would you at least agree with forgiving the advance deficiency payments, because you said you agreed with that. I will make a unanimous-consent request that we bring that up and deem that to have passed.'' The majority party objected to that. So that is what happened yesterday.

This is not just a chapter. This is a novel. One has to read all the chapters to understand the story line of this novel. This is not, however, entertainment reading for farmers in our country.

We are at the end of January. Congress has a responsibility to have a farm program and we do not have one. Some might say, ''Well, you do not have one because you would not swallow what we tried to shove down somebody's throat.'' I heard from others yesterday, ''Well, gee, nobody tried to shove anything down anybody's throat.''

The Senator from Alabama is on the committee. There was not a markup in which there was full discussion. We should have all reasoned together in a bipartisan way the way we have always done it on a 5-year farm bill. There was none of that.

There was not a bipartisan approach to a farm bill. It was, ''Here it is, swallow it or leave it. And, by the way, we will put it into the budget reconciliation bill for the first time in history.'' We have never done that before. The strategy was, ''That is where we will put it and we know the President will veto the bill. Then after he vetoes it we will feign surprise that we do not have a farm policy.''

I am puzzled. We must on every day in every way decide to give farmers an answer. What will the policy be? We must find a way to agree on common elements. I think there are areas where we have common agreement. We agree with substantial flexibility. We agree on that. There are a number of areas we agree. Forgiveness on some of the advance deficiencies.

Farmers do not have the luxury of saying, ''It is spring. The sun is shining. We have just had some rain but I decided to defer my planting until July.''

Congress ought not have the luxury of deciding it can wait until Friday, the next Friday, or the next spring to decide what the farm policy ought to be. If farmers do not have the luxury not to plant or harvest, we ought not have the luxury to decide not to give farmers an answer of what the farm policy ought to be in this country.

We have a responsibility to pass a 5-year farm plan. It has not been done. Somebody said, ''Well, but we did it.'' Yes, it was stuck into a reconciliation bill. But, the fact is it did not get passed. Everybody knew it would not get signed by the President and so we are left with nothing.

It seems to me we have a responsibility now to make something out of this mess. All of us from farm country need to come together here. This is not a joke or a laughing matter or amusing to any farmer in this country. They want to know under what conditions will they plant this spring.

Farmers face twin risks of planting a seed, not knowing whether it will grow, and then, if it grows, not knowing whether there will be a price at the marketplace. Family size farms wash away when international prices go down and stay down. That is why we have a safety net. That safety net is what we should be debating here in this Congress. Farmers deserve an answer, and we are going to keep pushing day after day to give them an answer.

Let me comment on the $6 billion my colleague mentioned. It is simply not the case that people over here say we do not want to spend enough on agriculture. That is not the case. My colleague knows that is not the case. The fact is, we are not debating the baseline for the 7-year period on agriculture. If we were debating that, the debate on the baseline is that the majority party's budget cut far more than twice as much from the baseline than the budget cuts that we had offered. If we are going to debate baselines, that is what we ought to debate. And I would be glad to do that, but I also want to go on to another brief subject.

A WAY TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was very heartened a few minutes ago by the discussion of the Senator from Mississippi, Senator LOTT, in which he talked about something that a number of us had advocated and the President advocated last evening.

In fact, Senator EXON and I were in a press conference about a week or so ago. At that time we said one idea about resolving the budget issue is to package up each side's offer, take the lower spending cut on each of the offers. When you add all that up you reach $711 billion in spending cuts and you reach savings sufficient so you can balance the budget. Why do we not do that?

The President came to the floor of the Chamber of the House last evening and said let us do that. Let us at least do that. We can just take the lower of the two offers from the Republicans and the Democrats. We can take the lower in each spending category of the two offers of saving money in every category. Then you have $711 billion, which is sufficient to balance the budget.

What I heard this morning is that the Speaker of the House suggested that might be a good thing. Senator LOTT indicated that makes a lot of sense. If we are moving in that direction, I am enormously heartened by that. It is a way to move towards a balanced budget, do it with the right priorities and do it in the right way.

If we can do that, we can solve the problems of the CR, the debt limit. We can have a clean appropriations extension, pass a clean debt limit and agree on taking $711 billion of savings. As a result we can balance this Federal budget. Then we will have done something, I think, of substantial good for this country.

So I would just say that I feel heartened by at least the little snippets I have heard today, first on television this morning by the Speaker, and next in a discussion by Senator LOTT. Maybe there is a formula here for breaking this gridlock and actually reaching results with respect to a 7-year balanced budget plan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we are in morning business as I understand it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business expired at 5:30, but the Senator may request to proceed under morning business.

Mr. EXON. Has time been limited for Senators in morning business when we were in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We had been under a 5-minute guideline.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask I may be allowed to proceed under the same rules for 5 minutes.

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

THE FARM BILL

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, there are two things I want to talk about. First, I have heard some of the discussion with regard to farm policy by some of my closest friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle today. It is a pretty sad situation when I see that the usual farm coalition between Democrats and Republicans is obviously breaking down. I think it is a tragedy of major proportions.

I would simply say, there are those of us who feel we should stay in session for lots of reasons, not the least of which is to pass a farm bill. If we cannot come to some kind of an agreement, I hope the majority leader will simply call up the farm bill for discussion, debate it on the floor of the U.S. Senate, pass something, and send it to the President and see if he will sign it.

The President, I might add, has been very supportive of the position for funding of agriculture that this Senator, as the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee, has been for a long, long time. We have a profarm advocate sitting at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the President of the United States of America. We should continue to build and work with him.

The various moves that have been made with regard to the Freedom To Farm Act that I do not agree with I will not vote for. I will simply correct something I thought I heard, that all major farm organizations have supported the Freedom To Farm Act. The Farmers Union is a major farm organization in the State of Nebraska. The Farmers Union is not only against the Freedom To Farm Act, it thinks it is folly.

I would say to all of my colleagues, this Senator yesterday had printed in the RECORD some true facts with regard to how far down the welfare road we are going under the Freedom To Farm Act. In summarizing what I put in the RECORD yesterday on page S 321 under Exhibit 1, for a 500-acre farm, 120 bushels to the acre in corn yield, the present cash price is in the vicinity of $3.10. That would be $186,000 gross—not net, gross—that the farmer would receive.

On top of that, under the Freedom To Farm Act, there is a welfare payment that goes to corn farmers. I think, when all the corn farmers found out about this, and especially when the public found out about it, there would be a revolution, and the Freedom To Farm Act would fall by the wayside, because, in the example that I have just given, a farmer would receive a check from the Federal Government for 1996 of $16,200 on top of the $186,000 gross that he got from his crop.

That might not be so bad. You might argue that is still a good thing, at $3.10 a bushel for corn. But most people in and outside the business recognize that $3.10 a bushel for corn is a pretty good price and one we can be satisfied with. The point is, if it were $5 a bushel or $7 a bushel, which I do not think it will ever go to, but whatever the price of corn would be under the Freedom To Farm Act, this typical farmer, and every farmer who is in a similar situation, which is typical, would receive a check from the Government regardless of the price of corn in the marketplace. That is welfare. That is an excessive amount of money.

I am for freedom-to-farm principles, giving them the decisions they can make out there on the farm. I am for simplifying. But I simply say there is a fault here in the Freedom To Farm Act that is a giveaway.

DO NOT RECESS THE SENATE

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I wanted to make just a few comments, if I might, with regard to what I consider to be a very ill-advised move, and that is the consideration that maybe, after Friday, we are going to recess the U.S. Senate, right in the middle of very important negotiations. I would simply say, Mr. President, we should stay here, work on the farm bill, work on the debt ceiling, work on the budget, and come up with a compromise. Certainly I, too, was pleased with the President's address last night and the acceptance, generally, as I understand it, of Speaker GINGRICH and leading Republicans in the U.S. Senate that says to take this $711 billion and balance the budget in 7 years, with CBO scoring, which we have all been for.

We cannot do those things, we cannot solve the crisis in the debt ceiling, by leaving here and not coming back until 2 or 3 days before we would have default. I hope, and I appeal, for both the House and the Senate to remain in session and do our work, especially at this critical time with regard to the farm bill and the other important matters that we have on our plate.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BODY ON NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last November, the British and Irish Governments acted jointly to create an innovative three-member committee,

called the International Body, to assess an extremely difficult issue that had become a serious obstacle to the peace process in Northern Ireland—how to remove all arms from Irish politics.

Our former colleague, Senator George Mitchell, agreed to serve as chairman of the International Body, and he was joined by two other distinguished international leaders, Gen. John de Chastelain of Canada and former Prime Minister Harri Holkeri of Finland.

The International Body issued its report earlier today, and I welcome it as a reasonable way forward for all sides in Northern Ireland. I hope all sides will make the fair and modest concessions needed to enable the peace process to move ahead.

I commend Senator Mitchell, General de Chastelain, and Prime Minister Holkeri for their sensible approach to the difficult problem of decommissioning weapons. The International Body did its work well. Reasonable people who genuinely want peace have a priceless opportunity now to make the kind of progress needed to end the current impasse. It is time for all-party talks to begin.

I believe that all of us in Congress concerned about Northern Ireland will find this report of great interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BODY, JANUARY 22, 1996

(By George J. Mitchell, Chairman, John de Chastelain, and Harri Holkeri)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On 28 November 1995, the British and Irish Governments issued a Communiqué which announced the launching in Northern Ireland of a ''twin track' process to make progress in parallel on the decommissioning issue and on all-party negotiations.''

2. One track was ''to invite the parties to intensive preparatory talks with a remit to reach widespread agreement on the basis, participation, structure, format and agenda to bring all parties together for substantive negotiations aimed at a political settlement based on consent.'' This has become known as the political track.

3. The other track concerned the decommissioning of arms and was set forth as follows in the Communiqué:

''5. In parallel, the two Governments have agreed to establish an International Body to provide an independent assessment of the decommissioning issue.

''6. Recognising the widely expressed desire to see all arms removed from Irish politics, the two Governments will ask the International Body to report on the arrangements necessary for the removal from the political equation of arms silenced by virtue of the welcome decisions taken last Summer and Autumn by those organisations that previously supported the use of arms for political purposes.

''7. In particular, the two Governments will ask the Body to:

—identify and advise on a suitable and acceptable method for full and verifiable decommissioning; and

—report whether there is a clear commitment on the part of those in possession of such arms to work constructively to achieve that.

''8. It will be for the International Body to determine its own procedures. The two Governments expect it to consult widely, to invite relevant parties to submit their analysis of matters relevant to the decommissioning issue and, in reaching its conclusions within its remit, to consider such evidence on its merits.''

4. We are that Body. This is our report. We have no stake in Northern Ireland other than an interest in seeing an end of the conflict and in the ability of its people to live in peace. Our role is to bring an independent perspective to the issue. We are motivated solely by our wish to help. This assessment represents our best and our independent judgement. We are unanimous in our views. There are no differences of opinion among us.

5. To provide us with sufficient information to meet our remit, we held two series of meetings in Belfast, Dublin and London: the first, 15 through 18 December 1995; the second, 11 through 22 January 1996. In addition, we held an organisational meeting in New York on 9 December 1995.

6. In the course of our meetings we heard orally and in writing from dozens of government officials, political leaders, church officials and representatives of other organizations and institutions. We received hundreds of letters and telephone calls from members of the public and met with many others. We thank all for their submissions. Contributions from those who suffered losses during the time of troubles but are strongly committed to the peace process were especially moving. All the submissions have been carefully reviewed and considered.

II. DISCUSSION

7. Our examination of the issues and of the facts, and the perspectives brought to us by those who briefed us or who made written representations to us, convince us that while there is no simple solution to the conflict in Northern Ireland, the factors on which a process for peace must be based are already known. We can indicate the way we believe these factors should be addressed so that decommissioning of arms and all-party negotiations can proceed, but only resolute action by the parties themselves will produce progress.

8. That noted, we are aware of the enormous contribution already made by individuals and groups in advancing the process of peace in Northern Ireland to its current stage. The tireless and courageous efforts of Prime Minister John Major and *Taoiseach* John Bruton (and before him Albert Reynolds) have been essential to the peace process. They have been joined by other political leaders, institutions, organisations and individuals in the promotion of peace.

9. We consider our task in the light of our responsibility to all of the people of Northern Ireland; the need for the people to be reassured that their democratic and moral expectations can be realised; and in the spirit of serious efforts made by the British and Irish Governments to advance the peace process.

10. For nearly a year and a half, the guns have been silent in Northern Ireland. The people want that silence to continue. They want lasting peace in a just society in which paramilitary violence plays no part. That was the dominant theme expressed in the many letters and calls we received from those in the North and South, Unionist and Nationalist, Catholic and Protestant, Loyalist and Republican.

11. Notwithstanding reprehensible ''punishment'' killings and beatings, the sustained observance of the cease-fires should not be devalued. It is a significant factor which must be given due weight in assessing the commitment of the paramilitaries to ''work constructively to achieve'' full and verifiable decommissioning.

12. Since the cease-fires, the political debate has focused largely on the differences that have prevented the commencement of all-party negotiations intended to achieve an agreed political settlement. This circumstance has obscured the widespread agreement that exists—so widespread that it tends to be taken for granted. In fact, members of both traditions may be less far apart on the resolution of their differences than they believe.

13. No one should underestimate the value of the consensus for peace, and the fact that no significant group is actively seeking to end it.

14. In paragraph five of the Communiqué we were asked ''to provide an independent assessment of the decommissioning issue.'' It is a serious issue. It is also a symptom of a larger problem; the absence of trust. Common to many of our meetings were arguments, steeped in history, as to why the other side cannot be trusted. As a consequence, even well-intentioned acts are often viewed with suspicion and hostility.

15. But a resolution of the decommissioning issue—or any other issue—will not be found if the parties resort to their vast inventories of historical recrimination. Or, as it was put to us several times, what is really needed is the decommissioning of mind-sets in Northern Ireland.

16. We have asked ourselves how those who have suffered during the many years of internal strife can accept the fact that the establishment of a lasting peace will call for reconciliation with those they hold responsible for their loss and pain. Surely the continued suffering and bereavement of individuals and of families should never be forgotten. But if the focus remains on the past, the past will become the future, and that is something no one can desire.

17. Everyone with whom we spoke agrees in principle with the need to decommission. There are differences on the timing and context—indeed, those differences led to the creation of this Body—but they should not obscure the nearly universal support which exists for the total and verifiable disarmament of all paramilitary organizations. That must continue to be a principal objective.

18. However the issue of decommissioning is resolved, that alone will not lead directly to all-party negotiations. Much work remains on the many issues involved in the political track. The parties should address those issues with urgency.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS: PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY AND NON-VIOLENCE

19. To reach an agreed political settlement and to take the gun out of Irish politics, there must be commitment and adherence to fundamental principles of democracy and non-violence. Participants in all-party negotiations should affirm their commitment to such principles.

20. Accordingly, we recommend that the parties to such negotiations affirm their total and absolute commitment:

a. To democratic and exclusively peaceful means of resolving political issues;

b. To the total disarmament of all paramilitary organizations;

c. To agree that such disarmament must be verifiable to the satisfaction of an independent commission;

d. To renounce for themselves, and to oppose any effort by others, to use force, or threaten to use force, to influence the course or the outcome of all-party negotiations;

e. To agree to abide by the terms of any agreement reached in all-party negotiations

and to resort to democratic and exclusively peaceful methods in trying to alter any aspect of that outcome with which they may disagree; and

f. To urge that ''punishment'' killings and beatings stop and to take effective steps to prevent such actions.

21. We join the Governments, religious leaders and many others in condemning ''punishment'' killings and beatings. They contribute to the fear that those who have used violence to pursue political objectives in the past will do so again in the future. Such actions have no place in a lawful society.

22. Those who demand decommissioning prior to all-party negotiations do so out of concern that the paramilitaries will use force, or threaten to use force, to influence the negotiations, or to change any aspect of the outcome of negotiations with which they disagree. Given the history of Northern Ireland, this is not an unreasonable concern. The principles we recommend address those concerns directly.

23. These commitments, when made and honoured, would remove the threat of force before, during and after all-party negotiations. They would focus all concerned on what is ultimately essential if the gun is to be taken out of Irish politics: an agreed political settlement and the total and verifiable disarmament of all paramilitary organisations. That should encourage the belief that the peace process will truly be an exercise in democracy, not one influenced by the threat of violence.

IV. COMMITMENT TO DECOMMISSIONING

24. The second of the specific questions in paragraph seven of the Communiqué asks us ''to report whether there is a clear commitment on the part of those in possession of such arms to work constructively to achieve'' full and verifiable decommissioning.

25. We have concluded that there is a clear commitment on the part of those in possession of such arms to work constructively to achieve full and verifiable decommissioning as part of the process of all-party negotiations; but that commitment does not include decommissioning prior to such negotiations.

26. After careful consideration, on the basis of intensive discussions with the Governments, the political parties, religious leaders, the security forces, and many others, we have concluded that the paramilitary organisations will not decommission any arms prior to all-party negotiations. That was the unanimous and emphatically expressed view of the representatives of the political parties close to paramilitary organisations on both sides. It was also the view of the vast majority of the organisations and individuals who made oral and written submissions. It is not that they are all opposed to prior decommissioning. To the contrary, many favour it. But they are convinced that it will not happen. That is the reality with which all concerned must deal.

27. Competing views were advanced on prior decommissioning. One was that decommissioning of arms must occur prior to all-party negotiations. We were told that the clearest demonstration of adherence to democratic principles, and of a permanent end to the use of violence, is the safe removal and disposal of paramilitary arms, and that at this time only a start to decommissioning will provide the confidence necessary for all-party negotiations to commence. In this view, all parties were aware of the need for prior decommissioning before the cease-fires were announced and should not now be able to avoid that requirement.

28. In the competing view we were told that decommissioning of arms prior to all-party negotiations was not requested before the announcement of the cease-fires, and that had it been, there would have been no cease-fires; that those who entered into cease-fires did so in the belief they would lead immediately to all-party negotiations; and that the request for prior decommissioning, seriously pursued for the first time months after the cease-fires were declared, is merely a tactic to delay or deny such negotiations. In this view, the cease-fires having been maintained for nearly a year and a half, all-party negotiations should begin immediately with no further requirements.

29. We believe that each side of this argument reflects a core of reasonable concern which deserves to be understood and addressed by the other side.

30. Those who insist on prior decommissioning need to be reassured that the commitment to peaceful and democratic means by those formerly supportive of politically motivated violence is genuine and irreversible, and that the threat or use of such violence will not be invoked to influence the process of negotiations or to change any agreed settlement.

31. Those who have been persuaded to abandon violence for the peaceful political path need to be reassured that a meaningful and inclusive process of negotiation is genuinely being offered to address the legitimate concerns of their traditions and the need for new political arrangements with which all can identify.

32. Clearly, new approaches must be explored to overcome this impasse. That is the purpose of the six principles we recommend. They invoke a comprehensive commitment to democracy and non-violence that is intended to reassure all parties to the negotiations.

V. DECOMMISSIONING DURING ALL-PARTY NEGOTIATIONS

33. One side has insisted that some decommissioning of arms must take place before all-party negotiations can begin. The other side has insisted that no decommissioning can take place until the end of the process, after an agreed settlement has been reached. This has resulted in the current impasse.

34. The parties should consider an approach under which some decommissioning would take place during the process of all-party negotiations, rather than before or after as the parties now urge. Such an approach represents a compromise. If the peace process is to move forward, the current impasse must be overcome. While both sides have been adamant in their positions, both have repeatedly expressed the desire to move forward. This approach provides them that opportunity.

35. In addition, it offers the parties an opportunity to use the process of decommissioning to build confidence one step at a time during negotiations. As progress is made on political issues, even modest mutual steps on decommissioning could help create the atmosphere needed for further steps in a progressive pattern of mounting trust and confidence.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS: GUIDELINES ON THE MODALITIES OF DECOMMISSIONING

36. The first of the specific questions in paragraph seven of the Communique asks us ''to identify and advise on a suitable and acceptable method for full and verifiable decommissioning.''

37. We recommend the following guidelines on the modalities of decommissioning. These recommendations are realistic in light of the nature and scale of the arsenals in question, estimates of which were provided to us by the Governments and their security forces. We believe these estimates to be accurate.

38. Decommissioning should receive a high priority in all-party negotiations. The details of decommissioning, including supporting confidence-building measures, timing and sequencing, have to be determined by the parties themselves.

The decommissioning process should suggest neither victory nor defeat.

39. The cease-fires and the peace process are products not of surrender but rather of a willingness to address differences through political means. This essential fact should be reflected clearly in the modalities of the decommissioning process, which should not require that any party be seen to surrender.

The decommissioning process should take place to the satisfaction of an independent commission.

40. The decommissioning process should take place to the satisfaction of an independent commission acceptable to all parties. The commission would be appointed by the British and Irish Governments on the basis of consultations with the other parties to the negotiating process.

41. The commission should be able to operate independently in both jurisdictions, and should enjoy appropriate legal status and immunity.

42. In addition to having available to it independent sources of legal and technical advice and adequate field resources to receive and audit armaments and to observe and verify the decommissioning process, the commission should be able to call upon the resources and the relevant technical expertise of the British and Irish Armies, when it is appropriate.

The decommissioning process should result in the complete destruction of armaments in a manner that contributes to public safety.

43. The decommissioning process should result in the complete destruction of the armaments. Procedures for destruction would include the cutting up or chipping of small arms and other weapons, the controlled explosion of ammunition and explosives, and other forms of conventional munitions disposal.

44. The decommissioning process could encompass a variety of methods, subject to negotiation, including:

The transfer of armaments to the commission or to the designated representatives of either Government, for subsequent destruction;

The provision of information to the commission or to designated representatives of either Government, leading to the discovery of armaments for subsequent destruction; and,

The depositing of armaments for collection and subsequent destruction, by the commission or by representatives of either Government.

Parties should also have the option of destroying their weapons themselves.

45. Priority should be accorded throughout to ensuring that armaments are safely handled and stored, and are not misappropriated.

The decommissioning process should be fully verifiable.

46. Whatever the options chosen for the destruction of armaments, including the destruction of weapons by the parties themselves, verification must occur to the satisfaction of the commission.

47. The commission would record information required to monitor the process effectively. The commission should have available to it the relevant data of the *Garda Siochana* and the Royal Ulster Constabulary. It would report periodically to relevant parties on progress achieved in the decommissioning process.

The decommissioning process should not expose individuals to prosecution.

48. Individuals involved in the decommissioning process should not be prosecuted for

the possession of those armaments; amnesties should be established in law in both jurisdictions. Armaments made available for decommissioning, whether directly or indirectly, should be exempt under law from forensic examination, and information obtained as a result of the decommissioning process should be inadmissible as evidence in courts of law in either jurisdiction.

49. Groups in possession of illegal armaments should be free to organise their participation in the decommissioning process as they judge appropriate, e.g. groups may designate particular individuals to deposit armaments on their behalf.

The decommissioning process should be mutual.

50. Decommissioning would take place on the basis of the mutual commitment and participation of the paramilitary organisations. This offers the parties another opportunity to use the process of decommissioning to build confidence one step at a time during negotiations.

VII. FURTHER CONFIDENCE-BUILDING

51. It is important for all participants to take steps to build confidence throughout the peace process. In the course of our discussions, many urged that certain actions other than decommissioning be taken to build confidence. We make no recommendations on them since they are outside our remit, but we believe it appropriate to comment on some since success in the peace process cannot be achieved solely by reference to the decommissioning of arms.

52. Support for the use of violence is incompatible with participation in the democratic process. The early termination of paramilitary activities, including surveillance and targeting, would demonstrate a commitment to peaceful methods and so build trust among other parties and alleviate the fears and anxieties of the general population. So, too, would the provision of information on the status of missing persons, and the return of those who have been forced to leave their communities under threat.

53. Continued action by the Governments on prisoners would bolster trust. So would early implementation of the proposed review of emergency legislation, consistent with the evolving security situation.

54. Different views were expressed as to the weapons to be decommissioned. In the Communiqué, the Governments made clear their view that our remit is limited to those weapons held by paramilitary organisations. We accept and share that view. There is no equivalence between such weapons and those held by security forces. However, in the context of building mutual confidence, we welcome the commitment of the Governments, as stated in paragraph nine of the Communiqué, ''to continue to take responsive measures, advised by their respective security authorities, as the threat reduces.''

55. We share the hope, expressed by many on all sides, that policing in Northern Ireland can be normalised as soon as the security situation permits. A review of the situation with respect to legally registered weapons and the use of plastic bullets, and continued progress toward more balanced representation in the police force would contribute to the building of trust.

56. Several oral and written submissions raised the idea of an elected body. We note the reference in paragraph three of the Communiqué to ''whether and how an elected body could play a part.'' Elections held in accordance with democratic principles express and reflect the popular will. If it were broadly acceptable, with an appropriate mandate, and within the three-strand structure, an elective process could contribute to the building of confidence.

57. Finally, the importance of further progress in the social and economic development of Northern Ireland and its communities was emphasised time and again in our meetings, in the context of building confidence and establishing a lasting peace.

VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

58. Last week we stood in Belfast and looked at a thirty foot high wall and at barriers topped with iron and barbed wire. The wall, which has ironically come to be known as the ''peace line,'' is a tangible symbol of the division of the people of Northern Ireland into two hostile communities. To the outsider both are warm and generous. Between themselves they are fearful and antagonistic.

59. Yet, it is now clear beyond doubt that the vast majority of the people of both traditions want to turn away from the bitter past. There is a powerful desire for peace in Northern Ireland. It is that desire which creates the present opportunity.

60. This is critical time in the history of Northern Ireland. The peace process will move forward or this society could slip back to the horror of the past quarter century.

61. Rigid adherence by the parties to their past positions will simply continue the stalemate which has already lasted too long. In a society as deeply divided as Northern Ireland, reaching across the ''peace line'' requires a willingness to take risks for peace.

62. The risk may seem high but the reward is great: a future of peace, equality and prosperity for all the people of Northern Ireland.

CHINA—TAIWAN DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to take a moment to read a story in today's New York Times on proposed military actions by the People's Republic of China [PRC] against the Republic of China on Taiwan. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PRESSLER. According to the story, the People's Republic of China has finished plans for a limited missile attack on Taiwan—an attack that could come following Taiwan's first Presidential election, which is scheduled for March 23.

This revelation is the latest in a series of intimidating tactics that work to threaten Taiwan and destabilize East Asia. Between July 21 and July 26, the PRC conducted a series of ballistic missile test firings 85 miles off the coast of Taiwan. All the missiles were modern, mobile and nuclear capable. No country ever has held this level of field tests for nuclear capable missiles before.

The results of that action were predictable—the stock market and the local currency in Taiwan plunged. These ballistic missile exercises resumed on August 15, and continued through the fall leading up to last December's elections in Taiwan for the 164-seat Legislature.

Now comes word that the PRC has done more than just test its military capability. It has matched its hardware testing with military planning—a plan that calls for one ballistic missile to be launched each day for 30 days.

As was the case with the missile tests, this recent report can be seen as a blatant attempt to influence the outcome of the upcoming Presidential elections in Taiwan. There could be more to this story. I believe this is an attempt to intimidate the Clinton administration and test our Nation's resolve in the Taiwan Straits. The fact that the PRC has advanced a limited but sustained missile attack plan indicates that it believes the Clinton administration may do nothing to strengthen Taiwan's defenses or come to its aid in the event of an attack.

It is not hard to understand why the PRC has come to this conclusion. The Clinton administration's policy with respect to the Taiwan-Mainland China issue is nothing short of confusing. The administration claims to be advancing a policy of deliberate ambiguity. For example, high level administration officials recently have been asked if the United States would come to Taiwan's defense in the event of an attack from the PRC. Their responses were consistently and ominously vague.

The administration seems to believe that this ambiguity will be enough to deter Beijing. Today's report indicates that the exact opposite has occurred. I believe this policy of strategic ambiguity is wrong and has failed. It is not just dangerous for the people of Taiwan, it is potentially destabilizing for the entire East Asia region. It is an approach that clearly advances the PRC's interests and not our own. The administration's ambiguity policy has fueled the belief within the PRC that the United States will look the other way if PRC missiles are launched. Because of our ambiguity, the PRC believes that it can achieve its policy goals at the very least through intimidation and military posturing. Even if the PRC privately has no intention for a direct military confrontation against Taiwan, our ambiguity gives the PRC's military maneuvers greater credibility. It sends a signal of weakness. It fosters a belief that we can be pushed around by the PRC. It is a belief shared by many in Taiwan as well. Indeed, this ambiguity has troubled other Asian democracies in the region, compelling many—from Japan to the Philippines—to increase their defense budgets.

Mr. President, as I said last August, in response to the PRC's first ballistic missile exercise, the United States is faced with three choices: First, we can do nothing, which appears to be the present course. I believe that is not in the national security interest of the United States. We must not allow Asia—a region of many thriving free market, democratic societies—to be dominated by an aggressive, nondemocratic power.

Second, at the other extreme, we could intervene should the moment of conflict become imminent by interposing the United States Pacific fleet in the Taiwan straits. President Truman did so in 1950. This, again, is an extreme course and thus, should only be

considered as a last resort. It is a course that could result in a direct military confrontation with the People's Republic of China.

Finally, we can take what I believe is the wisest course, which is a clear and unambiguous demonstration of political and military support so that Asian democracies, including Taiwan can resist aggression. In short, a clear statement of U.S. policy goals and conditions in the region will promote peace and stability far better than the administration's deliberate vagueness. Both houses of Congress have come to this conclusion as well. Both the House and Senate versions of the State Department authorization bill contain identical language that would amend the Taiwan Relations Act [TRA] to supersede restrictions on United States arm sales to Taiwan. These restrictions were imposed in a August 1982 communiqué between the People's Republic of China and the United States. The amendments to the TRA represent a clear statement by Congress that the TRA requires the United States to provide Taiwan with the appropriate means to defend itself.

This latter course achieves a number of important policy goals. First, it demonstrates to all democracies in Asia that the United States intends to work with them to ensure peace and stability in the region. Second, it demonstrates support for the continued political liberalization in Taiwan. Third, it sends a clear signal to the People's Republic of China that the United States will not accept the reunification of Taiwan with the mainland by force.

This latter point is important. Since President Nixon's overtures to Communist China, this Nation has taken a one China policy. The advent of that policy, coupled with the passage of the TRA, was designed to foster a strong diplomatic and economic relationship with the People's Republic of China, while sending a clear signal that our Nation would defend against any forced reunification of Taiwan by the People's Republic of China. Reunification, if it is to occur, must be done through diplomatic means.

I have said before on the Senate floor that our relationship with Taiwan is one of the ironies of history. Taiwan is a democracy and a growing economic power. The United States is Taiwan's primary foreign investor and trader. About 25 percent of Taiwan's exports go to United States markets. Many of Taiwan's business, academic and cultural leaders have studied in the United States. Yet, we do not have diplomatic ties with Taipei.

We must not add tragedy to this irony. In the midst of all its posturing, the People's Republic of China's real intentions are not clear. Most experts are divided on the question of whether or not the People's Republic of China actually will put its military plans into action. We must leave nothing to chance. Regardless of the People's Republic of China's intentions or its goals, the Clinton Administration has to recognize that its current policy of strategic ambiguity has failed. The United States needs to maintain a positive, constructive relationship with both the People's Republic of China and Taiwan. It is time we recognize that this triangular relationship can only be furthered if all sides of this triangle understood United States policy goals in the region.

It is time this Nation make very clear that we will not ignore direct or indirect intimidation against an Asian democracy. It is time that the administration not engage in any sales of advanced telecommunications technology that could be used to further the People's Republic of China's military capability. It is time that the administration came to the conclusion that any military attack by the People's Republic of China against any Asian democracy directly threatens the crucial regional and national security interests of the United States. It is time that we reassert that any reunification of Taiwan with the mainland must not be done through military aggression.

Mr. President, when Congress returns next month, it is my hope that Congress will take the opportunity to take a step toward a clear definition of United States policy in the region, and demonstrate its clear support for the democratic process underway in Taiwan. Given the strong support for amending the Taiwan Relations Act, we may want to consider making these changes through legislation independent of the State Department authorization bill, and to pass this legislation before the upcoming March 23 elections. That's one possible option. Wherever democracy may emerge, the United States should demonstrate its support for such efforts. I believe we should do so, hopefully with the administration's cooperation, but if necessary, without it.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1996]

AS CHINA THREATENS TAIWAN, IT MAKES SURE U.S. LISTENS

(By Patrick E. Tyler)

BEIJING, January 23.—The Chinese leadership has sent unusually explicit warnings to the Clinton Administration that China has completed plans for a limited attack on Taiwan that could be mounted in the weeks after Taiwan's President, Lee Tenghui, wins the first democratic balloting for the presidency in March.

The purpose of this saber-rattling is apparently to prod the United States to rein in Taiwan and President Lee, whose push for greater international recognition for the island of 21 million people, has been condemned here as a drive for independence.

While no one familiar with the threats thinks China is on the verge of risking a catastrophic war against Taiwan, some China experts fear that the Taiwan issue has become such a test of national pride for Chinese leaders that the danger of war should be taken seriously.

A senior American official said the Administration has ''no independent confirmation or even credible evidence'' that the Chinese are contemplating an attack, and spoke almost dismissively of the prospect.

''They can fire missiles, but Taiwan has some teeth of its own,'' the official said. ''And does China want to risk that and the international effects?''

The most pointed of the Chinese warnings was conveyed recently through a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Chas. W. Freeman Jr., who traveled to China this winter for discussions with senior Chinese officials. On Jan. 4, after returning to Washington, Mr. Freeman informed President Clinton's national security adviser, Anthony Lake, that the People's Liberation Army had prepared plans for a missile attack against Taiwan consisting of one conventional missile strike a day for 30 days.

This warning followed similar statements relayed to Administration officials by John W. Lewis, a Stanford University political scientist who meets frequently with senior Chinese military figures here.

These warnings do not mean that an attack on Taiwan is certain or imminent. Instead, a number of China specialists say that China, through ''credible preparations'' for an attack, hopes to intimidate the Taiwanese and to influence American policy toward Taiwan. The goal, these experts say, is to force Taiwan to abandon the campaign initiated by President Lee, including his effort to have Taiwan seated at the United Nations, and to end high-profile visits by President Lee to the United States and to other countries.

If the threats fail to rein in Mr. Lee, however, a number of experts now express the view that China could resort to force, despite the enormous consequences for its economy and for political stability in Asia.

Since last summer, when the White House allowed Mr. Lee to visit the United States, the Chinese leadership has escalated its attacks on the Taiwan leader, accusing him of seeking to ''split the motherland'' and undermine the ''one China'' policy that had been the bedrock of relations between Beijing and its estranged province since 1949.

A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeman, asked to comment on reports that the Chinese military has prepared plans for military action against Taiwan, said he was awaiting a response from his superiors. Last month, a senior ministry official said privately that China's obvious preparations for military action have been intended to head off an unwanted conflict.

''We have been trying to do all we can to avoid a scenario in which we are confronted in the end with no other option but a military one,'' the official said. He said that if China does not succeed in changing Taiwan's course, ''then I am afraid there is going to be a war.''

Mr. Freeman described the most recent warning during a meeting Mr. Lake had called with nongovernmental China specialists.

Participants said that Mr. Freeman's presentation was arresting as he described being told by a Chinese official of the advanced state of military planning. Preparations for a missile attack on Taiwan, he said, and the target selection to carry it out, have been completed and await a final decision by the Politburo in Beijing.

One of the most dramatic moments came when Mr. Freeman quoted a Chinese official as asserting that China could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders ''care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan,'' a statement that Mr. Freeman characterized as an indirect threat by China to use nuclear weapons against the United States.

An account of the White House meeting was provided by some of the participants. Mr. Freeman, reached by telephone, confirmed the gist of his remarks, reiterating

that he believes that while ''Beijing clearly prefers negotiation to combat,'' there is a new sense of urgency in Beijing to end Taiwan's quest for ''independent international status.''

Mr. Freeman said that President's Lee's behavior ''in the weeks following his re-election will determine'' whether Beijing's Communist Party leaders feel they must act ''by direct military means'' to change his behavior.

In recent months, Mr. Freeman said he has relayed a number of warnings to United States Government officials. ''I have quoted senior Chinese who told me'' that China ''would sacrifice 'millions of men' and 'entire cities' to assure the unity of China and who opined that the United States would not make comparable sacrifices.''

He also asserted that ''some in Beijing may be prepared to engage in nuclear blackmail against the U.S. to insure that Americans do not obstruct'' efforts by the People's Liberation Army ''to defend the principles of Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan and Chinese national unity.''

Some specialists at the meeting wondered if Mr. Freeman's presentation was too alarmist and suggested that parliamentary elections on Taiwan in December had resulted in losses for the ruling Nationalist Party and that President Lee appeared to be moderating his behavior to avoid a crisis.

''I am not alarmist at this point,'' said one specialist, who would not comment on the substance of the White House meeting. ''I don't think the evidence is developing in that direction.''

Other participants in the White House meeting, who said they would not violate the confidentiality pledge of the private session, separately expressed their concern that a potential military crisis is building in the Taiwan Strait.

''I think there is evidence to suggest that the Chinese are creating at least the option to apply military pressure to Taiwan if they feel that Taiwan is effectively moving out of China's orbit politically,'' said Kenneth Lieberthal, a China scholar at the University of Michigan and an informal adviser to the Administration.

Mr. Lieberthal, who also has traveled to China in recent months, said Beijing has redeployed forces from other parts of the country to the coastal areas facing Taiwan and set up new command structures ''for various kinds of military action against Taiwan.''

''They have done all this in a fashion they know Taiwan can monitor,'' he said, ''so as to become credible on the use of force.''

''I believe there has been no decision to use military force'' he continued, ''and they recognize that it would be a policy failure for them to have to resort to force; but they have set up the option, they have communicated that in the most credible fashion and, I believe, the danger is that they would exercise it in certain circumstances.''

Several experts cited their concern that actions by Congress in the aftermath of President Lee's expected election could be a critical factor contributing to a military confrontation. If President Lee perceives that he has a strong base of support in the United States Congress and presses forward with his campaign to raise Taiwan's status, the risk of a military crisis is greater, they said. A chief concern is that Congress would seek to invite the Taiwan leader back to the United States as a gesture of American support. A Chinese military leader warned in November that such a step could have ''explosive'' results.

In recent months, American statements on whether United States forces would come to the defense of Taiwan if it came under attack have been deliberately vague so as to deter Beijing through a posture of what the Pentagon calls ''strategic ambiguity.''

Some members of Congress assert that the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 includes an implicit pledge to defend Taiwan if attacked, but Administration officials say that, in the end, the decision would depend on the timing, pretext and nature of Chinese aggression.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal Government is, as the saying goes, living on borrowed time, not to mention borrowed money—nearly $5 trillion of it. As of the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, January 23, the Federal debt stood at $4,987,963,203,048.04. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,932.74 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

MARY BRENNAN'S PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to share with my colleagues the wonderful example of Mary P. Brennan, an extraordinary woman who combined the best qualities of politics and public service.

Mary Brennan, who retired last month as marketing director for Green State Airport after an extraordinary career in politics and public service, lost her battle with breast cancer earlier this month.

In a time when politicians and public servants are the targets of unusually harsh criticism, Mary was a sterling example of how some people were created to ennoble both politics and public service.

If you knew Mary, you felt special. It did not matter if your station were high or low, you received the warmth of her charm, the depth of her compassion and the inspiration of her ''can do'' spirit.

When she retired after 11 years as marketing director at Green State Airport, it was noted that often she would take 30 minutes to make her way across the airport terminal because she would bump into so many people she knew.

All who knew her, whether in her earlier job as executive aide to former Gov. J. Joseph Garrahy or her most recent job as marketing director, knew that she would put in 150 percent effort.

When asked why she worked so hard for so many people, Mary replied: ''If you care about people, you want to service them to the utmost. You start something right, you finish it right.''

She was loyal to public service and she valued loyalty above all other virtues. ''When you make a commitment to someone,'' she said, ''you keep it.''

Mr. President, we will miss Mary tremendously in Rhode Island. I will think of her when I fly into Rhode Island. It also is easy to hark back to an earlier decade and picture her hard at work in the Rhode Island State House.

Governor Garrahy delivered a heartfelt eulogy that I would like to share with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks and obituaries from the Providence, RI, Journal and the Woonsocket, RI, Call be printed in the RECORD as if read.

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

REMARKS BY FORMER RHODE ISLAND GOV. J. JOSEPH GARRAHY

Mary Brennan—say her name and you are guaranteed to smile. That's because her warmth, her care, her enthusiastic approach to life was contagious. She touched us all.

I can think of no higher honor than to have been asked to speak about my friend, our friend, Mary. My single regret is that I have to do this so soon, so early.

Like all of you, I have a special place in my heart reserved for Mary. She caught my attention 30 years ago and will forever hold it.

To know Mary was to know all the Brennans an the Partingtons, because special above everyone was her family. She came from such solid stock—Bumpsie and Mumsie. At the wonderful age of 91, it was Mumsie who cared for the daughter who loved her so. And boy if there were ever two peas in a pod, it was Mary and Mumsy. We admire your strength Mumsy and your faith. A faith that Mary carried with her throughout her life.

And Mary had a special sisterly bond with her brothers Bill and John. She would defend and care for them and they for her.

Her pride and joy were her two sons—Brian and Sean. She used to say how much like John, Brian was. And boy was she beaming last April at his and Sally's wedding. Sean was with her every step of the way—she was so proud of his work in Alaska and Hawaii and encouraged him to follow his dream. Typical Mary—always selfless.

They were blessed to have her. And, we were all blessed because Mary made us part of her extended family. She adopted each of us and we were better for it. A special thanks to Little Lynne who adopted Mary and was a great comfort in her final days.

All of us could easily be overwhelmed by grief of our great loss. Or we can proceed as Mary would have us—remembering our special times together and understanding what a special woman she was.

Mary has affected more lives than any newspaper report can ever catalogue. Each of us carries memories and stories of how Mary affected us. Every one of my days as Governor could be footnoted with a Mary Brennan story. Whether is was the difficult days of the oil crisis or celebrating RI's true ethnic diversity at one heritage celebration or another, or planning a President's visit, welcoming the most needy citizen in the State Room or working hour after hour during the Blizzard to get food and heat to the stranded, Mary was always there. She could even convince a group of angry voters that I was good, even if I wasn't right!

And I am convinced that were it not for Mary's wise counsel to Lynne Ryan—she and Michael would not be raising a family today. I can hear her words of advice, ''Lynne, be patient. He's Irish!''

Service to others was Mary's hallmark. An honorable devoted, and selfless public servant. From her early days running her own travel agency to the Heritage years and nearly a decade in the Governor's Office to her airport, travel and tourism time, Mary continuously served others. She would say ''if you care about people, you want to service them to the utmost.'' We all have a story of how Mary extended herself to each of us.

It didn't matter who you were, if you needed help, she was there. Her generosity knew no bounds.

All of us here today are a testimony to her life. Mary was as at ease with Governors, Bishops and Generals as she was with the regular folk. Individually, each of us represents a part of her life.

Well Mary, you have made our lives richer—serving as a teacher of how to treat people and have a passion for life. You made the world better because you have passed through it.

Although most didn't have a chance to say goodbye, every time you left Mary, your heart was a little warmer because you left with a piece of her heart.

As we help Mary to her rest today—close your eyes and think of how good Mary always made you feel about yourself.

Think of how Mary made you feel as if no one else in the world mattered but you.

Think of how Mary helped to make us work harder and be better than we ever thought we could be.

Close your eyes and think of how many times Mary got you to do the right thing—even when you didn't want to do it—and then made you believe it was your idea all along.

How fortunate are we, each one of us, to have been a part of Mary Brennan's life. We always felt safe with Mary. We knew that if anything went wrong Mary was there to fix it—to insure that things worked smoothly.

Now we are on our own. Sadness fills us today. But we are better because of Mary. We have smiled more because of Mary. And we will carry forward because that's what Mary would want.

And we can be happy for Mary that she is reunited with her Johnny. John Brennan who Mary so cherished.

Mike Ryan and I visited with Mary last Friday and she recalled the last book that John was working on before he passed away. She said she had to finish it to make the collection complete. Some of you may know that during my years as Governor, John Brennan painstakingly cut and catalogued a newspaper history of my terms of office.

Well John's been hard at work; cutting and cataloguing Mary's good deeds, her kindness, her courage and her love for her family. And John will make certain that St. Peter reads every single volume.

We love you Mary and we thank God for giving you to us.

[From the Providence Journal, Jan. 12, 1996]

MARY P. BRENNAN, FORMER DIRECTOR OF AIRPORT MARKETING, DIES AT 62

CUMBERLAND.—Mary P. Brennan, 62, who retired last month as marketing director for Green State Airport, died yesterday in Rhode Island Hospital.

Mrs. Brennan, who lived at 2 Hewes St., had been suffering from breast cancer.

She was the wife of the late John P. Brennan and the daughter of Mae Partington of Cumberland and the late Willard Partington.

Eugene Tansey, director of the state Airport Corporation, recalled on the occasion of Mrs. Brennan's retirement that it often would take her 30 minutes to make her way across the terminal because she would bump into so many people she knew.

''She knows everybody,'' Tansey remarked. ''You can hear people yelling across the floor, 'Mary, Mary!' ''

Linda Fischer worked with Mrs. Brennan when the two were executive aides to Gov. J. Joseph Garrahy. She recalled Mrs. Brennan as a stickler for detail.

''You'd always turn to her and you knew exactly what you asked would be done,'' Fischer said in an interview last month with M. Charles Bakst, Journal-Bulletin political columnist. ''There was never a time limit to the hours she would put in.''

Mike Ryan, who served Garrahy as press secretary, said Mrs. Brennan always put in 150 percent of effort.

When asked why she worked so hard for so many years, she said, ''If you care about people, you want to service them to the utmost.'' She said also that if ''you start something right, you finish it right.''

She said she valued loyalty above all other virtues. ''When you make a commitment to someone, you keep it,'' she said.

Garrahy said her loyalty was to public service, and people came to depend upon her for that. ''She was a public servant,'' the former governor said.

Mrs. Brennan was appointed to the Greater Providence-Warwick Convention & Visitors Bureau, but her tenure there fell prey to politics in November when both Mayor Vincent A. Cianci Jr. of Providence and Governor Almond sought her vote to break a tie in a struggle over whether Cianci or Almond would control the panel.

Mrs. Brennan was a state employee, but her brother, John J. Partington, was director of public safety for Cianci. She resolved the matter by resigning.

She also leaves another brother, Bill Partington, also of Cumberland, and two sons, Brian Brennan of Warwick and Sean Brennan of Cumberland.

The J.J. Duffy Funeral Home, 757 Mendon Rd., Cumberland, is handling funeral arrangements, which were incomplete last night.

[From the Woonsocket, RI, Call, Jan. 12, 1996]

MARY P. BRENNAN; LEADER IN STATE, CHARITY CONCERNS

CUMBERLAND.—Mrs. Mary P. (Partington) Brennan, 62, of 75 Hewes St., an executive in state positions for 25 years, died yesterday in Rhode Island Hospital, Providence. She was the wife of the late John P. Brennan.

Born Sept. 24, 1933, in Cumberland, a daughter of Mary C. (Hogan) Partington of Cumberland and the late Willard F. Partington, she was a lifelong town resident. She graduated from St. Xavier's Academy, Providence, in 1951 and the Ward Finishing School, Worcester, in 1954.

Mrs. Brennan was the marketing director for 11 years for the Rhode Island Airport Corp. at T.F. Green State Airport, Warwick, retiring last month.

Before that she was a station manager for Mohawk-Allegheny (USAir)—the first woman to hold that position in the country—at Logan Airport, Boston, from 1954 to 1960; owner of the Tradewinds Travel Agency, Providence, from 1960 to 1963; state coordinator of the Bicentennial celebration from 1971 to 1976; and an executive aide to Gov. J. Joseph Garrahy until 1984.

Mrs. Brennan recently was chairwoman of the Rhode Island Infrastructure Committee of the White House Conference on Travel/Tourism. She had served as chairwoman of the Governor's Advisory Council on Tourism, Discover New England and the Foundation for the Promotion of State Cultural Heritage; vice chairwoman of the Rhode Island Heritage Commission; vice president of New England USA Travel and Tourism; and a member of several other tourism organizations and commissions. She received the Governor's Award on Tourism in 1987.

She also contributed her time and experience to the Rhode Island 350th Celebration, Tall Ships Task Force, America's Cup Task Force, National and New England Governors conferences, Rhode Island Historical Society, Save the Bay and the January 1995 Inaugural Committee. She was president of the Rhode Island Heritage Hall of Fame.

Active in health and charity concerns, Mrs. Brennan led the Catholic Charity Fund Appeal for the state in 1988 and held memberships in numerous groups, including the Muscular Dystrophy Association, Leukemia Society, Rhode Island Cancer Coalition, Rhode Island Lung Association and Rhode Island Blood Center.

She was a member of the parish council at St. Patrick Church and past president of its Women's Club. She was a member of the Cumberland Crime Stoppers, Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce and the Girl Scouts of Rhode Island fundraising program.

Mrs. Brennan's wide-ranging efforts were recognized with many awards. In 1983 she received the Cumberland Business Association's Person of the Year award, the Italian Historical Society's Citizen award and the City of Newport's Civitas award.

The Papal Medal of the Cross was conferred on her in 1989, and the YWCA of Rhode Island deemed her its Outstanding Woman of 1995. She also has been cited by the Muscular Dystrophy Association, Leukemia Society, American Association of Retired Persons and the National Federation of the Blind.

She also is survived by two sons, Brian Brennan of Warwick and Sean Brennan of Cumberland; and two brothers, Providence Commissioner of Public Safety and former Cumberland Police Chief John J. Partington and Willard F. ''Bill'' Partington, both of Cumberland.

A Mass will be celebrated tomorrow at 11 a.m. at the Cathedral of SS, Peter and Paul, Cathedral Square, Providence. Burial will be in Resurrection Cemetery. Arrangements are under the direction of the J.J. Duffy Funeral Home, 757 Mendon Road.

ORPHANAGES IN CHINA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, our attention should be drawn to a horrifying report issued this month by the respected human rights organization, Human Rights Watch/Asia, titled ''Death by Default: A Policy of Fatal Neglect in China's State Orphanages.'' The allegations raised in ''Death by Default'' are more than a little disturbing; they are shocking. Mr. President, I ask that the report's ''Summary and Recommendations'' be submitted for the RECORD.

The report paints a grim picture of the lives of China's youngest, least fortunate citizens. With well-documented details from one institution—the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute—and publicly available statistics for orphanages nationwide provided by China's Ministry of Civil Affairs, the report indicates that orphans in most of China's state-run institutions are living in horrible conditions with little hope for survival. Statistics provided by the Ministry allow Human Rights Watch to conservatively estimate a national death rate in China's orphanages of 25 percent. Critics of the report charge that terrible conditions and high death rates are to be expected in a developing country because of a lack of adequate funding, but ''Death by Default'' again uses official documents to show otherwise. The report shows, for example, that from 1989 to 1992 employees' salaries at state-run orphanages nationally increased at close to twice the rate of expenditures for the children. The question does not seem to be

one of having funding, but one of how that funding is used.

This report relies heavily on documents and pictures taken by a former doctor and a former inmate at the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute for its most harrowing sections. It provides pictures of emaciated children and children tied to their beds, and stories of medical neglect, dying rooms, beatings and rapes by orphanage officials, and children carrying the corpses of other children to the orphanage's morgue. These nightmarish allegations are made worse by documented accounts of how the doctor and others tried in vain to raise the issue of conditions at the orphanage with city government officials. An investigation into the situation was apparently stonewalled and later stopped completely by senior officials. The report notes that conditions at the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute have since improved remarkably and it is now open to visitors, even foreigners. But the report strongly indicates that the Shanghai No. 2 Social Welfare Institute, which is not open to the public, may be carrying on many of these same abuses.

Mr. President, I have not visited either of these institutes in China and cannot personally vouch for the accuracy of ''Death by Default.'' But I can say that the evidence it presents to support its allegations is compelling enough for me to join Human Rights Watch/Asia in calling on government officials in Beijing to reopen the investigation into the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute and to review conditions at state-run institutions nationally. I also urge the U.S. Embassy in Beijing to raise the issue of child welfare with Chinese Government officials at the highest levels. The U.S. Government cannot credibly claim to champion human rights issues globally if it ignores the brutal treatment of young children documented by this report.

This is not the first public report on the state of China's orphanages. The British Broadcasting Corporation and other media organizations have looked at conditions in them before. But I want to commend Human Rights Watch/Asia for again bringing this serious matter to public attention with such a carefully researched document. I hope it is widely read and its recommendations taken in Beijing.

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

DEATH BY DEFAULT: A POLICY OF FATAL NEGLECT IN CHINA'S STATE ORPHANAGES

I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

China's Orphans and Human Rights

In response to widespread criticism of its human rights record, the Chinese government has frequently argued that the international community places too much emphasis on civil and political rights, while neglecting the more basic rights to food, shelter, and subsistence—rights which China claims to have secured for its citizens more effectively than some democratic countries. In accordance with the country's post-1949 political tradition, China's leaders assert that economic well-being forms the basis for the enjoyment of all other rights, and that the protection of economic rights can therefore justify restrictions on civil liberties.

In some important respects, China's record in protecting social and economic rights may serve as a model for the rest of the developing world. Levels of well-being, as measured by social indicators such as literacy and life expectancy, are considerably higher in China than in other countries at comparable stages of development, and in some cases higher than those in much wealthier nations.

But China's claim to guarantee the ''right to subsistence'' conceals a secret world of starvation, disease, and unnatural death—a world into which thousands of Chinese citizens disappear each year. The victims are neither the political activists nor the religious dissidents who dominate the international debate over human rights in the People's Republic; they are orphans and abandoned children in custodial institutions run by China's Ministry of Civil Affairs. This report documents the pattern of cruelty, abuse, and malign neglect which has dominated child welfare work in China since the early 1950s, and which now constitutes one of the country's gravest human rights problems.

Human Rights Watch/Asia has now pieced together at least a fragmentary picture of conditions for abandoned children throughout China, including staggering mortality rates for infants in state institutions and the persistent failure of official statistics to track the vast majority of orphans, whose whereabouts and status are unknown.

The evidence—largely official documents cited in detail below—indicates that the likelihood of survival beyond one year, for a newly admitted orphan in China's welfare institutions nationwide, was less than 50 percent in 1989. The documents also show that overall annual mortality at many of China's orphanages is far higher than that documented in any other country. In Romania in December 1989, for example, when foreigners first visited the grim state orphanages housing abandoned and handicapped children and were outraged by what they found there, a representative of the France-based humanitarian group Médecins du Monde stated that the 1989 death rate from infectious disease and neglect was 40 percent, in one home that was particularly abusive. In the Chinese provinces of Fujian, Shaanxi, Guangxi and Henan, overall annual mortality among institutionalized orphans that year ranged from 59.2 percent to 72.5 percent.

When sustained over an extended period, moreover, any of the above annual rates means far higher actual mortality. We estimate that in China's best-known and most prestigious orphanage, the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute, total mortality in the late 1980s and early 1990s was probably running as high as 90 percent; even official figures put the annual deaths-to-admissions ratio at an appalling 77.6 percent in 1991, and partial figures indicate an increase in 1992. Neither institutional welfare policy nor the size of the orphanage system have changed notably since then, while the crisis of abandoned children continues unabated, due in part to China's one-child policy. In the case of Shanghai, there have been cosmetic improvements at the orphanage itself since 1993, designed to encourage foreign adoption, but there is evidence that many disabled infants and children are now simply transferred to a facility outside the city, where access for outsiders is extremely rare and where, according to numerous reports received by Human Rights Watch/Asia, the children are grossly mistreated.

Unlike their Romanian counterparts, the management and staff of China's orphanages cannot claim that their shortcomings result from a lack of funding or from inadequately paid employees. Dispelling a misconception reflected in nearly all Western media coverage of the issue to date, Human Rights Watch/Asia's research confirms that many Chinese orphanages, including some recording death rates among the worst in the country, appear to enjoy more than sufficient budgets, including adequate wages, bonuses, and other personnel-related costs. Expenses for children's food, clothing, and other necessities, however, are extremely low in institutions throughout the country.

The crisis, both nationwide and in Shanghai, is known to the top leadership of China's Ministry of Civil Affairs. Conditions at the Shanghai orphanage are well known to the local political elite and by members of the Politburo. But the government reaction has been to maintain a facade of normalcy, to punish dissenters who have sought to expose abuses and, in certain crucial cases, to promote those responsible for the abuses.

A Nationwide Crisis

Abandonment of children surged in China during the 1980's, in part due to the one-child population control policy and in part due to policies restricting adoption by Chinese couples who are not childless. The national statistics on mortality cited in this report do not contain a gender breakdown, but anecdotal and journalistic reporting on orphanages nationwide reveals that the vast majority of children in orphanages are, and consistently have been during the past decade, healthy infant girls; that is, children without serious disabilities who are abandoned because of traditional attitudes that value boy children more highly. The financial and social problems that these children are perceived to constitute are made more acute by the fact that Chinese couples are not permitted to adopt them, for the most part.

Reports of inhumane conditions in Chinese orphanages have attracted growing international concern in recent years, prompted chiefly by the country's greater openness to foreign press coverage and charitable work financed from abroad, as well as a dramatic increase in overseas adoptions from the People's Republic. Although some scattered allegations have succeeded in bringing to light grave abuses against China's orphans, there has been virtually no effort to place these charges in context through systematic research on the country's institutional welfare system.

The Chinese government's own statistics reveal a situation worse than even the most alarming Western media reports have suggested. In 1989, the most recent year for which nationwide figures are available, the majority of abandoned children admitted to China's orphanages were dying in institutional care. Many institutions, including some in major cities, appeared to be operating as little more than assembly lines for the elimination of unwanted orphans, with an annual turnover of admissions and deaths far exceeding the number of beds available.

In any case, the majority of abandoned children in China never reach the dubious security of a state-run orphanage. Many are sent instead to general-purpose state institutions, where they are confined indiscriminately with retarded, disabled, elderly, and mentally disturbed adults. Although the statistical evidence is unclear, the limited eyewitness information available suggests that death rates among children held in these facilities may be even higher than in China's specialized orphanages.

In addition, Chinese official records fail to account for most of the country's abandoned

infants and children, only a small proportion of whom are in any form of acknowledged state care. The most recent figure provided by the government for the country's orphan population, 100,000 seems implausibly low for a country with a total population of 1.2 billion. Even if it were accurate, however, the whereabouts of the great majority of China's orphans would still be a complete mystery, leaving crucial questions about the country's child welfare system unanswered and suggesting that the real scope of the catastrophe that has befallen China's unwanted children may be far larger than the evidence in this report documents.

Evidence From Shanghai

In addition to nationwide statistics on the condition of China's institutionalized children, Human Rights Watch/Asia has recently obtained a large quality of internal documentation from one of the most prominent specialized orphanages in the country, the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute. Based on these documents, which include medical records and other official files recording the deaths of hundreds of children, and on the testimony of direct witnesses who left China in 1995, Human Rights Watch/Asia has concluded that conditions at the Shanghai orphanage before 1993 were comparable to those at some of the worst children's institutions in China, several of which have already been exposed in journalistic accounts in the West. Since 1993, a program of cosmetic ''reforms'' has transformed the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute into an international showcase for China's social policies, while an administrative reorganization of the city's welfare system has largely concealed the continuing abuse of infants and children.

Ironically, the Chinese government has praised Shanghai's municipal orphanage extensively as a national model for the care of abandoned and disabled children. In addition to frequent flattering coverage in China's official media, the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute receives considerable financial support from Chinese and international charities and hosts a steady stream of private and official visitors. Behind the institution's glossy official image, however, lies a pattern of horrifying abuse. The brutal treatment of orphans in Shanghai, which included deliberate starvation, torture, and sexual assault, continued over a period of many years and led to the unnatural deaths of well over 1,000 children between 1986 and 1992 alone. This campaign of elimination could be kept secret through the complicity of both higher- and lower-level staff, and because the city's Bureau of Civil Affairs, responsible for the orphanage, also runs the crematoria, where starved children's corpses were disposed of with minimum oversight, often even before a death certificate has been filled out by the attending physician. In addition, officials of various Shanghai municipal agencies knowingly suppressed evidence of child abuse at the orphanage, persistently ignored the institute's high monthly death figures, and in 1992, quashed an investigation into orphanage practices.

Conditions in the Shanghai orphanage came close to being publicly exposed in the early 1990s as a result of pressure by concerned orphanage employees, local journalists and sympathetic Shanghai officials. By 1993, however, virtually all the critical staff members were forced out of their positions and silenced. The orphanage leadership was assisted in its efforts to cover up the truth by three of the city's top leaders: Wu Bangguo, Shanghai's Communist Party secretary; Huang Ju, the city's mayor; and Xie Lijuan, deputy mayor for health, education, and social welfare. Wu, Huang, and Xie were fully informed of the abuses occurring at the Children's Welfare Institute, but took no action to halt them or to punish those responsible, acting instead to shield senior management at the orphanage and to prevent news of the abuses from reaching the public. Meanwhile, Wu Bangguo and Huang Ju have risen to positions of national prominence in China's ruling Politburo.

The cosmetic changes at the Shanghai orphanage since 1993 have been engineered by Han Weicheng, its former director. Although he was a major perpetrator of abuses there, Han was promoted to an even more senior position within the municipal welfare bureaucracy. At about the same time, the orphanage was opened to visitors and large numbers of children from the city's orphanage began to be transferred to another custodial institution, the Shanghai No. 2 Social Welfare Institute. Located on Chongming Island, a remote rural area north of Shanghai, the No. 2 Social Welfare Institute, which is ostensibly a home for severely retarded adults, has been transformed since 1993 into a virtual dumping ground for abandoned infants delivered to the orphanage. While the city government has aggressively promoted the adoption of healthy or mildly disabled orphans by visiting foreigners, reports from visitors to the orphanage in 1995 indicate that infants with more serious handicaps are generally diverted to the Chongming Island institution within weeks or months of their arrival. Human Rights Watch/Asia has not been able to ascertain the mortality rates of children at the No. 2 Social Welfare Institute, but has collected credible reports of severe mistreatment and of staff impunity. Extreme secrecy surrounds the functioning of the Chongming Island institution, raising serious suspicions and fears as to the likely fate of children transferred there.

Perversion of Medical Ethics

Some Western observers have charged that the phenomenally high death rates among China's abandoned children result from neglect and lack of medical training on the part of orphanage employees. Anecdotal evidence from foreign charity workers and adoptive parents has painted a grim picture of decrepit and poorly financed institutions run by demoralized and unskilled nursing staff.

However, medical records and testimony obtained by Human Rights Watch/Asia show that deaths at the Shanghai orphanage were in many cases deliberate and cruel. Childcare workers reportedly selected unwanted infants and children for death by intentional deprivation of food and water—a process known among the workers as the ''summary resolution'' of childrens' alleged medical problems. When an orphan chosen in this manner was visibly on the point of death from starvation or medical neglect, orphanage doctors were than asked to perform medical ''consultations'' which served as a ritual marking the child for subsequent termination of care, nutrition, and other life-saving intervention. Deaths from acute malnutrition were then, in many cases, falsely recorded as having resulted from other causes, often entirely spurious or irrelevant conditions such as ''mental deficiency'' and ''cleft palate.''

The vast majority of children's recorded at the Shanghai orphanage thus resulted not from lack of access to medical care but from something far more sinister: an apparently systematic program of child elimination in which senior medical staff played a central role. By making unfounded diagnoses of mental retardation and other disorders, these doctors have helped to disseminate the widespread belief—which appears to be quite inaccurate—that virtually all of China's abandoned children are physically or mentally handicapped. Worse, the Shanghai orphanage's medical staff then used these supposed disabilities as a justification for eliminating unwanted infants through starvation and medical neglect. Such unconscionable behavior by doctors in China's most advanced and cosmopolitan city points to an ethical crisis of immense proportions in the country's medical profession.

This corruption of medical ethics reflects broader trends in Chinese law and health policy, including recent debates in the National People's Congress, the country's nominal legislature, on legalizing euthanasia for the incapacitated elderly. Official press reports indicate that the Chinese government may also have given serious consideration to allowing euthanasia for handicapped children, but has declined to do so for fear of the international repercussions. The medical evidence suggests, however, that just such pseudo-eugenic practices may have been carried out at the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute. At the very least, the city's abandoned infants, even when not genuinely disabled, became the victims of a policy of deliberate and fatal neglect resulting in their wholesale death by default.

Reports from the Shanghai orphanage also indicate that medical staff there misused their authority in other ways. In several cases, children who were accused of misbehavior or were in a position to expose abuses at the orphanage were falsely diagnosed as ''mentally ill'' and transferred to psychiatric hospitals against their will; in one case, a teenage girl named Chou Hui was imprisoned for four months to prevent her from testifying that she had been raped by orphanage director Han Weicheng. Many other children were given powerful drugs without any apparent medical justification, in order to control their behavior. Human Rights Watch/Asia calls on the leaders of the Chinese medical profession to denounce these gross ethical violations and to take urgent steps to improve standards of medical ethics in China.

The Need For A Worldwide Response

The enormous loss of life occurring in China's orphanages and other children's institutions calls for immediate action by the international community. The United Nations and its specialized agencies must take the lead in investigating conditions in China's child welfare system and in bringing these abuses to an end. Governments throughout the world must make the treatment of China's abandoned children one of their highest priorities as they continue to press for improvements in the country's human rights record.

The People's Republic of China ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child in December 1991, and submitted its first implementation report to the U.N. Committee on the Rights of the Child in 1994. The Chinese government has thus submitted itself voluntarily to international monitoring on the treatment of its minor citizens. Nevertheless, the evidence compiled in this report shows that China's policies towards abandoned infants and children are in clear violation of many articles of the convention. Human Rights Watch/Asia urges the Committee on the Rights of the Child to place conditions in the Chinese child welfare system at the top of its agenda for the coming year. Specialized agencies working on children's issues in China, such as the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Health Organization, should also make a thorough reform of the country's orphanage system their highest priority. We further call for an immediate investigation into abuses against institutionalized children in China by the Special Rapporteur on

Extrajudicial Executions, who investigates patterns of deliberate state action resulting in death.

Action by the United Nations and its agencies must be accompanied by a strong response from national governments. Bilateral pressure on China to ensure the rights of abandoned infants and children should be give at least as high a priority as demands to free political and religious detainees or to end torture and ill-treatment in the country's prisons. Protecting the lives of China's orphans must remain at the top of the agenda in any future human rights dialogue with the Chinese authorities.

Despite the Chinese government's generally hostile attitude towards Western human right organizations, Human Rights Watch/Asia believes that many government and Communist Party officials will recognize the need for immediate action to resolve this humanitarian crisis. Other branches of the Chinese government must hold the Ministry of Civil Affairs and its officials fully accountable for the atrocities being committed against China's orphans. Human Rights Watch/Asia calls on the authorities to take immediate steps to bring an end to these abuses and offers its full cooperation to the Chinese authorities in formulating the necessary reforms. A list of the organization's recommendations follows.

Ending Impunity in Shanghai

Most Chinese citizens familiar only with official media reports on the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute accept the authorities' claim that conditions for the city's orphans are exemplary. This report shows that the fate of most abandoned children in Shanghai is, in fact, much the same as elsewhere in China. Until 1993, the majority of infants brought to the institute died there within a few months of arrival, and the minority who survived to older childhood were subject to brutal abuse and neglect.

Indeed, the only genuinely unique feature of the Shanghai orphanage appears to be its success since 1993 at generating revenue for the municipal Civil Affairs Bureau. The city's newly reorganized child welfare system now presents the municipal orphanage as its acceptable public face, serving as an advertisement for both charitable giving and profitable foreign adoptions, and a ban on negative media coverage of the Children's Welfare Institute has been in force since 1992.

Human Rights Watch/Asia believes that the spectacular financial success of the Shanghai policies is the real motive behind official praise of the city's child welfare system as a national model. We fear that efforts to duplicate the Shanghai experience elsewhere in China are likely to further worsen conditions for the country's abandoned children, and to strengthen the vested interest of the Ministry of Civil Affairs in obstructing genuine reforms.

Any attempt to improve the treatment of Chinese orphans must therefore begin by reopening the official investigation into misconduct within the Shanghai Civil Affairs Bureau, launched in 1991 and abruptly terminated the following year. Above all, such an inquiry would seek the widest possible publicity for any evidence of wrongdoing uncovered and would pursue appropriate legal sanctions against bureau employees found responsible for abusing children and causing avoidable deaths.

Such an inquiry will confront the fact that a number of people associated directly or indirectly with abuses at the Shanghai orphanage continue to hold positions of authority, and many have since been promoted or otherwise risen in status. The beneficiaries of this apparent impunity range from ordinary staff members such as the child-care worker Xu Shanzhen, certified as a ''model worker'' in early 1995 despite her brutal abuse of a retarded child, to the former Communist Party secretary of Shanghai, Wu Bangguo, who reportedly ordered media coverage of the scandal suppressed and has since been appointed vice-premier of China.

However, these obstacles make it all the more imperative that swift action be taken at the most senior levels to break the cycle of impunity. Human Rights Watch/Asia urges the Chinese authorities to take the following immediate steps:

(1) The highest government and Communist Party officials in the country should publicly state their determination to investigate unnatural deaths and abuse of children in welfare institutions run by the Shanghai Civil Affairs Bureau.

To demonstrate this commitment, the authorities should immediately reopen the 1991 inquiry into conditions at the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute. The leadership of the new investigation should be entirely independent of both the Shanghai municipal government and the Ministry of Civil Affairs. Such an inquiry could be led by a specially appointed committee of delegates to the National People's Congress or the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference. Members of the committee should include medical and legal professionals and should be drawn from throughout the country.

Pending the outcome of the investigation, all management personnel at the institution should be suspended from their positions and replaced by an independent leadership group, preferably including a number of qualified medical doctors, which would aid the authorities in gathering evidence about conditions at the orphanage. Administrative authority over the city's custodial welfare system should be temporarily transferred from the Shanghai Civil Affairs Bureau to another government department, possibly the Shanghai Public Health Bureau.

(2) The authorities should emphasize that institute staff members implicated in criminal offenses against children, including murder, rape, assault, sexual abuse, and financial corruption, will be tried and punished according to Chinese law. Criminal penalties should be applied as well to those responsible for administrative violations, such as falsification of medical records and unlawful disposal of corpses, which constitute, among others, the crime of ''dereliction of duty'' (*duzhi zui*) under China's Criminal Code.

In reopening the investigation, the authorities should place particular emphasis on the practices of ''summary resolution'' before 1993, whereby children were intentionally killed through deprivation of food and medical care. Public statements by senior officials should stress that all such incidents, where they can be verified, will be prosecuted to the full extent under Chinese law.

(3) The scope of the investigation should be extended beyond the original terms of the inquiry launched in 1991, and should examine evidence of complicity by senior Shanghai officials in shielding the management of the Children's Welfare Institute. Criminal charges of ''dereliction of duty'' should be brought against present and former city officials who appear to have knowingly suppressed evidence of child abuse at the orphanage. Among the officials so implicated, in official documents cited in this report, are Wu Bangguo, the former Communist Party secretary of Shanghai; Huang Ju, Shanghai's former mayor; Xie Lijuan, the city's deputy mayor, and Sun Jinfu, director of the Shanghai Civil Affairs Bureau.

(4) The investigation should also examine the legal culpability of other official bodies in Shanghai which helped to conceal misconduct within the Civil Affairs Bureau, in the process implicating their own officials in possible criminal acts. At a minimum, these include:

The Shanghai Public Security Bureau, for allowing the Children's Welfare Institute to disobey regulations governing the reporting of unnatural deaths; for unlawfully detaining and intimidating Chou Hui, the plaintiff in a rape case against the then-director of the orphanage, Han Weicheng; and for failing to investigate the orphanage employees accused of assaulting Chen Dongxian, a driver at the Shanghai orphanage;

The Shanghai Public Health Bureau, for failing to investigate the extremely high monthly death figures reported from the Children's Welfare Institute over a period of years;

The Shanghai Supervision Bureau, for suppressing evidence obtained during an eight-month-long inquiry that it carried out into conditions at the children's Welfare Institute in 1991 and 1992.

(5) The investigation should urgently examine the present situation at the Shanghai No. 2 Social Welfare Institute, including evidence of unlawful practices such as the detention of mentally normal adults against their will, and, the use of disciplinary measures constituting torture or ill-treatment. Special attention should also be paid to conditions for infants and young children secretly transferred to the Chongming Island institute since 1993, and should seek to determine whether the killing of infants through ''summary resolution'' or other similar methods is presently occurring there. A criminal investigation should be opened into the alleged rape and murder of a twenty-nine-year-old woman, named Guang Zi, at the facility in August 1991.

(6) The municipal Propaganda Department should lift its present ban on critical coverage of events at the Children's Welfare Institute, and invite journalists familiar with conditions at the orphanage to publish any information which might assist the authorities in their investigation. The progress of the official inquiry, including any resulting criminal prosecutions, should be publicized without restraint by local and national media.

Public Accountability

Despite the urgent need to resolve these outstanding problems in Shanghai, the above measures represent only the first stage of what should be a nationwide campaign to improve conditions for children in China's welfare institutes. A critical factor in the success of any such effort will be the Chinese government's willingness to expose these institutions to intensive public scrutiny, not only from concerned foreigners but, even more importantly, from China's own citizens. The deceptive policy of ''openness'' introduced by the Shanghai Children's Welfare Institute in 1993 must be replaced by genuine transparency in order to prevent future abuses from going undetected.

Human Rights Watch/Asia believes the following measures are likely to produce immediate and substantial improvements in the quality of care for children in state custody, even without fundamental reforms in management and law:

(1) The Ministry of Civil Affairs should immediately publish comprehensive statistics on the scale of China's child abandonment problem. These should given detailed figures on the number of abandoned infants and children discovered in each Chinese province in recent years, as well as the number of such children offered up for legal adoption, fostered with private families, and placed in institutional care.

The ministry should also publish a list of all custodial institutions in China which care for unsupported minors, including specialized orphanages, urban ''social welfare institutes,'' and collectively run ''respecting-the-aged homes'' in rural areas. The list should include the location of each institution and its population on a specified date, as well as all available statistics on child intake and mortality rates in recent years. In future, such basic population statistics for each institution should be published on an annual basis.

Since most abandoned infants and children in China are delivered to the civil affairs authorities by local police departments and hospitals, the Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of Public Health should begin compiling and publishing regular statistics on child abandonment, including the sex and estimated age of each child discovered. This will provide an independent check on the accuracy of intake figures submitted to the Ministry of Civil Affairs by individual institutions, and will prevent the under-reporting of intakes which allegedly took place in Shanghai during the 1980s.

(2) The Ministry of Civil Affairs should make public its policy on ''fostering'' orphans and abandoned children in private family care, including details of the screening process, if any, for prospective foster parents, and of monitoring procedures aimed at ensuring that fostered children are treated humanely.

(3) The propaganda organs of the Communist Party should publicize the severe problems in Shanghai's child welfare system, and instruct the state-controlled media throughout China to investigate conditions for children in welfare institutions within their own area of coverage. The Ministry of Civil Affairs should ensure that journalists participating in these investigations receive full cooperation from institute staff, including unrestricted access to all children in each institution. Any abusive or negligent conditions uncovered during the course of journalists' inquiries should be publicly exposed and promptly remedied. Objective reporting on conditions in China's child welfare system should remain a priority indefinitely.

Welfare institutes should permit unscheduled visits by local residents, including both Chinese and foreign nationals. Local civil affairs authorities should encourage public involvement in the care of orphans, particularly by qualified medical personnel.

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and established private children's charities from overseas should be granted access on a regular basis to all welfare institutions holding minors.

Management Reforms

Although the steps outlined above are likely to bring about a sharp reduction of some of the worst abuses within the child welfare system, basic changes in institutional management are equally important in order to guarantee that these initial improvements last. These include administrative measures to strengthen the outside monitoring of children's treatment, as well as improvements in the selection, training and discipline of institute staff. Human Rights Watch/Asia recommends that the Chinese authorities undertake the following reforms:

The leadership of the Ministry of Civil Affairs should publicly state its commitment to improving conditions for institutionalized children, and should emphasize that the directors of welfare institutes and other management-level staff will be evaluated primarily on their success in reducing children's death rates to an absolute minimum. The directors of welfare institutes where child mortality rates appear to be higher than expected, given normal levels of care, should be subject to investigation and dismissed if mismanagement is shown to be a contributing factor.

The Ministry of Civil Affairs should immediately begin reorganizing its custodial welfare system to ensure that minors and adults are kept in separate institutions. The use of all-purpose ''social welfare institutes'' to warehouse orphans and other incapacitated persons should be ended as soon as practically possible.

(3) The Ministry of Civil Affairs should cooperate with the Ministry of Public Health and the Ministry of Public Security to ensure that staff of welfare institutions strictly follow all rules and other legal requirements regarding the reporting of inmates' deaths. All deaths of minors in institutional care should be treated as potentially unnatural, and hence subject to reporting, investigation and documentation requirements of the Public Security Bureau, as well as independent autopsies by qualified medical personnel affiliated with the Bureau of Public Health. Local health bureaus which are notified of a significant number of children's deaths in welfare institutions within their jurisdiction should immediately call for an investigation by local authorities.

(4) The Ministry of Civil Affairs should promulgate strict rules prohibiting the abuse of children in welfare institutions, such as excessive corporal punishment, tying of children's limbs, medically unjustified use of drugs to control children's behavior, and all forms of paid or unpaid child labor. The ministry should also promulgate a formal disciplinary policy to be applied by institute management in cases of misconduct by junior staff.

(5) All staff at custodial welfare institutes should undertake a period of formal training, aimed at impressing on newly assigned employees that the protection of inmates' well-being is of paramount importance. Ordinary child-care workers should be trained in basic first-aid techniques, particularly to respond to cases of choking and accidental injuries, and in appropriate feeding methods for infants and small children, especially those with disabilities.

(6) Welfare institutes should be staffed with, or (where personnel shortages cannot be resolved) be provided with full and regular outside consultancy services by, an adequate number of fully qualified medical professionals, including specialists in pediatrics. Doctors whose medical educations were interrupted, for example during the Cultural Revolution, should not be employed as institute medical staff unless they have completed the necessary remedial coursework.

(7) The surgical repair of harelips, cleft palates and other correctable birth defects should be one of the highest medical priorities for welfare institutes and cooperating local hospitals. Abandoned infants requiring these relatively inexpensive procedures should receive them as soon as medically advisable, and should be given individual attention in the meantime to ensure that they remain adequately nourished.

(8) Infants and small children should not be classified as ''mentally retarded'' until they are old enough to undergo appropriate psychological tests. Training programs for child-care workers should emphasize the importance of individual care, attention and stimulation for infants' normal mental development.

Legislative Reforms

The phenomenon of child abandonment is not unique to China, and many of the factors which lead parents to abandon their children are beyond the government's power to remedy, at least in the short term. Rural poverty, prejudice against the disabled, traditional attitudes towards female children, and the pressures generated by the country's stringent population policy all contribute to the problem. It must be stressed, however, that whatever the reasons for the orphanhood or abandonment, once such children are accepted into state care, the government has an unshirkable duty to provide them with adequate care and protection.

For the foreseeable future, China will need to maintain a system of state-run foster care for some orphans, particularly the severely disabled. However, Human Rights Watch/Asia believes that relatively minor legislative changes would enable most children now living in welfare institutions to be placed for adoption with Chinese families. An effective domestic adoption program would eliminate the need for institutional care for virtually all of China's abandoned children.

Human Rights Watch/Asia urges the Chinese authorities to take the following steps:

(1) China's ''Adoption Law'' and its implementing regulations should be amended to abolish the legal distinction between ''orphans'' and ''abandoned infants.'' The provisions of the adoption law which prohibit adults under age thirty-five and couples with children from adopting abandoned infants without handicaps, and which prohibit foster parents from adopting more than one abandoned child, should be repealed.

(2) The State Commission for Family Planning should issue instructions to local family planning authorities, expressly prohibiting any interference in the adopting of children from welfare institutions.

(3) The propaganda organs of the Communist Party should publicize changes in the country's adoption policy through the official media. Both the media and the State Commission for Family Planning should actively promote the adoption of orphans as an alternative for couples seeking larger families than China's population policies allow.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting five withdrawals and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 5:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in

which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2567. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyances.

H.R. 2657. An act to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

H.R. 2726. An act to make certain technical corrections in law relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2567. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyances; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1524. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit smoking on any scheduled airline flight segment in intrastate, interstate, or foreign air transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1524. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit smoking on any scheduled airline flight segment intrastate, interstate, or foreign air transportation.

THE AIRLINER CABIN AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am introducing the Airliner Cabin Air Quality Act of 1996, which would prohibit smoking on international flights to and from the United States by domestic and foreign carriers.

Mr. President, more than 50,000 studies have established the scientific evidence incriminating cigarette smoking as a direct cause of death and disability. Volumes of evidence also document similar health effects as a result of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. For example, in 1991, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health placed environmental tobacco smoke in its most significant category of human carcinogens.

The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that environmental tobacco smoke causes some 3,000 lung cancer deaths and 12,000 other cancer deaths each year. In addition, the EPA believes that 70 percent of the lung cancer deaths attributable to environmental tobacco smoke are due to exposures outside of the home.

Environmental tobacco smoke exposure leads to coughing, chest discomfort, and reduced lung function in nonsmoking adults. While these symptoms may seem minor in nature, their effects on individuals can have permanent health and financial consequences. It is estimated that flight attendants lose about $10,000 per year in salary if they are unable to work on international flights on which smoking is still allowed.

Mr. President, in September 1992, the International Civil Aviation Organization [ICAO] passed a nonbinding resolution urging governments to take the necessary steps to ban smoking on all international flights as a safety and health measure. The resolution calls for the ban to be in place no later than July 1, 1996. I am hopeful, but not confident, that the ICAO resolution will be successful.

This past summer, ICAO released a working paper on the progress being made toward the implementation of its international smoking ban resolution. While developing the working paper, ICAO asked its more than 300 members to indicate their intentions with respect to implementation of the smoking ban. Of the 67 replies, 34 countries gave either no indication of their intentions or indicated they were going to delay implementation. Another 10 countries indicated implementation plans were under study. Only 24 countries stated that they would implement the smoking ban. Based upon replies to this questionnaire, some have estimated that just 13 percent of all ICAO members will take the steps necessary to ban smoking on international flights.

Mr. President, from the perspective of the United States, the potentially low rate of participation of other countries in an international smoking ban should be unacceptable. The United States and its carriers have repeatedly demonstrated their support for an international smoking ban. As the result of an agreement between the United States, Canada, and Australia, passengers traveling between these countries need not suffer through a smoke-filled flight.

About a year ago, the Department of Transportation provided eight U.S. carriers with an antitrust waiver so they could discuss implementing a voluntary transatlantic smoking ban. Despite their unanimous resolve to move toward a smoke-free environment, the participating carriers were unable to reach an agreement. Many were unwilling to ban smoking because of perceptions about competitive pressures from foreign carriers who are unwilling to voluntarily ban smoking.

Mr. President, I have been active for many years in efforts to ensure clean cabin air for airline passengers. In 1988, I sponsored legislation that banned smoking on domestic flights of 2 hours or less. This law protected approximately 80 percent of all domestic passengers from the documented effects of environmental tobacco smoke. In 1989, based upon the success and popularity of the 2-hour smoking ban, Congress expanded the ban to include nearly all domestic flights.

Mr. President, this legislation would extend the protection now enjoyed by domestic passengers and flight attendants to those who fly into and out of this country. I wish other countries would enter into multilateral smoking-ban agreements on their own so this bill would be unnecessary. However, that does not seem likely. Therefore, this bill is needed to demonstrate the U.S. Congress' resolve and continued leadership on this issue. The bill would create a level competitive playing field for carriers utilizing our market. And, most importantly, it would protect the health and safety of all those who fly internationally.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 877

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to amend section 353 of the Public Health Service Act to exempt physician office laboratories from the clinical laboratories requirements of that section.

S. 1028

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes.

S. 1295

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. THOMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1295, a bill to prohibit the regulation of any tobacco products, or tobacco sponsored advertising, used or purchased by the National Association of Stock Car Automobile Racing, its agents or affiliates, or any other professional motor sports association by the Secretary of Health and Human Services or any other instrumentality of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1418

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1418, a bill to provide for the more effective implementation of the prohibition against the payment to prisoners of supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act or monthly benefits under title II of such Act, and to deny such supplemental security income benefits for 10 years to a person found to have fraudulently obtained such benefits while in prison.

S. 1421

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from Illinois [Ms.

MOSELEY-BRAUN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat as a zone business an otherwise qualified business dissected by a census tract boundary line of a designated empowerment zone or enterprise community.

S. 1519

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] were added as cosponsors of S. 1519, a bill to prohibit United States voluntary and assessed contributions to the United Nations if the United Nations imposes any tax or fee on United States persons or continues to develop or promote proposals for such taxes or fees.

S. 1520

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1520, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

SENATE RESOLUTION 85

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 85, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that obstetrician-gynecologists should be included in Federal laws relating to the provision of health care.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE HOUSING OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1995

D'AMATO (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3118

Mr. LOTT (for Mr. D'AMATO, for himself, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BOND) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1494) to provide an extension for fiscal year 1996 for certain programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 5, strike ''During fiscal year 1996'' and insert the following: ''To the extent that amounts are made available in advance in any appropriations act for contract renewals under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for fiscal year 1996''.

On page 2, line 11, insert ''project-based'' after ''for''.

On page 5, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 7. CAPACITY BUILDING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Initiative to develop'' and inserting the following: ''Initiative—

''(1) to develop'';

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) for national or regional organizations or consortia, including Habitat for Humanity International, that have experience in providing or facilitating self-help housing homeownership opportunities.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) innovative homeownership opportunities for the acquisition and rehabilitation of single family housing through the provision of self-help housing, under which the homeowner contributes a significant amount of sweat equity toward the construction of the new dwelling; and''; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, of which $25,000,000 shall be made available to Habitat for Humanity International for activities under this section.''.

SEC. 8. THE NATIONAL CITIES IN SCHOOLS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 930(c) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–550, 106 Stat. 3887) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996.''.

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 FOR SAFETY AND SECURITY IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.

(a) CONTRACT PROVISIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (k), by striking ''on or near such premises'' and inserting ''on or off such premises''; and

(2) in subsection (*l*)(5), by striking ''on or near such premises'' and inserting ''on or off such premises''.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CRIMINAL RECORDS FOR SCREENING AND EVICTION; EVICTION FOR DRUG-RELATED ACTIVITY.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(q) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), the National Crime Information Center, police departments, and other law enforcement agencies shall, upon request, provide information to public housing agencies regarding the criminal conviction records of adult applicants for, or tenants of, public housing for purposes of applicant screening, lease enforcement, and eviction.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Except as provided under any provision of State, tribal, or local law, no law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A) shall provide information under this paragraph relating to any criminal conviction if the date of that conviction occurred 5 or more years prior to the date on which the request for the information is made.

''(2) OPPORTUNITY TO DISPUTE.—Before an adverse action is taken with regard to assistance under this title on the basis of a criminal record, the public housing agency shall provide the tenant or applicant with a copy of the criminal record and an opportunity to dispute the accuracy and relevance of that record.

''(3) FEE.—A public housing agency may be charged a reasonable fee for information provided under paragraph (1).

''(4) RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Each public housing agency shall establish and implement a system of records management that ensures that any criminal record received by the public housing agency is—

''(A) maintained confidentially;

''(B) not misused or improperly disseminated; and

''(C) destroyed, once the purpose for which the record was requested has been accomplished.

''(5) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'adult' means a person who is 18 years of age or older, or who has been convicted of a crime as an adult under any Federal, State, or tribal law.

''(r) EVICTION FOR DRUG-RELATED ACTIVITY.—Any tenant evicted from housing assisted under this title by reason of drug-related criminal activity (as that term is defined in section 8(f)(5)) shall not be eligible for housing assistance under this title during the 3-year period beginning on the date of such eviction, unless the evicted tenant successfully completes a rehabilitation program approved by the public housing agency (which shall include a waiver of this subsection if the circumstances leading to eviction no longer exist).''.

(c) LIMITATION ON OCCUPANCY IN ELDERLY AND DISABLED HOUSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437e) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) LIMITATION ON OCCUPANCY IN DESIGNATED PROJECTS.—

''(1) OCCUPANCY LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a dwelling unit in a public housing project (or portion of a project) that is designated under subsection (a) shall not be occupied by any person whose illegal use (or pattern of illegal use) of a controlled substance or abuse (or pattern of abuse) of alcohol provides reasonable cause for the public housing agency to believe that such occupancy could interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.

''(2) REQUIRED STATEMENT.—A public housing agency may not make a dwelling unit in a public housing project (or portion of a project) designated under subsection (a) available for occupancy to any family, unless the application for occupancy by that family is accompanied by a signed statement that no person who will be occupying the unit illegally uses a controlled substance, or abuses alcohol, in a manner that would interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.''.

(2) LEASE PROVISIONS.—Section 6(l) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(l)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) provide that any occupancy in violation of section 7(h)(1) or the furnishing of any false or misleading information pursuant to section 7(h)(2) shall be cause for termination of tenancy; and''.

(d) INELIGIBILITY OF ILLEGAL DRUG USERS AND ALCOHOL ABUSERS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING.—Section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) INELIGIBILITY OF ILLEGAL DRUG USERS AND ALCOHOL ABUSERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a public housing agency shall establish standards for occupancy in public housing dwelling units—

''(A) that prohibit occupancy in any such unit by any person—

''(i) who the public housing agency determines is illegally using a controlled substance; or

''(ii) if the public housing agency determines that it has reasonable cause to believe that such person's illegal use (or pattern of illegal use) of a controlled substance, or abuse (or pattern of abuse) of alcohol, could interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project; and

''(B) that allow the public housing agency to terminate the tenancy in any public housing unit of any person—

''(i) if the public housing agency determines that such person is illegally using a controlled substance; or

''(ii) whose illegal use of a controlled substance, or whose abuse of alcohol, is determined by the public housing agency to interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.

''(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO INDIAN HOUSING.—This subsection does not apply to any dwelling unit assisted by an Indian housing authority.''.

SEC. 10. ELIGIBLE HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGES.

Section 255(d)(3) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(d)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) be secured by a dwelling that is designed principally for a 1- to 4-family residence in which the mortgagor occupies 1 of the units;''.

On page 5, strike line 8, and insert the following:

SEC. 11. APPLICABILITY.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WAR ON DRUGS

• Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last night, President Clinton announced his intention to reenlist in the war against drugs. It is an announcement that is long overdue.

For 3 years, the Clinton administration has failed to provide any leadership in this battle. And one of the results has been a dramatic increase in drug use among America's youth.

One of the most eloquent and effective soldiers in the war against drugs is former First Lady Nancy Reagan. Throughout the 1980's Mrs. Reagan devoted her tremendous energy to leading the ''Just Say No'' campaign—a campaign that is credited with dramatically lowering this Nation's tolerance and use of illegal drugs.

Like countless other concerned citizens, Mrs. Reagan is concerned with the recent increase in drug use. And a column she wrote in yesterday's Wall Street Journal should be required reading for all Americans.

I salute Mrs. Reagan for her commitment to this most important issue, and I ask that her column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

JUST SAY ''WHOA''

(By Nancy Reagan)

Statistics released last fall from the annual Household Survey of Drug Use and, more recently, from the 21st annual Monitoring the Future Survey show that marijuana use among teenagers was up again last year. Where is the public outrage over this finding? When will this country realize that as long as we don't wake up and adopt a zero tolerance for drug use, we are heading down a path of no return? Most we lose another generation of children to the horrors of crack addiction? Must the statistics soar to all-time highs before we bother to take notice?

Last March I was invited to testify before a congressional committee, at which time I said: ''I am not here to criticize or place blame, but after the great strides that we made just a few years back, I'm worried that this nation is forgetting how endangered our children are by drugs. I'm worried that for the first time in many years, tolerance for drugs and the mistaken perception that 'everyone is doing it' is creeping back into our national mentality. And I am worried that the psychological momentum we had against drug use has been lost.

''[Y]et it's more than worry,'' I pleaded. ''This weakening vigilance against the drug threat can have a tragic effect on this country for many years to come. . . . How could we have forgotten so quickly? Why is it we no longer hear the drumbeat of condemnation against drugs coming from our leaders and our culture? Is it any wonder drug use has started climbing again, and dramatically so?''

Regarding the drug use survey, NBC News reported: '''Just Say No' was an effective message in the '80s . . . in the '90s much more will be needed.'' Denver drug counselor Bob Cota emphasized, ''Kids have to be shown why they need to learn it early, in the third and fourth grades—and it has to be repeated often.''

Repeated often—like in the '80s when the national leadership was vigilant and visible. And yes, we do need even more now. In response to the 1994 Monitoring the Future Survey, Joseph Califano Jr., chairman and president of the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA), warned: ''If historical trends continue, the jump in marijuana use among America's children (age 12–18) from 1992 to 1994 signals that 820,000 more of these children will try cocaine in their lifetime. Of that number, about 58,000 will become regular cocaine users and addicts.'' In a 1995 survey by CASA, adolescents said that drugs were their ''number one'' problem. Our children are crying out for help.

While drug use is on the rise, the perceived risk of drug use is on decline. The two go hand in hand. Only a few short years ago, the constant message to young people—in the media, in their classrooms, and in their homes—was that drugs lead to destruction. But where are those messages today? Those messages, those lessons, are what change perceptions, change attitudes, change lives. Each of us has a responsibility to bring back those messages—loud and clear.

Before the drug-use increases of the past three years, we really had seen marked progress. As I told the members of the committee: ''A decade of effort was beginning to pay off. Attitudes were being changed. I don't mean to sit here and say that we had won the battle against drugs. I think it's plain we had not.'' However, between 1985 and 1992, monthly cocaine use declined 78%, or to an annual rate of 3.1% from its peak of 13.1% in 1985. It's the same story with other numbers: Annual use of any illicit drug by high school seniors dropped to 27.1% in 1992 from 54.2% in 1979. ''The battle was going forward one child at a time,'' I said in March. ''There was momentum, unity, intolerance of the exaggeration and glorification of drug use by the media—we were building peer support for saying 'no,' Children were being taught resistance skills—in short, there was progress.''

Now there is silence—and not without consequence. In 1994, twice the number of eighth-graders were experimenting with marijuana as did in 1991, and daily use of marijuana by high school seniors in 1994 was up by half from 1993. The 1995 Monitoring the Future Survey shows that daily use has made another jump.

We should all, as citizens of this great nation, be frightened by the latest drug statistics. We should all question what they mean to our futures and those of our children. We should all resolve not to be silent any longer. By the latest drug statistics and the renewed calls for legalization of marijuana, it is painfully obvious that our ''letting up'' is going to let down the young people of this country. It's time to just say ''Whoa!''•

STUDENT LOANS AND CORPORATE WELFARE

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in his State of the Union Address, President Clinton made a reference to the successful effort to streamline the college student loan process and make repayment easier.

Some of my colleagues may be surprised to learn that much of the credit for these improvements should go to a conservative Republican from Wisconsin, Representative TOM PETRI. He developed one of the earliest models for a direct loan program and for income-contingent repayment, and he has been a consistent proponent over the years.

Earlier this month, Congressman PETRI appealed to fellow conservatives to help save the direct loan program, which has come under attack by banks and agencies that do not want to lose their Government-guaranteed income.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. PETRI's article which appeared in the Washington Times on January 9. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

STUDENT LOANS: DIRECT LENDING VS. SPECIAL PLEAS

(By Thomas E. Petri)

How's this for a switch? The Clinton administration stands firm for private enterprise and competition, against Republican attempts to stomp out a successful competitor and perpetuate an inefficient monopoly.

That's exactly what's occurring in the ongoing student loan debate. Administration officials accuse congressional Republicans of caving in to loan-industry lobbyists by eviscerating the Direct Student Loan program. And on this issue, the administration actually occupies the conservative high ground.

The loan industry (banks, secondary markets and guaranty agencies) wants to protect its lucrative, fraud-infested, no-risk student loan program from any meaningful competition. It's losing in the marketplace; so it mounted a multi-million-dollar lobbying campaign this year to persuade Congress to eliminate direct student loans.

By casting the debate in simple, ideological terms, the loan lobbyists have won some allies. they've equated the Department of Education's Direct Student Loan (DSL) program with Big Government—and they've successfully portrayed it as a Clinton initiative. That guarantees enmity from conservative Republicans.

Unfortunately, it's a hoax. One creator of the DSL program was a Republican with solid fiscal conservative credentials—me. It was developed not by the reviled liberal Clinton, but by the Bush administration.

And there is far more free enterprise in DSL—and less bureaucracy—than in the bloated Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) program. I dislike the term ''corporate welfare,'' but if any program deserves that title, it's guaranteed student loans.

Here are conservative principles I believe in: substituting market forces for political forces; simplifying programs and cutting bureaucracy; saving taxpayers money.

On all counts, killing the DSL program goes in the wrong direction.

All major functions under DSL are run through private sector services under competitively bid contracts. This competition is bringing down the cost of those contracts via market forces.

Under the guaranteed student loan program, all payment levels are determined politically by Congress—not by the free market. Here's just one example of the resulting built-in profits: While the student is in school or during the six-month grace period following school (a period averaging 2.5 years for each loan), the lender does nothing but collect interest directly from the government at 2.5 percent above the Treasury-bill rate on paper that's as good as a Treasury bill. It's a system of political entitlements, and any conservative ought to prefer the competitive bidding system under direct loans.

The Education Department says it can manage all direct loans with only 400 employees. All important business functions—loan origination, servicing, debt collection—are handled by private firms, with Education Department supervision.

But overseeing 7,100 guaranteed bank lenders takes 525 Education Department employees and another 5,000 employees in 41 federally subsidized guaranty agencies. It's a bureaucratic nightmare.

Congress can easily oversee the direct program because it involves relatively few contractors, all of whom have have incentives to do a good job in order to win additional contracts.

But there's little supervision of the guaranteed program's guaranty agencies. Congress isn't looking over their shoulders because they're not federal entities. State legislatures aren't interested because the guaranty agencies aren't state-funded. And they have no stockholders to answer to. Unsurprisingly, the result is abuse.

In one case, a guaranty agency's chief executive officer earns $700,000 a year plus untold benefits. Some 15 other employees in the same agency earn more than the U.S. secretary of education. In another, board members set up a for-profit corporation to provide services to the guaranty agency that they controlled. More taxpayer money goes largely unchecked in these agencies for platinum parachutes, perks, lavish pensions, executive cadillacs and dining rooms and retreats at posh resorts.

Little wonder the lending moguls want to kill direct lending. Their cause is helped by various scoring errors (including some they lobbied for) that make direct lending look more expensive than guaranteed. The worse is the assumption of a high long-term interest rate as the cost of the federal funds used to make the direct loan. That would be appropriate if the interest rate that student borrowers paid were fixed, but it's not. It's variable, based on 91-day Treasury bills; so these loans do not carry the kind of interest-rate risk that a long-term rate discounts. Indeed, no private bank treats variable-rate loans the way the Congressional Budget Office treats direct student loans.

In general, it's inconceivable that a simpler program based on competitive bidding could be more expensive than a vastly more complex one based on politically negotiated entitlements. Especially when the complex one actually encourages defaults—because guaranty agencies get to keep 27 cents of every dollar they collect *after* a default and their costs for those collections average only 13 cents on the dollar.

Some Republicans believe that if President Clinton supports a program, that program must be opposed. Right now, Mr. Clinton is telling the American people that the GOP Congress is trying to shut down a conservative reform effort, which is good for both students and schools, in order to keep the gravy flowing to powerful special interests.

In this case, the president is right.●

DAPCEP

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Detroit Area Pre-College Engineering Program, Inc. [DAPCEP], is celebrating its 20th anniversary in this year. The organization was founded in 1976 with a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. DAPCEP's mission is ''to increase the number of minority students who are motivated and academically prepared to choose careers in science, engineering and technical fields.''

In its first year, 245 students took DAPCEP enrichment courses offered through 1 high school and 2 universities. Today, the organization serves more than 5,000 sixth through twelfth graders each year, through a collaboration with 8 universities, 64 Detroit public middle schools and high schools, 30 local corporations, and an active parent group. DAPCEP also receives funding from the National Science Foundation, the State of Michigan, and the city of Detroit. Current DAPCEP programs include an in-school component with hands-on research, experiments and science fairs; Saturday morning classes; and summer enrichment programs. DAPCEP also offers mentoring, tutoring, summer jobs, scholarships, and teacher training.

DAPCEP was featured on the NBC ''Nightly News'' in April 1995 in a story highlighting successful extracurricular enrichment programs. DAPCEP students captured 62 percent of the top awards given at the 1995 Metropolitan Detroit Science and Engineering Fair, one of the largest and most successful fairs in the Nation. Recognized nationally as a model for pre-college programs, DAPCEP was named by Crain's Detroit Business as the 1995 Best-Managed Nonprofit for nonprofits having budgets larger than $2.5 million.

Through working to further the study of science and engineering for all, DAPCEP has made a great contribution to our local community and our country as a whole. I know that my Senate colleagues join me in congratulating the Detroit Area Pre-College Engineering Program on its 20th anniversary.●

AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have long been active in issues of importance for individuals suffering from a mental illness or disability. Through my efforts in this area, I have become familiar with the vast spectrum of these disorders, and I have found that we as a society have much to learn about both the causes and cures for these illnesses. Knowledge of the medical conditions underpinning these disorders has only recently begun to make progress by leaps and bounds, and I fear that public awareness and knowledge has not grown in step. Because society is still unfamiliar with these advances, an aura of fear and suspicion persists with regard to any one of the illnesses or disorders which afflict so many Americans. It is because of this widespread lack of knowledge and understanding that I add my support in recognition of the National Autism Society's designation of January as ''National Autism Awareness Month.''

Autism is a neurological disorder that interrupts the brain's ability to process and understand information. Nearly 400,000 Americans suffer from this disorder, making it more prevalent than Down's syndrome or muscular dystrophy.

Autism is a complex, spectrum disorder that manifests itself in many ways. Symptoms and characteristics present themselves in a variety of combinations, and no two children or adults are affected in the same way.

Autism is not curable, but it is treatable. Many types of treatments have proven effective in combating this disorder, and improvements are being discovered every day.

A generation ago, nearly 90 percent of those suffering from autism were placed in an institution. Today, group homes, assisted living arrangements, and home care are much more common. Thanks to the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, many children with autism receive appropriate education and go on to become contributing members of the work force.

In April 1995, in response to direction from Congress, the National Institutes of Health [NIH] held a State-of-the-Sciences Conference on Autism. Conference participants included scientists, clinicians, and parents. The conference highlighted how far we have come in diagnosing and treating autism, but also illuminated how far we have yet to go. National Autism Month is designed to bring attention to these issues, and seeks to further the Nation's understanding of this complicated and debilitating disorder. I fully support the National Autism Society's designation of January as ''National Autism Awareness Month,'' I share their goal of teaching America more about this disorder, and I welcome my colleagues' support as well.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HOUSING OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking Committee be immediately discharged from further consideration of S. 1494, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1494) to provide an extension for fiscal year 1996 for certain programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I urge support for the Housing Opportunity Program Extenders Act of 1995. This legislation is designed to provide HUD and Farmers Home with authority to continue certain housing programs which are strongly supported by the American public.

Most importantly, similar to the VA/HUD fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill, this bill would require HUD to renew expiring section 8 project-based contracts for fiscal year 1996 for 1 year at current rents. There are some 900,000 FHA-insured units with section 8 project-based assistance expiring over the next 10 years. Many of these section 8 contracts are oversubsidized under existing contracts and fiscal responsibility requires that Congress contain the spiraling costs associated with this inventory. Moreover, under a recent HUD legal opinion, HUD may renew these expiring section 8 project-based contracts at the market rent with some exceptions for contract rents up to 120 percent of the market rents; this means that these section 8 projects will begin to default and face foreclosure by HUD during fiscal year 1996.

I believe it is critical that Congress reform and adjust the costs, including section 8 costs, of this assisted housing to the existing market rents. However, in doing so, we must balance the cost of the expiring section 8 contracts with the cost of foreclosure of these projects to the FHA insurance fund, as well as the significant social policy of the possible displacement of low-income housing residents and the disinvestment by project owners in these projects which could result in significant deterioration of this valuable housing stock. Like the VA/HUD fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill, renewing these section 8 contracts for 1 year will provide the Banking Committee with an opportunity to develop a dialog and resulting meaningful policy that will preserve this valuable housing resource as low-income housing at a reasonable cost to the Federal Government.

Second, the legislation would extend the Home Equity Conversion Mortgage Program through fiscal year 1996, increasing the maximum number of units eligible for insurance from 25,000 to 30,000. This program is designed to allow the elderly to tap the accumulated equity in their homes for needed expenses without the risk of losing the housing as a principal residence. This is a successful program that is growing in popularity among the elderly population as an option to assist in providing continuing independence, both financially and through the continuing use of their homes as a principal resident.

Third, the legislation would extend the home ownership program under the CDBG Program as a continuing eligible activity through fiscal year 1996. This program is widely supported by a number of communities throughout the Nation which use the program as an additional resource to expand homeownership opportunities.

Finally, the bill would extend the FmHA's section 515 rural multifamily program for fiscal year 1996. Currently, the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations has limited the section 515 funding for fiscal year 1996 to rehabilitation. However, there is a significant number of section 515 projects in the development pipeline. Section 515 projects are, in many cases, the only available and affordable low-income housing in rural areas. While there has been substantial criticism leveled at abuses in the section 515 program, FmHA has addressed a number of the failings in the program and the Banking Committee has pledged to review closely the section 515 program and address any concerns as part of a major housing and community development overhaul and reform bill.

In addition, a manager's amendment to this bill legislation would incorporate Habitat for Humanity as an eligible organization under the National Community Development Initiative [NCDI]. Habitat for Humanity is one of the best models in this country for the development of affordable low-income housing. The foundation of this program is sweat equity, where a potential homeowner must contribute their own labor and hard work to the construction of their home and the homes of others. In this way, participating families develop a tangible bond with their homes combined with a strong interest in maintaining them. Since 1976, Habitat has constructed over 40,000 homes worldwide, in every U.S. State and in 45 other countries. As a consequence, some 250,000 people are living in decent, safe and affordable housing.

Under this program, Habitat for Humanity would receive a $25 million authorization to assist in the acquisition of land or infrastructure improvements, and only in the United States. I urge HUD to develop flexible requirements for Habitat for Humanity's participation in NCDI with deference to the underlying vision of homeowner contribution to the construction of their home.

This manager's amendment also would provide clear statutory guidance to empower PHAs and assisted property owners with the tools to screen out and evict from public and assisted housing persons who illegally use drugs or whose abuse of alcohol is a risk to other tenants. I cannot emphasize enough the need to take the bull by the horns and provide real solutions to the problems created by alcohol abuse and illegal drug use in federally assisted housing.

Mr. President, this legislation is bipartisan, simple, straightforward and necessary. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

AMENDMENT NO. 3118

(Purpose: To make a series of amendments)

Mr. LOTT. I understand that there is a managers' amendment at the desk in behalf of Senators D'AMATO, MACK, and BAUCUS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] for Mr. D'AMATO, for himself, Mr. MACK, and Mr. BAUCUS, proposes an amendment numbered 3118.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 5, strike ''During fiscal year 1996'' and insert the following: ''To the extent that amounts are made available in advance in any appropriations act for contract renewals under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for fiscal year 1996''.

On page 2, line 11, insert ''project-based'' after ''for''.

On page 5, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 7. CAPACITY BUILDING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Initiative to develop'' and inserting the following: ''Initiative—

''(1) to develop'';

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) for national or regional organizations or consortia, including Habitat for Humanity International, that have experience in providing or facilitating self-help housing homeownership opportunities.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) innovative homeownership opportunities for the acquisition and rehabilitation of single family housing through the provision

of self-help housing, under which the homeowner contributes a significant amount of sweat equity toward the construction of the new dwelling; and''; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, of which $25,000,000 shall be made available to Habitat for Humanity International for activities under this section.''.

SEC. 8. THE NATIONAL CITIES IN SCHOOLS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 930(c) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–550, 106 Stat. 3887) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996.''.

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 FOR SAFETY AND SECURITY IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.

(a) CONTRACT PROVISIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (k), by striking ''on or near such premises'' and inserting ''on or off such premises''; and

(2) in subsection (*l*)(5), by striking ''on or near such premises'' and inserting ''on or off such premises''.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CRIMINAL RECORDS FOR SCREENING AND EVICTION; EVICTION FOR DRUG-RELATED ACTIVITY.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(q) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), the National Crime Information Center, police departments, and other law enforcement agencies shall, upon request, provide information to public housing agencies regarding the criminal conviction records of adult applicants for, or tenants of, public housing for purposes of applicant screening, lease enforcement, and eviction.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Except as provided under any provision of State, tribal, or local law, no law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A) shall provide information under this paragraph relating to any criminal conviction if the date of that conviction occurred 5 or more years prior to the date on which the request for the information is made.

''(2) OPPORTUNITY TO DISPUTE.—Before an adverse action is taken with regard to assistance under this title on the basis of a criminal record, the public housing agency shall provide the tenant or applicant with a copy of the criminal record and an opportunity to dispute the accuracy and relevance of that record.

''(3) FEE.—A public housing agency may be charged a reasonable fee for information provided under paragraph (1).

''(4) RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Each public housing agency shall establish and implement a system of records management that ensures that any criminal record received by the public housing agency is—

''(A) maintained confidentially;

''(B) not misused or improperly disseminated; and

''(C) destroyed, once the purpose for which the record was requested has been accomplished.

''(5) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'adult' means a person who is 18 years of age or older, or who has been convicted of a crime as an adult under any Federal, State, or tribal law.

''(r) EVICTION FOR DRUG-RELATED ACTIVITY.—Any tenant evicted from housing assisted under this title by reason of drug-related criminal activity (as that term is defined in section 8(f)(5)) shall not be eligible for housing assistance under this title during the 3-year period beginning on the date of such eviction, unless the evicted tenant successfully completes a rehabilitation program approved by the public housing agency (which shall include a waiver of this subsection if the circumstances leading to eviction no longer exist).''.

(c) LIMITATION ON OCCUPANCY IN ELDERLY AND DISABLED HOUSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437e) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) LIMITATION ON OCCUPANCY IN DESIGNATED PROJECTS.—

''(1) OCCUPANCY LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a dwelling unit in a public housing project (or portion of a project) that is designated under subsection (a) shall not be occupied by any person whose illegal use (or pattern of illegal use) of a controlled substance or abuse (or pattern of abuse) of alcohol provides reasonable cause for the public housing agency to believe that such occupancy could interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.

''(2) REQUIRED STATEMENT.—A public housing agency may not make a dwelling unit in a public housing project (or portion of a project) designated under subsection (a) available for occupancy to any family, unless the application for occupancy by that family is accompanied by a signed statement that no person who will be occupying the unit illegally uses a controlled substance, or abuses alcohol, in a manner that would interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.''.

(2) LEASE PROVISIONS.—Section 6(*l*) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(*l*)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) provide that any occupancy in violation of section 7(h)(1) or the furnishing of any false or misleading information pursuant to section 7(h)(2) shall be cause for termination of tenancy; and''.

(d) INELIGIBILITY OF ILLEGAL DRUG USERS AND ALCOHOL ABUSERS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING.—Section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) INELIGIBILITY OF ILLEGAL DRUG USERS AND ALCOHOL ABUSERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a public housing agency shall establish standards for occupancy in public housing dwelling units—

''(A) that prohibit occupancy in any such unit by any person—

''(i) who the public housing agency determines is illegally using a controlled substance; or

''(ii) if the public housing agency determines that it has reasonable cause to believe that such person's illegal use (or pattern of illegal use) of a controlled substance, or abuse (or pattern of abuse) of alcohol, could interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project; and

''(B) that allow the public housing agency to terminate the tenancy in any public housing unit of any person—

''(i) if the public housing agency determines that such person is illegally using a controlled substance; or

''(ii) whose illegal use of a controlled substance, or whose abuse of alcohol, is determined by the public housing agency to interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.

''(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO INDIAN HOUSING.—This subsection does not apply to any dwelling unit assisted by an Indian housing authority.''.

SEC. 10. ELIGIBLE HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGES.

Section 255(d)(3) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(d)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) be secured by a dwelling that is designed principally for a 1- to 4-family residence in which the mortgagor occupies 1 of the units;''.

On page 5, strike line 8, and insert the following:

SEC. 11. APPLICABILITY.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be deemed read for a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 3118) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1494), as amended, was deemed read a third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1494

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; DEFINITION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1995''.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 2. SECTION 8 CONTRACT RENEWALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that amounts are made available in advance in any appropriations Act for contract renewals under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for fiscal year 1996, with respect to any project that is determined by the Secretary to meet housing quality standards under the United States Housing Act of 1937 and to be otherwise in compliance with that Act, at the request of the owner of the project, the Secretary shall renew, for a period of 1 year, any contract for project-based assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 that expires or terminates during fiscal year 1996, at current rent levels under the expiring or terminating contract.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT.—Section 236(f) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''The rental charge for each dwelling unit shall be at the basic rental charge, or such greater amount, not to exceed the lesser of (i) the fair market rental charge determined pursuant to this paragraph, or (ii) the fair market rental established under section 8(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for existing housing in the market area in which the

housing is located, as represents 30 percent of the tenant's adjusted income.''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (6).

SEC. 3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.

Notwithstanding the amendments made by section 907(b)(2) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, section 105(a)(25) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as in existence on September 30, 1995, shall apply to the use of assistance made available under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 during fiscal year 1996.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF RURAL HOUSING PROGRAMS.

(a) UNDERSERVED AREAS SET-ASIDE.—Section 509(f)(4)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1479(f)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''fiscal years 1993 and 1994'' and inserting ''fiscal year 1996''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''each''.

(b) RURAL MULTIFAMILY RENTAL HOUSING.—Section 515(b)(4) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485(b)(4)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 1994'' and inserting ''September 30, 1996''.

(c) RURAL RENTAL HOUSING FUNDS FOR NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—The first sentence of section 515(w)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485(w)(1)) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 1993 and 1994'' and inserting ''fiscal year 1996''.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGES.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—The first sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(g)) is amended by striking ''September 30, 1995'' and inserting ''September 30, 1996''.

(b) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF MORTGAGES.—The second sentence of section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(g)) is amended by striking ''25,000'' and inserting ''30,000''.

SEC. 6. EXTENSION OF MULTIFAMILY HOUSING FINANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) RISK-SHARING PILOT PROGRAM.—The first sentence of section 542(b)(5) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1707 note) is amended by striking ''on not more than 15,000 units over fiscal years 1993 and 1994'' and inserting ''on not more than 7,500 units during fiscal year 1996''.

(b) HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY PILOT PROGRAM.—The first sentence of section 542(c)(4) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1707 note) is amended by striking ''on not to exceed 30,000 units over fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and inserting ''on not more than 10,000 units during fiscal year 1996''.

SEC. 7. CAPACITY BUILDING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Initiative to develop'' and inserting the following: ''Initiative—

''(1) to develop'';

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) for national or regional organizations or consortia, including Habitat for Humanity International, that have experience in providing or facilitating self-help housing homeownership opportunities.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) innovative homeownership opportunities for the acquisition and rehabilitation of single family housing through the provision of self-help housing, under which the homeowner contributes a significant amount of sweat equity toward the construction of the new dwelling; and''; and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, of which $25,000,000 shall be made available to Habitat for Humanity International for activities under this section.''.

SEC. 8. THE NATIONAL CITIES IN SCHOOLS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

Section 930(c) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–550, 106 Stat. 3887) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996.''.

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 FOR SAFETY AND SECURITY IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.

(a) CONTRACT PROVISIONS AND REQUIREMENTS.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (k), by striking ''on or near such premises'' and inserting ''on or off such premises''; and

(2) in subsection (l)(5), by striking ''on or near such premises'' and inserting ''on or off such premises''.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CRIMINAL RECORDS FOR SCREENING AND EVICTION; EVICTION FOR DRUG-RELATED ACTIVITY.—Section 6 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(q) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), the National Crime Information Center, police departments, and other law enforcement agencies shall, upon request, provide information to public housing agencies regarding the criminal conviction records of adult applicants for, or tenants of, public housing for purposes of applicant screening, lease enforcement, and eviction.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Except as provided under any provision of State, tribal, or local law, no law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A) shall provide information under this paragraph relating to any criminal conviction if the date of that conviction occurred 5 or more years prior to the date on which the request for the information is made.

''(2) OPPORTUNITY TO DISPUTE.—Before an adverse action is taken with regard to assistance under this title on the basis of a criminal record, the public housing agency shall provide the tenant or applicant with a copy of the criminal record and an opportunity to dispute the accuracy and relevance of that record.

''(3) FEE.—A public housing agency may be charged a reasonable fee for information provided under paragraph (1).

''(4) RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Each public housing agency shall establish and implement a system of records management that ensures that any criminal record received by the public housing agency is—

''(A) maintained confidentially;

''(B) not misused or improperly disseminated; and

''(C) destroyed, once the purpose for which the record was requested has been accomplished.

''(5) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'adult' means a person who is 18 years of age or older, or who has been convicted of a crime as an adult under any Federal, State, or tribal law.

''(r) EVICTION FOR DRUG-RELATED ACTIVITY.—Any tenant evicted from housing assisted under this title by reason of drug-related criminal activity (as that term is defined in section 8(f)(5)) shall not be eligible for housing assistance under this title during the 3-year period beginning on the date of such eviction, unless the evicted tenant successfully completes a rehabilitation program approved by the public housing agency (which shall include a waiver of this subsection if the circumstances leading to eviction no longer exist).''.

(c) LIMITATION ON OCCUPANCY IN ELDERLY AND DISABLED HOUSING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437e) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) LIMITATION ON OCCUPANCY IN DESIGNATED PROJECTS.—

''(1) OCCUPANCY LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a dwelling unit in a public housing project (or portion of a project) that is designated under subsection (a) shall not be occupied by any person whose illegal use (or pattern of illegal use) of a controlled substance or abuse (or pattern of abuse) of alcohol provides reasonable cause for the public housing agency to believe that such occupancy could interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.

''(2) REQUIRED STATEMENT.—A public housing agency may not make a dwelling unit in a public housing project (or portion of a project) designated under subsection (a) available for occupancy to any family, unless the application for occupancy by that family is accompanied by a signed statement that no person who will be occupying the unit illegally uses a controlled substance, or abuses alcohol, in a manner that would interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.''.

(2) LEASE PROVISIONS.—Section 6(l) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(l)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

''(6) provide that any occupancy in violation of section 7(h)(1) or the furnishing of any false or misleading information pursuant to section 7(h)(2) shall be cause for termination of tenancy; and''.

(d) INELIGIBILITY OF ILLEGAL DRUG USERS AND ALCOHOL ABUSERS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING.—Section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437n) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) INELIGIBILITY OF ILLEGAL DRUG USERS AND ALCOHOL ABUSERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a public housing agency shall establish standards for occupancy in public housing dwelling units—

''(A) that prohibit occupancy in any such unit by any person—

''(i) who the public housing agency determines is illegally using a controlled substance; or

''(ii) if the public housing agency determines that it has reasonable cause to believe

that such person's illegal use (or pattern of illegal use) of a controlled substance, or abuse (or pattern of abuse) of alcohol, could interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project; and

''(B) that allow the public housing agency to terminate the tenancy in any public housing unit of any person—

''(i) if the public housing agency determines that such person is illegally using a controlled substance; or

''(ii) whose illegal use of a controlled substance, or whose abuse of alcohol, is determined by the public housing agency to interfere with the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by the tenants of the public housing project.

''(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO INDIAN HOUSING.—This subsection does not apply to any dwelling unit assisted by an Indian housing authority.''.

SEC. 10. ELIGIBLE HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGES.

Section 255(d)(3) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–20(d)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) be secured by a dwelling that is designed principally for a 1- to 4-family residence in which the mortgagor occupies 1 of the units;''.

SEC. 11. APPLICABILITY.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to have become effective on October 1, 1995.

ORDERS FOR JANUARY 25 AND JANUARY 26, 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon on Thursday, January 25; further, that immediately following the prayer the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come under over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, and the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 4 p.m. equally divided between the majority and the minority; and, that immediately following the conclusion or yielding back of that time the Senate immediately adjourn over until the hour of 12 noon on Friday, January 26, and further that the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that there then be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we will reconvene then tomorrow at noon for a period of morning business. Rollcall votes are not expected during tomorrow's session. The Senate will then adjourn over until noon on Friday. During Friday's session, rollcall votes could occur on a continuing resolution, the Department of Defense authorization conference report or the START II Treaty. All Members will be notified of any scheduled rollcall votes during Friday's session, if there are to be any, as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move then that the Senate adjourn under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 6 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 25, 1996, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1996:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LAWRENCE NEAL BENEDICT, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CAPE VERDE.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

JOSEPH J. DINUNNO, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2000. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

RONNIE FEUERSTEIN HEYMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNSEL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2000, VICE JOCELYN LEVI STRAUS, TERM EXPIRED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BARRY R. MCCAFFREY, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, VICE LEE PATRICK BROWN, RESIGNED.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

ROBERT B. ROGERS, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM OF 3 YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

SHIRLEY W. RYAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 1997. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN B. CROKER, 000–00–0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ARLEN D. JAMESON, 000–00–0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL D. MCGINTY, 000–00–0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE POSITIONS AND GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 8037:

THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BRYAN G. HAWLEY, 000–00–0000.

THE DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ANDREW M. EGELAND, JR., 000–00–0000.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PHILLIP J. FORD, 000–00–0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH A. MINIHAN, 000–00–0000, U.S. AIR FORCE.

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, TO THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 8373, 12004, AND 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BOYD L. ASHCRAFT, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
BRIG. GEN. JIM L. FOLSOM, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. HAIGHT, JR., 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH A. MCNEIL, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT E. PFISTER, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
BRIG. GEN. DONALD B. STOKES, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN L. BALDWIN, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. JAMES D. BANKERS, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. RALPH S. CLEM, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. LARRY L. ENYART, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. JON S. GINGERICH, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. CHARLES H. KING, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. RALPH J. LUCIANI, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. RICHARD M. MCGILL, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. DAVID R. MYERS, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. JAMES SANDERS, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. SANFORD SCHLITT, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. DAVID E. TANZI, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.
COL. JOHN L. WILKINSON, 000–00–0000, AIR FORCE RESERVE.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN M. KEANE, 000–00–0000, U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER SECTION 1370 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. HOWARD D. GRAVES, 000–00–0000, U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE U.S. ARMY WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A):

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. PATRICK M. HUGHES, 000–00–0000, U.S. ARMY.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE NAVAL RESERVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (1H) JAMES WAYNE EASTWOOD, 000–00–0000, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.
REAR ADM. (1H) JOHN EDWIN KERR, 000–00–0000, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.
REAR ADM. (1H) JOHN BENJAMIN TOTUSHEK, 000–00–0000, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.

UNRESTRICTED LINE

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (1H) ROBERT HULBURT WEIDMAN, JR., 000–00–0000, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.

STAFF CORPS

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (1H) M. EUGENE FUSSELL, 000–00–0000, U.S. NAVAL RESERVE.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER SECTION 1370 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOHN B. LA PLANTE, 000–00–0000.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER SECTION 1370 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOHN M. MC CONNELL, 000–00–0000.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on January 24, 1996, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND

KIRSTEN S. MOY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND (NEW POSITION), WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 24, 1995.

CIVIL LIBERTIES PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND

CHERRY T. KINOSHITA, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CIVIL LIBERTIES PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND FOR A TERM OF 2 YEARS (NEW POSITION), WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 5, 1995.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD

STANLEY K. SHEINBAUM, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF 4 YEARS, VICE JOHN P. ROCHE, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 5, 1995.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

CHRISTINE HERNANDEZ, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM OF 2 YEARS (NEW POSITION), WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 6, 1995.

CHRIS EVERT, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM OF 3 YEARS (NEW POSITION), WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 6, 1995.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OBSERVING THE HISTORIC PALESTINIAN ELECTIONS

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Arab-American Institute [AAI] January 23, 1996 delegation, which I had the high honor to chair, traveled to Palestine to witness the first ever, historymaking free national elections in that country.

I was accompanied by Dr. James Zogby, president of AAI, and by former Members of Congress Mary Rose Oakar (D-OH), Toby Moffett (D–CT), and by Ruth Joseph, mayor and State representative of Waterville, ME, Thomas Lazieh, former mayor Central Falls, RI, Teresa Isaac, vice mayor, Lexington, KY.

Also present during the observation were Kenneth Handel, partner at Arnold and Porter law firm of New York with previous international electoral experience, and Dr. Najat Arafat Khelil, co-coordinator of the Palestinian Jewish Women's Dialogue Group.

The delegation was coordinated by Zogby and Washington businessman Hani Masri with assistance from Hady Amr, a political consultant with electoral monitoring experience in South Africa. My special thanks and that of the delegation goes to Jim Zogby for making it possible, and to Hani Masri for all of his unstinting support that helped lead to this historic occasion and who shared his electoral monitoring skills with us during this important observance.

Thanks goes also to Mr. Said Hamad, deputy director of the PLO office in Washington who did an excellent job of coordinating events on the ground in Palestine and smoothing our way there.

We witnessed a professional, politically progressive, patriotic, and proud Palestine people parade to the polls for their historic first national elections.

An excitement and enthusiasm permeated the air and ran in the veins of a people tasting and thirsting for freedom.

Nothing can detract from the success of a people determined to regain control of their destiny—over their dreams and aspirations for their children.

We witnessed Palestinians traveling to the polls via cars, trucks, buses, tractors, donkeys, horses, carts, hobbling on canes, and once arriving having to wait hours in long lines due to huge voter turnouts. But to many who have waited a lifetime to vote freely—a couple more hours' wait was very little.

The International Community of Observers and former President Carter were encouraged and impressed and gave the Palestinians very high marks.

The bottom line—these elections were free; these elections were fair. They were conducted in a highly professional manner.

The President-elect, Yasir Arafat and his elected leadership team, many of whom were elected not as Arafat condidates but as independents, deserve our praise and congratulations. Tremendous duties have been bestowed by the people and they now embark upon a new journey as the freely elected representatives of Palestine.

Our presence demonstrated clearly to the Palestinians that America and the world are strongly with them in their quest for democratic development and in their quest to quash disruption by extremists from all sides.

The Israeli Government and Prime Minister Peres deserve commemdation for their support as well as of this electoral process and, with a few exceptions, allowed Palestinians to conduct themselves freely.

From revolutionary to Ra'ees—Arabic for President—many in our delegation, like Representative Mary Rose Oakar and Toby Moffett, and Jim Zogby, have personally stood by President Arafat for a portion of his long, long, long journey to this point in history.

From the bowels of Beirut in 1980 and 1982 to the palace of the President in Gaza last Friday, where the lights flickered from lack of sufficient power, we have conversed with, we have pleaded with, we have sought dialog, we have agonized with and we now celebrate a new-era President Arafat and the Palestinian people. He fully recognizes that with new legitimacy from the people comes new responsibilities.

Israel Prime Minister Peres will now allow all PNC members to meet in Palestine so as to conduct the people's business and properly amend the PNC charters per the Oslo accords.

As both men enter final status negotiations this coming May 4, may they enter with a greater strength within themselves and greater faith in each other, and a greater resolve to enhance and spread his peace of the brave among their people and among all mankind—two states, two peoples living side by side in peace—Israel and Palestine forever.

STATE OF THE UNION

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, last night President Clinton delivered a good speech. Our hope is that he follows his words with his deeds. President Clinton acknowledged in his address last night the need to pay special attention to our problems with illegal immigration.

However, President Clinton forgot to mention to the American people that he vetoed a bill which would have provided Californians $1.6 billion in reimbursement funds over the next 5 years for the costs of providing health care to illegal immigrants. He also vetoed the 1996 Commerce-State-Justice Appropriations Act, thus denying Californians more than $300 million as reimbursement for the cost of incarcerating alien felons.

Mr. President, your actions speak louder than words; and words alone will not solve our problem. This lack of attention has a human cost. Last year at San Diego's border with Mexico, a Border Partol agent fell to his death while chasing illegal immigrants. Last week, a man trying to evade U.S. Border Partol agents plunged to his death, and five other men were injured when they ran off a 120-foot cliff near Otay Lakes Dam.

Words are hollow if they are not backed up with actions. Our hope in the California delegation is that President Clinton joins us with the force of his actions, as we address these difficult immigration problems.

EXTRADITION OF INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to express my solid support for language contained in H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act, providing for the extradition of indicted war criminals from the United States to the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda in the Hague. This legislation provides the legal basis for the surrender of such persons and closes a technical loophole which could undermine efforts to prosecute those responsible for the commission of war crimes. Adoption of this provision should serve as an example to other countries to undertake similar action consistent with our obligations to cooperate fully with the important work of the Tribunal. To date more than 50 individuals from the former Yugoslavia have been indicted, including the Bosnian Serb leaders Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic. Last November, I had an opportunity to meet with Chief Prosecutor Richard Goldstone to discuss his on-going investigations. He stressed that those responsible for war crimes must be held personally accountable, regardless of their relationship to peace negotiations.

As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I urge my colleagues to demonstrate their firm commitment to the pursuit of justice in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda by passing this implementing legislation and ensuring that the Tribunal receives the resources it needs to accomplish the vital tasks it has been given. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the text of a letter to the President on this matter be included in the RECORD.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE,
Washington, DC, February 8, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, we have been following with great

concern all aspects of the former Yugoslavia's violent disintegration. In this regard, our Commission held a hearing on January 31, at which we received compelling testimony from the Bosnian Prime Minister, Haris Silajdzic. Although the Prime Minister raised a number of issues regarding the crisis, we would like to focus on one issue in particular: the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

After overcoming considerable barriers to its establishment and staffing, the Tribunal issued its first indictment in early November, is proceeding with investigations and is expected to bring cases to trial later this year. We understand that the Tribunal's UN budget will be under review during the second half of this month and that officials from the Tribunal have requested a $28 million budget for the coming year to proceed with the work they have begun.

Non-governmental experts have already suggested that this figure may be too low given the costs of gathering testimony from the thousands of victims of, and witnesses to, war crimes and in light of the on-site investigations that the effective prosecution of war criminals will require. Nevertheless, it appears that securing even these funds may be an uphill battle with the UN bureaucracy.

We urge you to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to press vigorously at these upcoming budget meetings to ensure adequate funding for the Tribunal. The establishment of this body, in spite of considerable political resistance and technical complications, is a credit to strong U.S. leadership. But, without proper funding, the Tribunal will never be able to execute the historic tasks that have been set for it.

We also support an additional voluntary contribution to the Tribunal by the United States of an amount not less than the $3 million cash contribution provided last year. Monetary, as well as personnel or other in-kind donations, enhance the ability of the United States to foster the effectiveness of the Tribunal by strengthening specific aspects of its work. In addition, this would enable the United States to play a leadership role in urging other UN member states to make similar contributions. If the United States, at this juncture, inexplicably reduces the level of financial support it has provided to the Tribunal, it might send a regrettable signal of weakening U.S. resolve to see war criminals held truly accountable.

We would also like to take this opportunity to raise the issue of implementing legislation. UN member states are already bound as a matter of international law to deliver to the Hague persons indicted by the Tribunal. But most countries—including the United States—will require the passage of implementing legislation to ensure that a national legal basis exists for doing so; without such legislation, a technical loophole would exist in most countries that would give indicted persons the legal grounds to challenge jurisdiction and avoid trial.

Convinced of the importance of this issue, a bipartisan U.S. delegation to the 1994 CSCE Parliamentary Assembly achieved agreement to review, at future meetings of the Assembly, steps that the CSCE (now OSCE) participating States have taken to ensure that they are able to comply with the orders of the Tribunal. As Members of Congress, we feel a special responsibility to ensure that the necessary implementing legislation is passed. It is possible that some countries—states likely to find themselves with war criminals in their territories—will need international prodding if they are to cooperate with the Tribunal. Passage of U.S. implementing legislation will enable our country to foster compliance by others.

We understand that the Department of Justice has been working on draft implementing legislation for over a year. We urge you to communicate to the Department of Justice the high degree of urgency that you, as President, attach to the tasks of bringing war criminals to justice and of taking concrete legislative measures to that end. To follow up on the Commission's inquiry of April 1994, we would like to know when the administration anticipates presenting such legislation to Congress.

Finally, we again call for the appointment of a CSCE (OSCE) Special Reapporteur on the War Crimes, Tribunal, a Commission proposal that was endorsed at the 1994 meeting of the CSCE Parliamentary Assembly. A Special Rapporteur would be tasked with monitoring the participating States' required cooperation with the Tribunal and reporting back to the decision-making bodies of the OSCE for further action in cases of willful noncompliance.

We understand that the U.S. delegation to the 1994 CSCE (OSCE) Budapest Conference included this proposal in a package of ideas addressing the many urgent crises in the former Yugoslavia but that, regrettably, this package was not adopted. We urge the United States to pursue the adoption of this proposal as a priority matter at the on-going OSCE meetings in Vienna, where negotiations on Bosnia-related questions continue.

Mr. President, we cannot sufficiently underscore our conviction that holding war criminals accountable for the heinous crimes they have committed in this conflict will be an essential element for any long-term resolution of this tragedy. To this end, we look forward to hearing from you on these matters.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
Chairman.

ALFONSE D'AMATO,
Co-Chairman.

STENY H. HOYER,
Member of Congress.

GREATER SAINT PAUL AFRICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of an important benchmark for a religious lighthouse in the Metropolitan Dade County community. April 14, 1996 will mark Greater Saint Paul African Episcopal Church's centennial anniversary. It is with great pleasure that I recognize and thank the congregation for their vision and years of continual service to the Miami community.

I urge Members to read the church history I am inserting into the RECORD.

GREATER SAINT PAUL AFRICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

(By Mrs. Esther M. Armbrister)

During the 1880's the first Negro settlers arrived in small numbers from the Bahama Islands by way of Key West, Florida. Between 1885 and 1889 Negroes from West and North Florida began to migrate to Coconut Grove, which was called at the time the last frontier to be settled. One of those settlers was the late Jeremiah A. Butler, who was to be the minister founder and organizer of the first African Methodist Episcopal Church in Dade County, Saint Paul AME Church.

The late Rev. Samuel Sampson was the founder of the first church for ''colored people'' in Coconut Grove, St. Agnes Baptist Church. At that time blacks and whites worshipped together at Union Chapel. As one elderly pioneer related the story, the ''colored folks'' were not use to the type of quiet service being held, and whites could not understand the blacks' reactions of shouting, clapping of hands and the stumping/stamping of feet. After a gift of property on Thomas Avenue from Count Jean Hodonville, a young French man, to Rev. Sampson and the black pioneers, St. Agnes was built in 1895, and thus, henceforth, was the beginning.

In the early part of 1896 Rev. Butler and twelve members withdrew from the newly organized St. Agnes, and founded and organized Saint Paul AME Church on Evangelist Street. Evangelist Street was purchased, and on November 21, 1896 when it was recorded. A small church was built at that time to accommodate a small membership. Trustee whose names appeared on the abstract title were J.H. Butler, J.P. Brookins, Walter Burrows. In 1897 the names of Murray Burrows, J.W. Gibson, Williams Counts, Theodore Blackshear, D.C. Williams and Hiram McLeod were added. At that time the population of Coconut Grove was less than 300.

By the year 1900 it was decided there were enough ''colored'' children to warrant a school, and henceforth the first school in Dade County was held at the St. Paul AME Church. The school, with only twelve children, was taught by the late Dr. John Davis.

In the year 1902 the first choir, the Mozart Choir, was organized with the late J.P. Brookins as president and choir director. Since the membership was so small the larger children were placed in the choir to replace the adults when death or some other reasons occurred. In 1910 the first cornerstone was laid by the pastor at that time, the late Reverend Thomas Henry. Two more men were added to the Steward Board, which had been organized earlier, consisting of the men of the church. Men also comprised the trustee board and the ushers.

In 1914 the late Mrs. Agnes Armbrister organized Armbrister's Quartet, which was comprised of her four oldest children. She also organized other singing groups.

In 1915 the first Stewardess Board was organized with the late Mesdames Aramintha W. Roberts, Mary Sands, Agnes Armbrister, McCleod, Elsa Gibson and Estella Counts as members. Their first project was to purchase individual communion glasses. Communion bread was made by the late Mrs. Sands and Mrs. McCleod.

In 1915 the parsonage was built. Property was purchased at 3352 Charles Avenue, and the house which presently stands was used.

In early 1920's people were still migrating from other parts of Florida, Georgia and Alabama.

During the 1926 hurricane quite a bit of damage was done to the church. A steeple was completely damaged. In the same year an organ was purchased.

In 1932 under the administration of the late Rev. M.P. Chappelle a new church was built to facilitate a growing membership. Bro. A.G. Lattimore gave the first $200 toward the purchase of the property on the present site. The church was built with all of the membership working as one to accomplish their dream.

Wood and other materials were salvaged from the church on the hill, and used in the construction of the new church. The salvaged materials were guarded by Mrs. Aramintha W. Roberts and her children.

In 1932 Rev. Chappelle organized the Supreme Usher's Board (#2 Usher Board). The White Rose Usher Board (#1 Usher Board) had been organized between 1918 and 1920. Rev. Chappelle also organized the Gospel Choir (Choir #2).

In 1943 the existing parsonage was built under the pastorate of the late Rev. F.A. Roundtree.

In 1945 the late Rev. R.A. Jackson, the pastor, organized the first Women's Day below the Mason Dixie Line, which was held in the present church. The last Mrs. Myrtle McCleod Davis served as Chairperson.

In 1947 Rev. I.D. Hinson, pastor at that time, started construction of the Educational Building, now known as the Annex. Improvements were made by Rev. R.E. Lamb and the late Rev. J.A. Robertsl, and it was completed by the Rev. T.C. Kelley. Rev. Kelley also organized the Male Chorus, the Busy Bee Club and the Willing Workers.

The previous mortgage had been burned by the late Rev. A.F. Little.

Under the pastorate of the late Rev. T.E. Wright the name of the church was changed to Greater Saint Paul AME Church. He saw a need to serve the community of Coconut Grove with a Day Care Center, which accommodated at least 45 working mothers. Necessary repairs were made to the church and the annex during his administration. He had an undying loyalty to the Youth Church which he referred to as the ''church of tomorrow''. Under the leadership of Mesdames Elizabeth Espy, Ruth Seal Bullard, Hattie Johnson, Carlee Daniels, Esther M. Ambrister and Cliffonia Ross, the Junior Church was one of the best in the South Florida Conference.

The Missionary Choir was organized with Mrs. Catherine Morgan as the directress, and the late Mrs. Miriam Sands Massey as the pianist. Mrs. Massey served the church well for 38 years, her sister the late Ms. Ernestine Sands, served the church for 12 years, and their father, the late Nathan Sands, served as director of the Mozart Choir for 45 years. The service of the Sands family was unlimited.

From 1972 and during the pastorate of Rev. F.A. Allen, major renovations and repairs were made to the exterior and interior of the church and the annex. He organized the F.A. Allen Gospel Choir and the Singing Angels, our youth choir. In 1972 Hauley Wiggins Choir was organized, consisting of the young adults of the church.

According to church records four ministers were ordained into the ministry and now pastor their own churches. Under Rev. Wright's pastorate, Rev. John Bodison was ordained, along with Rev. Theodore Barnett and Rev. Eugene Wilson. Rev. Michael Bouie was ordained under the pastorate of Rev. Allen.

During the Annual Conference of 1984 Rev. O.W. Burroughs was appointed as pastor, and interestingly enough he had been ordained in St. Paul 1949, having come from another district, Rev. Burroughs served the church well, liquidating the church of debt before his untimely demise in 1987. Regrettably he was unable to physically witness the burning of the mortgage, however, spiritually his presence was felt.

During the annual conference Rev. James H. Davis was given the charge to shepherd the flock of St. Paul, to uplift their morale and give them insight into the future of a new Greater Saint Paul. The church took on a new outlook with a vision in mind, which was to build a new edifice, one of which we can be proud. Property was purchased on Thomas Avenue across the street, which is now being used for parking. Property was purchased on Williams Avenue, behind the church, which holds a set of duplexes, which are self supportive.

The assistant pastor, Rev. Phillip Cooper, having been inherited from the Allen administration, is working diligently alongside our pastor. He serves the church spiritually, musically, educationally and financially. Rev. Cooper is quite supportive of the church's programs.

Greater Saint Paul AW Church witnessed the building of a new church, and will celebrate its centennial anniversary and dedication on April 14, 1996.

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. PATRICK L. HIGGINS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and great respect that I rise to recognize the retirement of Capt. Patrick L. Higgins from the Thompsonville fire district in Enfield, CT, after 30 years of unparalleled and dedicated service. Throughout his exceptional career he has been active in his community, not only through his role in public safety, but also with his membership in such organizations as the VFW.

In 1969, early in his career with the fire department, Captain Higgins traveled to Wisconsin to pick up and deliver Thompsonville's first firefighting foam unit. Later, although not known for being foam unit specialists, Captain Higgins led his department to victory in competitions at Westover Air Force Base, defeating the renowned Westover department in foam unit firefighting.

Captain Higgins was born and raised in Thompsonville and is married, with two children. Today we pay tribute to his years of valiant service and outstanding contributions and wish him well in all his future endeavors.

JUDGE PENZIEN: GUILTY AS CHARGED

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, in our system of government where legislatures pass laws, executives sign them, and courts interpret and apply them, we need to be very appreciative of the dedicated jurists who take the task of judging disputes between society and individuals, or simply between individuals. The people of Bay County, MI, my home county, have had the good fortune to be served by a very dedicated man, Bay County Circuit Judge Eugene C. Penzien, who is retiring after nearly 40 years of effort in a stellar legal career.

Judge Penzien began private general practice in 1958 with former prosecuting attorney and district and circuit court judge, Ira Butterfield, as well as David Skinner. After 11 years, he became the first full-time Bay County prosecuting attorney until 1978. He first became circuit judge in 1979 and also served as chief judge between 1979 and 1982.

During his tenure, he became a personally important individual to literally thousands of Bay County residents. Having rendered over 22,000 decisions from the bench, there is no doubt that this fine jurist has left his mark on Bay County. But while some people think that the courtroom is always as dramatic as television portrays, many are quite appreciative of the fact that throughout his time as a circuit court judge that Judge Penzien has encouraged people to meet in chambers to reach amicable agreement in a quick and less onerous fashion than a protracted court fight which may ultimately be no better than the settlement.

His membership in numerous professional organizations, including the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan and its coordinating council, as well as his chairmanship of the Bay County Law Enforcement Council only begin to describe his civil commitment. He has been involved with the American Cancer Society Bay County Chapter, the Bay Area Child Guidance Clinic, the Bay City Kiwanis Club, the Bay County Mental Health Society, the Bay City YMCA, and the First United Methodist Church.

He has provided an admirable role model to the people of Bay County. He has done so with the support of his wonderful wife Mary, his children Karla and Douglas, and his stepchildren Stephen Chick and Caroline Arnold. And now his grandchildren Jessica Richards and Kimberly Penzien, and his grandchild Daishelle Richards, can learn more about what justice is supposed to be from a man who has worked a lifetime to provide it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in thanking Bay County Circuit Court Judge Eugene C. Penzien for his years of service, and in wishing him the very best for the challenges that lie ahead.

THE PHILLIPS AMBULATORY CARE CENTER

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues Beth Israel Medical Center's Phillips Ambulatory Care Center, which is opening its doors today in New York's 14th Congressional District.

The Phillips Ambulatory Care Center is an extraordinary new health care facility that is designed to provide a single standard of ambulatory care to all patients, regardless of health insurance status. The development of new ambulatory care facilities such as this one is particularly important at a time when health insurance plans are increasingly emphasizing out-of-hospital service.

Phillips proposes to provide each patient medical services at a designated patient care module that is small, patient-friendly, and modeled after the most modern and comfortable private physician office.

As a state-of-the-art ambulatory care center, this new facility incorporates many technological innovations into its design and operation. For example, the Phillips Ambulatory Care Center has the Nation's first digitized filmless radiology service.

Filmless radiography will allow physicians to view radiographic images promptly at convenient locations within the facility and will make it possible to consult with a radiologist moments after the studies are done.

Another technological innovation at the Phillips Ambulatory Care Center is a computer-based, paperless medical records system. With this system, physicians and other clinical staff will have immediate access to a patient's

most up-to-date medical records. This state-of-the-art medical records system will strengthen the continuum of care for patients. For example, notes made in a patient's chart during a morning visit to the Phillips Ambulatory Care Center will be accessible to emergency room staff at the Petrie Division of Beth Israel Hospital the same day, should the patient need emergency care.

Located in Zeckendorf Towers, the Phillips Ambulatory Care Center will play an important role in revitalizing the Union Square area. Early this summer, Beth Israel Hospital will open a comprehensive cancer center and a six-unit ambulatory surgery center in the same building that houses the Phillips Ambulatory Care Center. The combined facilities are expected to bring additional visitors into the area and to add to its economic vitality.

Mr. Speaker, Beth Israel Medical Center has a reputation for innovation and care. The Phillips Ambulatory Care Center should prove to be another fine example of the extraordinary work done by this institution. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing the Phillips Ambulatory Care Center all the best as it begins its work in our community.

MACEDONIA MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH OF MIAMI, INC., OLDEST BLACK CHURCH IN DADE COUNTY

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a cherished house of worship, Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church, located in Miami, FL. In October 1995, Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church celebrated its 100th year as a spiritual beacon for the Miami community.

I urge the Members to read the church history which I'm inserting into the RECORD.

THE OLDEST BLACK CHURCH IN DADE COUNTY

The Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church of Miami, Incorporated lineage began at Union Chapel (Plymouth Church) in 1891. Because the Black worshipers at Union Chapel were not accustomed to the style of worship services, they organized their own church in 1895. Rev. S.A. Sampson and fifty-six other black members of Union Chapel were successful in organizing a church in the home of Mrs. Edith Albury. This church was called the Fifty-Six Baptist Church. The Fifty-Six Baptist Church was later blessed with a gift of land on which to build a church. The land was donated to the Fifty-Six Baptist Church by the Count Jean D'Hedouville and it was located on Thomas Avenue. After the church was erected, the name was changed from Fifty-Six Baptist Church to St. Agnes.

In 1903, St. Agnes Church was moved from Thomas Avenue to Charles Avenue where another edifice was erected. Deacons Washington and Bumey played the primary role in changing the name from St. Agnes to Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church on May 25, 1922. In June 1948 Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church was again moved to its present site. It was incorporated in 1976 and the name was changed to Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church of Miami, Incorporated. The organization of this church was significant in South Florida's history because it was the first Black church on the South Florida mainland to be organized by Blacks. On April 15, 1993, Macedonia's name was placed on one of Coconut Grove's Historical Markers. This marker was placed next to the church on Charles Avenue.

1835–1939: Rev. S.A. Sampson was the organizer and founder of Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church of Miami, Incorporated. Succeeding Rev. Sampson were Reverends Watson, Yates, Guilford, Nicholson, Sneed, Driver, and Whitaker.

1939–1970: Rev. Finlayson pastored Macedonia Baptist Church for thirty-one years and left a strong church organization that was spiritually sound and financially secure. During his tenure, the present edifice was built; the parsonage on Charles Avenue was built, property on Williams Avenue was acquired for future expansion.

1971–1975: Rev. Philip Cooper, a gifted musician and educator, served as an interim pastor. During his tenure, the thirteen deacon concept as ward leaders was organized; the use of collection plates to ascertain offerings and tithes, was initiated; the prelude before worship was instituted; and the financial department organized.

1976–1981: Rev. Arthur Jordan was the youngest minister to ever pastor Macedonia. Under his administration—the church was redecorated and refurbished; the fellowship hall was air-conditioned. Rev. Jordan, with keen insight, began a financial drive to buy a church van.

1981–1983: From June 1981 to April 1983 Macedonia was void of a pastor. Deacon Charlie Sinkler, Chairperson of the Deacon Board and Sister Arlene Broxton, Chairperson of the Board of Directors, were instrumental in keeping the church in unity. Under their leadership, the church was spiritually filled and financially secure, the parsonage was refurbished; and a financial drive was begun to raise funds for a decorative security fence for the church.

1983–: Rev. Rudolph Daniels, a gifted gospel singer and educator, was called for his first pastorate at Macedonia on April 20, 1983. Since 1983, the fifteen passenger van and the decorative ornamental fence have been realized; an elevator has been installed. During hurricane Andrew, Macedonia sustained extensive damage but has since restored to her original beauty both inside and outside.

Macedonia's roots are like those of a redwood tree, intertwined throughout Dade County. However, the future of the church is assured because its rich heritage is being transferred to its youth through the revived Christ emphasis. Its heritage reflects the real struggles of Christianity throughout the world, but its philosophy remains: ''With Christ all things are possible.''

The roots of this great church are firmly planted in the whole armor of Jesus Christ and shall not be moved.

COLORADO JOINS STATES LEGISLATING AGAINST FGM

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report that Colorado has joined the growing ranks of States that are drawing up their own legislation to ban female genital mutilation [FGM]. In fact today Senator Dorothy Rupert, who sponsored the bill along with Senator Bill Thiebaut and Representative Glenda Swanson Lyle, is among lawmakers who are conducting hearings on the bill back in Denver.

Their bill is similar to mine, H.R. 941, in that it has criminal and education components. It would make it a crime of child abuse to mutilate a child's genitalia, or allow it to be done, and would require the public health department to carry out education among communities that traditionally practice FGM, using private funds, grants, gifts, or donations.

The education is essential, but so is the criminalization of this brutal act, which is done in the name of custom. As the Congressional Research Service has pointed out:

> While most states have laws which prohibit endangering the welfare of a child or creating a substantial risk to the health of a child, it is not clear whether these laws would necessarily be interpreted to prohibit female genital mutilation in all cases.

So, we need explicit legislation, both on a State and Federal level.

Senator Rupert tells me that she knows FGM is being practiced in Colorado because she gets anecdotal reports of it. And this has really been the problem with legislation such as this—because FGM takes place so covertly and the evidence of it is largely anecdotal, some people still don't want to believe it happens in this country. But if it doesn't, then why have Colorado, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, and North Dakota introduced or passed their own legislation against it? And why do I get regular inquiries from other States that are interested? It's because it's happening here. It's high time we took our heads out of the sand and did something about it.

ENFIELD, CT, FIRE DEPARTMENT CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO COMMUNITY

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I rise to pay tribute to the men and women, past and present, of the Enfield, CT, Fire Department as they celebrate 100 years of service and dedication to the citizens of Enfield, CT.

Volunteers comprise the majority of members of the Enfield Fire Department, a further testament to the department's commitment to Enfield and its surrounding communities. For the past century the members of the Enfield Fire Department have selflessly contributed countless hours to ensure the safety of their neighbors and protect them from danger.

These men and women are, indeed, a rare breed. Courageously, they put their lives on the line each day—often in situations where they are keenly aware of the realities of personal injury. The Enfield Fire Department and others across America deserve our thanks, as it is their meritorious deeds that have saved many lives each year. Accordingly, I would like to thank the Enfield Fire Department, on this their 100th anniversary, for their service, and let them know they are not forgotten.

AMERICA AT WAR

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, although some of us did not live World War II, we all are aware of its meaning. As a young boy, I remember my father, a World War II combat veteran himself, telling our family about the conflict and what it stood for.

Now, in the Chowchilla News, a paper in my district, Jim Dumas, my constituent, has brilliantly told his recollection of World War II, as 1996 marks the 50th anniversary of this critical event in our Nation's history.

It is my pleasure to share his article with my colleagues.

AMERICA AT WAR

(By Jim Dumas)

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the ending of the most expensive, deadly and devastating conflict the world has ever seen.

When the war ended in Europe, Hitler and his people could look at the ruins of Germany and see the results of their wish to dominate all the world's people. When it ended in the Pacific, Japan lay in the ashes of two atom bombs which were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

People all over the world celebrated the surrender of the Axis nations, and those Americans who were serving overseas soon started home for a reunion with their loved ones and friends.

This was the most expensive war in people and material lost and used in which our nation has been involved. The total cost of the nearly five years of fighting had cost the world almost two trillion dollars, and the lives of nearly 800 million people.

The United States alone lost over 400 thousand men and women during this great conflagration. These figures tell a sad story of almost five years of war. The cost was very high when measured by any standard, but it brought almost a half century of peace and prosperity to most of the world.

Paul A. Spera, National Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, writing in the California Veteran, December 1995, wrote these words, ''Because of the sacrifices of the more than 12 million Americans who served overseas and another four million who wore the uniform stateside, would-be dictators recognized that free men and women will fight and prevail when their freedoms are at stake. Because of their sacrifices, Americans were never forced to defend their own homes.

''As we enter our sixth decade of freedom and prosperity in America, it's important that we recall the pain and sacrifice of those who served to ensure that freedom . . . for each American soldier, sailor, Marine and airman who perished, there is an entire family whose lives were forever changed. And for each one that perished, there are thousands who returned from war, and whose lives have never been the same.

''When you see an elderly veteran, there's a good chance he or she served in World War II. If you are fortunate enough to hear them speak about what America means to them, please pay close attention. They have a perspective few of us share. They are rightfully proud of their service and the glory of their victory. However, they share a deeper and more profound perspective.

''You see, they know how it feels to face the reality of losing everything they had ever hoped for. They have dealt with the prospect of seeing their loved ones die, their nation's flag trampled and their homeland in ruins. Perhaps that is why our flag, their flag, is so important to them. That is why they deeply appreciate our Constitution and the institutions which serve under that document.

''They have paid a dear price so that all these things could endure. On these, the final days of the 50th commemoration of their war, we must remind ourselves that we owe them a debt which can never be repaid.''

How could anyone say it better? When I read those words, I knew I had to pass them on to you. I don't know if Commander Spera is a veteran of WWII or not, but I like what he said.

My generation suffered the greatest casualties of any one generation which has fought in our many wars. I just hope future generations will not allow historians to sanitize the history of WWII to suit their present day thinking.

That is why we need more veterans to write what it was really like so the school children of today and tomorrow will know the real truth of the entire war period.

With this episode, the ''America At War'' series comes to a close. My friend, John Wolfshorndl, recently made a 17-day visit to China. He brought back many pictures and has agreed to lend them to me and this newspaper so you may see what that nation is like today.

Many of his pictures show it much the same as when I was there in 1942–43. Some changes for the better have taken place. He went to many places I did not get to see, such as the Great Wall.

He did bring some pictures of Kweilin (Guilin) and Kunming where I was stationed during WWII. He has some good pictures of the very unusual mountains around Kweilin of which I have written before. The editor has promised me two half-pages so we may show you these pictures.

My heart is heavy as I bring this series to a close. I really don't know why, but as I type this, I find it impossible to keep back the tears. Perhaps no one else will understand it either. Writing this series of articles has been like reliving it all over again.

This isn't the first time tears have come to my eyes as I wrote them. I've heard all my life that ''There is no fool like an old fool.'' Maybe an old sentimental fool is even worse. I am a sentimentalist, and some may say I am all of the above.

So many of you have asked if I was writing these articles for a diary. The answer is no. I did not keep a diary while in China because I never even thought about writing about my experiences while I was there.

These have been written from memory. Again, many of you have asked how in the world I could remember all this stuff. I don't know. I have just written it as I remember it. I'm sure there are some who might take exception to some of the things I've written. No two people see things exactly the same. I guess these things have been deeply embedded into the wrinkles of my brain or I couldn't have remembered them.

The editor, Jess Chambers, has asked me to continue writing for him on several subjects. I plan to do that as long as people like and read what I write. I love writing and wish I had gone to journalism school right after I retired.

There are many things about which I have very strong opinions and could write about. I travel a lot and could write about those trips and the interesting places my wife and I visit. That would not be controversial, whereas, my opinions about other things could be.

But first, I think I would like to take a little rest. However, I see things everyday in various newspapers and magazines about which I would like to write. Maybe I can write a few and not have to meet a deadline. I don't really enjoy having to do that.

One of the things which Jess asked me to write about is vacation spots where people can go and be outdoors and camp without it costing them an arm and a leg. Since I own a little recreation type land in northeast California, I could write a few of those already. But I would need to go to those places and take some pictures to be printed along with the articles. So, you may see some more of my writing in this paper following the last of these articles.

Anyway, before I close, I must say that I am proud to have been able to fly and fight with the great Flying Tigers, even though I was only attached to them for training. It was a great organization and a fine group of men to be with.

It is an honor to have been around such men as Tex Hill, Ed Rector, Charley Bond, Joe Rosbert and Bill Bartling, to name a few. When I first met them, I thought they were all ''Supermen,'' which they were, but when the 14th Air Force took over from the AVG, we had some ''Supermen'' among us. Men like Charles DuBois, Mortimer Dog Marks, Patrick H. Daniels III, Johnny Alison and others.

Most of all, I'm proud I got to know personally the man most responsible for the success of both organizations, General Claire Lee Chennault. It was a pleasure serving under him. I was honored to have been asked to be one of his honor guard at his homecoming in New Orleans.

Now I'd like to quote from another veteran's magazine, The American Legion, September 1995. There was no byline or I would give credit to the writer. It is called ''The Road to Victory.''

''America's triumph in WWII was so much more than a military victory. It was a victory that energized democracies around the world, primed the economy at home and secured the continuation of the American way of life. There are no words that can bestow enough honor upon those who served, but WWII veterans know how important their contribution has been and continues to be. We must be sure that future generations never forget their bravery, sacrifice and service to our country. WWII veterans have earned our eternal gratitude.'' Amen.

Finally, I'd like to thank the Chowchilla News, the owners and Jess Chambers, editor, for their confidence in me, and for publishing these articles. They were the first. And my thanks to all who telephoned, wrote me, and told me personally that you enjoyed them.

You have no idea how much that has meant to me. You may not believe this, but I have never received a derogatory remark about them from anyone. Not one. There must be some who didn't like them enough to read them, and to them I would like to say, thanks for not telling me.

I close wishing all of you good health throughout 1996, and may it be the best year ever for each and every one of you.

DR. PHILIP BUCHANAN HONORED FOR VOLUNTARISM

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man whose record of community service spans more than two decades. Dr. Philip Buchanan will receive the Firman B. Voorhies Volunteer of the Year Award from

the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce at the chamber's 43d Annual Meeting and Awards Dinner on February 2, 1996, in Gilroy, CA. It is an honor to join with the chamber in acknowledging Dr. Buchanan's many contributions.

Dr. Buchanan is best known for starting Gilroy's Christmas street ornament program over 20 years ago; a program that provides for the purchase, maintenance, and installation of the street pole decorations each year. Over the years, Dr. Buchanan has used the program to get residents involved in civic pride, enlisting participation from the Boy Scouts, for instance, to help youth to take an active interest in their city.

A two-term Gilroy City planning commissioner, Dr. Buchanan now serves as chair of the Citizens Committee, working on bike trails and sound wall planning. He has cochaired the Grants Committee of the Gilroy Foundation and played an active role in making the world famous Gilroy Garlic Festival a success year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Dr. Philip Buchanan as he is honored and invite my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in saluting Dr. Buchanan for his efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1996, I was unavoidably detained due to changes in my air travel, which were out of my control, and missed three rollcall votes. I would like the record to show that had I been present for rollcall vote No. 13, on H.R. 2657, the Ruth & Billy Graham Congressional Gold Medal bill, I would have voted ''yes.'' On rollcall vote No. 14, S. 1341, the Saddleback Mountain—Arizona Settlement bill, I would have voted ''yes.'' And on rollcall vote No. 15, H.R. 2726, Technical Corrections to Native American Laws, I would have voted ''yes.''

TRIBUTE TO U.S. FEDERAL MARSHAL ROMOLO J. IMUNDI

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Federal Marshal Romolo J. Imundi. At the age of 75, Marshal Imundi has completed 53 consecutive years of Government service and retired from his post as U.S. marshal for the southern district in New York on October 15, 1995.

Mr. Imundi was a highly respected marshal in New York and has received numerous awards and plaques during his long and distinguished career in law enforcement. For 13 years, Mr. Imundi's office has been responsible for the security of 80 Federal judges, 200 U.S. attorneys, 80 security officers, 100 marshals and inspectors, and dozens of crime suspects. In recognition of his unfailing dedication to his work, I am inserting an article into the RECORD detailing his years of public service.

The suspects he has escorted have been some of the most famous and notorious this century, Sheik Omar Abdel-Rahman—found guilty of plotting the bombing of national monuments such as the Statue of Liberty—and those accused of plotting the World Trade Center bombing. Not a single one of his clients has been injured or harmed in any way during his protection, to say nothing of all the innocent lives he has helped to save during the course of his impeccable career.

The southern district of New York is losing a marshal greatly respected by all people. He brought to his post, his 32 years of experience in the New York Police Force and 8 years as an investigator for the U.S. Veterans Administration. He was first appointed Federal marshal by President Ronald Reagan and served under Presidents George Bush and Bill Clinton, giving him the distinction of being the longest-serving Federal marshal this century. His record in public office has been an inspiration to his colleagues as well as the community as a whole.

Mr. Imundi's well-deserved retirement will sadden all those who gained so much from his time in office: not just the citizens of New York but all the people of the United States. On January 30, 1996, there will be an event honoring Mr. Imundi's years of service and dedication to law enforcement and justice. Mr. Speaker, I know you will join me in wishing Mr. Imundi well and the best of luck in his retirement.

GLADIATOR RETIRES AFTER HALF-CENTURY OF SERVICE

Wyatt Earp and Bat Masterson may have been the most famous federal marshals.

Romolo J. Imundi may be the most photographed.

''I'm also the longest-serving federal marshal in this century,'' Imundi said.

He retired Oct. 15 from his job as U.S. marshal for the Southern District in New York after 13 years in the post. He was appointed by President Reagan in 1982.

At 75, Imundi completed 53 years of government service, including 32 years as a New York City police officer and detective, eight years as an investigator for the U.S. veterans Administration and the past 13 as a federal marshal in the Manhattan office.

Imundi and his wife of 48 years, Rosemarie, who have four grown children and eight grandchildren, have lived in the Crestwood section of Yonkers the past eight years.

''This job is a presidential appointment,'' Imundi said. ''George Washington appointed the first federal marshal in New York City in 1789. He was the chief lawman for the area. I'm a conservative Republican. I was appointed by Reagan and reappointed by George Bush. When Bill Clinton came in, I was asked to stay on the job.''

Imundi, nicknamed the ''Roman gladiator,'' often was seen in newspaper photographs and on television as he escorted such suspects as Leona Helmsley, Bess Myerson, mobster ''Fat Tony'' Salerno, Michael Milken, Mafia boss Paul Castellano and Imelda Marcos into federal court.

His last case was completed earlier this month when Sheik Omar Abdel-Rahman was convicted of plotting the bombing of the Lincoln Tunnel, the United Nations, the Holland Tunnel and the Statue of Liberty.

''Imagine what would have happened if they blew up a tunnel, and you had water cascading all over Manhattan,'' he said. ''It is too horrible to even think about.''

The sheik and his followers were moved each day from the Metropolitan Corrections Center underground to the federal courts for their trial. All were found guilty and will be sentenced in January.

''I think they will all spend the rest of their natural lives in jail,'' Imundi said.

They were not subject to the death penalty. Imundi has witnessed one execution, the electrocution of murderer Elmer ''Trigger'' Burke in Sing Sing Correctional Facility 40 years ago.

For 13 years, Imundi's office has been responsible for the security of 80 federal judges, 200 U.S. attorney, 80 security officers, 100 marshals and inspectors and dozens of crime suspects.

He never had a client injured or killed in all that time, although junk-bond king Milken fainted after Judge Kimba Wood sentenced him to 10 years in prison.

Former Miss America Myerson, charged with a tax violation, was close to fainting when she was in a cell and was told she had to be fingerprinted.

''I put a hand on her shoulder and steadied her,'' he said.

Helmsley, who served three years in prison on a tax charge, was one of his most difficult cases.

''She was so disliked that many people stood on the courthouse steps and screamed obscenities at her every day of the trial,'' he said.

''The terrorist trial was clearly the trial of the century, not that thing in Los Angeles,'' he said. ''Millions of lives were at stake here when these guys plotted their violence. Judge Michael B. Mukasey really did a great job of handling that. He had to deal daily with 15 lawyers and kept * * *.''

Imundi, who handled the suspects in the World Trade Center bombing case, said that crime really frightened him.

''Few people know this, but if that bomb was planted two stories higher and not in the garage, that entire building would have gone down,'' he said. ''It would have dwarfed the bombing at Oklahoma City and thousands upon thousands of lives would have been lost.''

Now, the care and feeding of so many suspects has been turned over to a new marshal—Martin Burke, a bodyguard for former Gov. Mario Cuomo.

''Now, I'll just take it easy for a while, do some painting, work around the house, tend to my garden, and enjoy our family,'' Imundi said.

Few public servants have done as much to earn a quiet, peaceful retirement as Imundi has. Few have had a half-century of such adventures.

PRESERVING AMERICA'S MIDDLE CLASS

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the RECORD an opinion piece I wrote concerning the need to take action to preserve the American middle class:

PRESERVING AMERICA'S MIDDLE CLASS

(By Congressman Robert Torricelli)

Some 50 years ago president Harry Truman asked his assembled economic advisors for their interpretation of his economic policies. The economy was faltering, and he needed answers. They told him on the one hand what was right, and on the other hand what was wrong. Harry Truman said that what he needed was more one-handed economists.

The massive layoffs at AT&T reminded us again this week that indeed, the American economy is in two very different and often contradictory hands. We are, on the one hand, an extraordinary innovative people. We have the world's most productive workers. Our stock market is booming. We have captured the technological edge in vital and lucrative fields. We are the world's largest exporter. In many ways, the United States is the marvel of the international economy.

But there is another side to our rapidly changing economy. In the last decade there has been a loss of 20 million jobs due to corporate downsizing. One half of all Fortune 500 companies have seen dramatic changes in their employment. In the 1980s, 50 percent of those who lost their jobs and found new employment, did so at reduced wages. Twenty percent found themselves out of the workforce permanently. And a million of these newly unemployed found themselves without health care benefits or pensions.

A slow motion downsizing is taking place in many corporations across America which never makes the headlines. Middle class America hangs by a very thin and precious thread. Few of our families are more than a serious illness, a technological breakthrough, or a corporate downsizing away from losing a standard of life that took generations to earn.

We are becoming a nation of smaller, leaner, and much more competitive corporations. The layoffs at AT&T are the most dramatic expression of a growing phenomenon of corporate restructuring. But unlike General Motors or I.B.M. who were in serious financial crisis, AT&T is strong and profitable. Yet, AT&T has made a prospective decision about a problem it might or might not face in future years.

The impact in New Jersey of the loss of 7,000 jobs will be exacerbated by the loss of work for hundreds of contractors in the community that depend on the health of the company. These layoffs will impact families, communities, and state and local governments.

The question is not whether we can adapt to the changing economy, but whether we can do so fairly, while protecting our families, and remaining consistent with our sense of community. To do so, we must re-examine our responsibilities as corporate citizens, individuals, and government.

Every corporation has the right and the responsibility to control costs, maximize returns to its investors, to survive and to prosper. But, corporate responsibility was never to its sources of capital alone, but also to its employees, its suppliers, and to its community. Today's laid off workers are having a hard time understanding why their companies allow their chief executive to collect 200 times what their average employee makes per year. And community leaders are having a hard time understanding why they provided lucrative tax breaks to corporations to move into their areas, only to see their neighbors thrown out of work with little justification.

There had always been a sense of balance among these interests. Today's CEOs, however, have lost sight of that importance balance, and their responsibility to maintain it. In order to succeed in this new economy, corporations must correct the dangerous imbalance between the interests of financial capital and human capital.

For individual workers, it is increasingly unlikely that the corporation they join early in life will be the same one they end their careers with. The age of freelance workers is upon us. People must now identify less with a corporation and more with their skills. It means constant re-eduction, flexibility, and mobility. It means greater self-reliance.

And we in the government have a responsibility to adapt our tax incentives and educational culture in order to succeed in the 21st century. That means making innovative changes to our tax code and making education and training programs more accessible. Here's what government can do:

Establish Individual Training Accounts, where employees in good times can save money tax free so they have the resources available to receive retraining and continuing education to keep up with technological advances. Maintaining competitive skills is as important to individuals now as it is to corporations.

Give preferential corporate tax treatment for worker training. Ninety percent of all training of employees in America today is being done by only one percent of our corporations. We need to create incentives to make training American workers a rational business decision again.

Change the way we asses corporate taxes. Our current tax code treats equally: excessive executive bonuses; excessive compensation; and expenses like compensation for workers and retraining of employees. However, these expenses are not of equal value to society, they are not of equal value to the future of this country, and they should not be treated equally by our tax code.

Reduce capital gains taxes, to ensure that the middle class can invest and save, to finally get some security by accumulated savings. Only family savings will afford the American workforce the financial security it needs to change jobs.

Increase the availability of federally-backed student loans, and broaden them to apply to retraining, vocational, and continuing education programs. Universities must become more open to all generations who will need re-education, and their classes must become more relevant to the local economy.

Ensure that workers' pensions and health care plans are portable. Losing a job must not mean losing the security of a pension and health care coverage. Workers should be able to carry their pensions to other companies throughout their careers.

We are all in this new economy together. These are neither good times nor bad times. They are different times. And if we are like all Americans that came before us, we can make them work for our families, our community, and our country. Together we must develop good ideas and make sound decisions that help our people deal with rapid economic change. We must not allow the modernization of America to become the downsizing of America.

ELEANOR VILLARREAL NAMED WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Eleanor Villarreal, named ''Woman of the Year'' by the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce in Gilroy, CA. I know Eleanor and have had the pleasure of working with her over the years on matters important to the district I represent in this 104th Congress. Eleanor is being honored for her contributions to our community as a prolific volunteer and strong advocate for children.

Eleanor Villarreal is well known in Gilroy, having served on numerous local boards and for spearheading community events benefiting Gilroy residents throughout the years. She was the first woman to become president of the Gilroy Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. She is president of the Salvation Army Council and a regular volunteer for the Special Olympics. In addition, Eleanor has lent her skills to volunteer efforts such as the Toys for Tots Campaign, the Gilroy Garlic Festival, the Exchange Club, Gilroy 2000, the Hispanic Cultural Festival and too many others to include in these remarks.

So very significant among Eleanor's contributions is her continuing work with the Odd Fellow-Rebekah Children's Home where she successfully organized a multi-million dollar campaign to fund a 20,000 square foot expansion of facilities. The new facilities allow this dedicated agency to better meet the demands of the troubled youths it serves in a more home-like setting.

Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1996, the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce will honor Eleanor Villarreal at its 43d annual meeting and awards dinner. I would like to invite my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join with me in expressing gratitude and appreciation to Eleanor for her efforts.

IN HONOR OF LORI JEAN MACHARA

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to this year's recipient of the J. Robert Ladd Community Service Award, Lori Jean Machara of Mount Gretna. She is a shining example of the volunteer spirit that so exemplifies central Pennsylvania.

In addition to her tireless efforts as the manager of the Cardiac Rehabilitation Department of the Good Samaritan Hospital, Lori has been active in the hospital auxiliary and been involved with the Cornwall Children's Center. She is a member of the board of directors of the American Heart Association and coordinates several activities for the Junior Women's Club.

I congratulate Lori Jean Machara on a lifetime of success and accomplishment. The Lebanon area is profoundly richer because of her work.

ANNOUNCING THE 1995 RECIPIENT OF THE SERVICE TO MANKIND AWARD: LORI JEAN MACHARA

As the oldest of 4 children growing up in Natrona Heights, PA, it seemed that Lori was born into a leadership role. In the words of Lori's mother, ''she was and still is a perfect child''. Lori's formative years reads very similar to her present life and included activities such as class officer in grade school, high school class vice president, active participation in church youth group and Girl Scouts, and president of junior achievement. She was also an intricate part of a school newspaper and yearbook staff. Duquesne University was Lori's home for the next 5 years, as she received a B.A. degree in Nursing, a profession she chose to pursue to a post graduate level through Penn State University.

Lori and her husband, Lou, were married shortly after she received her undergraduate degree and at that time, the Machara family as a result of Lou's job, established residency

at Mt. Hope Estates, where they lived for approximately 7 years. Through her work as a nurse, Lori has lived her philosophy that encompasses a strong work ethic and character, contributing back to society that which she has been blessed with throughout her life. Lori served The Good Samaritan Hospital with her skills and talents as a medical/surgical nurse prior to her association with the Cardiac Rehabilitation department. Historically, the cardiac rehabilitation program consisted of a patient room converted to an exercise facility housing 3 pieces of equipment. Presently, Lori is manager of Cardiac Rehab, and through her leadership abilities, the department has grown to an extent that it is now housed in the ground floor of the Cardiac Cath Lab, serving over 1,000 community patients providing them with 21 pieces of equipment plus a universal weight set, nutrition education, and an exercise program to rehabilitate those who have experienced cardiac disease. The center benefits GSH employees as well, with fitness evaluations and personalized exercise programming. At a recent Pennsylvania worksite health promotion conference held in Harrisburg, PA, which hosted 275 attendees, The Good Samaritan Hospital's employee health program was rated among the top 4 in its content which includes educational and incentive aspects. In addition to her full time employment through The Good Samaritan Hospital, Lori and Lou maintain a family business at the Renaissance Faire.

Branching out from her responsibilities through Hospital employment, Lori also serves as secretary for the Hospital auxiliary. Upon her initiative, the Fair has a Hearty Fare Booth which provides low-fat and low-cholesterol foods. As Lori strives to promote intellectual development as well as physical development, she has been involved with the Cornwall Children's Center since its conception, in capacities ranging from a child's mom to a board member.

Through Lori who is a member of the board of directors of the American Heart Association, a Heart At Work program was coordinated. She is chairperson for both the Lebanon County Heart At Work task force and the Worksite task force for the Pennsylvania affiliates. She was nominated for volunteer of the year in 1994, and attained awards for The Good Samaritan Hospital, including Most Creative Activity for the Lebanon division and Heart At Work Company of the year. As the Heart Association National Representative, Lori has provided lectures in several states. Cornwall Lebanon School District attributes the success of their smoke free program to Lori Machara.

Amazingly, Lori is as active with the Junior Women's Club as she has been with every organization with which she becomes involved. Annually, she volunteers at the Mt. Gretna Art Show, chairs a kick-off buffet for over 80 people, coordinates the children's Halloween and Christmas parties, and instills family values and cohesiveness by organizing monthly activities, including educational trips, ski outings, Easter egg hunts, and Mother/Daughter banquets. Lori was previously a board member for the Junior Women's Club. The Albert A. Alley Developmental and Disability Services facility recently benefitted by $15,000 due to the efforts of Lori in chairing an annual American Girl fashion show, an enormous project requiring a mailing list of 25,000 people.

Most importantly, Lori contributes most of her energies to creating family unity. She and Lou are very involved in their daughter, Jessica's, activities both in her education and gymnastic and dance studies. Lou has chosen one word to describe Lori and that is ''stability''. Through her caring, giving and enduring disposition, Lori has created a loving home environment. Of all of the functions that Lori has served, that which she does best is provide an excellent role model for her daughter.

Although Lebanon County may not be aware of her presence, Lori has touched the lives of many individuals through her active participation in her community. It is with great pride that the Lebanon Valley Sertoma Club honors Lori Jean Machara as the 1995 recipient of the J. Robert Ladd Community Service Award for Service to Mankind. May her example of selflessness emulate throughout the community and continue to touch the lives of our fellow citizens.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO RUTH AND BILLY GRAHAM

HON. W.G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend this body for its passage of H.R. 2657 to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

In a time when society is torn by the conflicting messages it receives, it is appropriate that we honor a couple whose decency and moral character is exemplified in everything they do. From their involvement with the flood victims of India to championing the cause of children through the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Center, the commitment that these two have to others is unfailing.

No matter where the Lord has called them to go, they have been there, overcoming challenges which would have impeded the average person. But then these are no two average people. Citizens the world over could learn a lesson or two from Ruth and Billy. I, for one, am very proud to count them among my fellow North Carolinians.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER JAMES PAUL MURPHY

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who has brought 15 years of joy to his parishioners at St. Patrick Church in Miami Beach, FL. Unfortunately, his archbishop has decided that his talents are more needed elsewhere.

I speak of Father James Paul Murphy, originally of Cork, Ireland. Last year Father Murphy celebrated 25 years in the priesthood, the past 15 of which have been spent at St. Patrick Church. Coincidentally, Father Murphy came to St. Patrick's the same year that I came to Congress. This parish holds a particularly special place in my heart, as I was baptized there.

Before coming to St. Patrick Church, Father Murphy was the director of the youth office at the chancellory of the Archdiocese of Miami. Since Father Murphy joined St. Patrick's he has continued his work with the youth in the community and is well liked by the children in school. He has formed a program for the youth in the parish, as well as a child care center.

Father Murphy administers to the elderly, the sick, and the needy of our community. He holds luncheons for the elderly on Tuesdays, likes to visit the homebound, holds engagement encounters, visits Mt. Sinai, and the Miami Heart Institute and serves as the chaplain of the Miami Beach Police Department.

Father Murphy's parishioners think he is a terrific pastor. He has said the pain his move is causing his parishioners is the hardest part for him and reminds him of the French song Plaisir D'Amour, which he remembers from his childhood in Ireland. ''The joys of love are but a moment long. The pain endures the whole life through.''

St. Patrick's and the town of Miami Beach are losing not only a wonderful pastor but a good friend. Father Murphy will surely be missed for the outstanding contributions he has made to his parish and community. Our Lady of Lakes will count their blessings when they see what a wonderful addition their parish is getting.

BUSINESS HONORED FOR COMMUNITY SPIRIT

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a business in California's 16th District that has been honored for its generous support of local nonprofit organizations. South Valley Disposal and Recycling, Inc., of Gilroy, CA, was selected as Business of the Year by the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce because of its contributions to the community.

South Valley Disposal and Recycling, Inc., has been involved in many efforts to help the needy in Gilroy and Santa Clara County. Its management and employees have successfully promoted the biannual food drive for the Second Harvest Food Bank as well as charitable drives by the Salvation Army and Toys for Tots Programs. Their support has helped the nonprofit Odd Fellow-Rebekah Children's Home provide care and health services to children in crisis.

Additionally, South Valley Disposal and Recycling, Inc., is working to keep our environment clean by promoting recycling opportunities, taking a proactive role through public education.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to express gratitude and appreciation to South Valley Disposal and Recycling, Inc., as it is recognized by the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce.

A FOND FAREWELL TO AN EDUCATOR OF MORE THAN 40 YEARS

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in Richmond Hill, GA, there was not much room to stand in the multipurpose room of the Richmond Hill Primary School as hundreds gathered to honor the woman that has had the most impact on this growing coastal community just south of Savannah. Frances Meeks has taught

and served as a school administrator to thousands in this bustling community, and their admiration showed in the huge turnout and many gifts that were presented in her honor during a retirement ceremony this past November.

At the ceremony honored guests, colleagues, and friends spoke about the many special memories they had of her. Appropriately, Meeks was presented with a portrait of Anne of Green Gables, whom a Canadian educator made famous in a series of novels. She was also presented with a U.S. flag flown at the Capitol and a letter of congratulations from U.S. Congressman JACK KINGSTON (R-GA). Among other items that she received were: A scrapbook with newspaper clippings, a State flag and a proclamation from the Georgia Legislature, and a special gift from the teachers and staff of Richmond Hill Primary School. Media specialist Bob Fennel presented Meeks with a plaque rededicating the library at the school in her name. Also a scholarship was announced by the Bryan Bank and Trust in her name that will benefit aspiring teachers.

A 1953 graduate of the University of Georgia with a degree in home economics, she began her teaching career in Richmond Hill as a home economics instructor in 1954. She was certified in elementary education at Georgia Southern College in 1956. By 1975, and several teaching positions later, Meeks received her masters in elementary education from nearby Armstrong State College in Savannah.

Throughout her life, Meeks has taught at different grade levels at several schools. It was not until 1976 that she shifted gears and began serving at the administration level. Since that time, she served as assistant principal for 5 years and principal for 14. All of those who have worked with Meeks share an equal admiration for her innovative approach to working with children. She was always open to new ideas and had an open door policy with her colleagues.

Among the groups that Meeks is, or was, a part of are: PAGE [Professional Association of Georgia Educators], Delta Kappa Gamma Society International, Epsilon Sigma Alpha International, PTSO, SACS Initial Accreditation Team and the Georgia Association of Elementary Schools. She has served as a Sunday school teacher, organized the Richmond Hill Garden Club, organized the annual Richmond Hill Fourth of July celebration and organized the Richmond Hill unit of the American Heart Association.

It is difficult to sum up the impact that Meeks has had on this growing southeast Georgia community, but not too many people can claim such a gala event at their retirement ceremony. The many items presented to Meeks reflect the deep rooted feelings of those whom she has touched throughout her life. She will most definitely be missed in the education field of Georgia. She will now be able to spend some quality time with her grandchildren and enjoy the good life. Assuming the role as principal of the Richmond Hill Primary School will be Dahlia Davis. She will no doubt have some tough shoes to fill.

NEW BEDFORD HONORS LEON DASH

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Martin Luther King Day I was very pleased to be able to attend a breakfast organized by the Black Professional Association of New Bedford, MA.

The event was attended by hundreds of people, and was an impressive tribute to Dr. King. The main speaker at the breakfast was, very appropriately, Leon Dash, now an award winning reporter for the Washington Post, and a native of New Bedford

Mr. Dash's speech was an extraordinarily thoughtful and informative discussion of the problems of teenage pregnancy. It reflected the painstaking and creative investigative work he has done on this subject, and indeed Mr. Dash's work represents one of the major contributions that anyone has made to our understanding of this important problem.

The quality of the speech Mr. Dash gave is an indication of the high quality of the work he has done as a journalist and sociologist over the past several decades. After graduating from Howard University in 1968, he worked as a reporter at the Washington Post, and then joined the Peace Corps serving as a volunteer teaching in a rural high school in Kenya from 1969 to 1970. In 1971 he returned to the Post, serving from 1979 to 1984 as West Africa's bureau chief. At that point he joined the newspaper's investigative desk where he continues to work and where he does enormously important journalism.

His book on teenage pregnancy, ''When Children Want Children: The Urban Crisis in Teenage Childbearing'' was published in 1989, and he has also coauthored ''The Shame of the Prisons'' which was published in 1972. Last year, along with Washington Post photographer Lucian Perkins, Mr. Dash won the Pulitzer Prize for Explanatory Journalism. He also in that year won first prize for print journalism from the Robert F. Kennedy Book and Journalism awards. And in 1990 his book received a PEN/Martha Albrand special citation for nonfiction work. He has also won the Washington Independent Writers President's Award for excellence in urban affairs reporting, first prize—Public Service from the Washington-Baltimore Newspaper Guild, the international reporting awards of Africare and the Capitol Press Club, and the George Polk Award of the Overseas Press Club. Mr. Dash has won a number of other awards as well, and they reflect the extremely high quality of his work, and his dedication to helping provide our society with the information we need if we are to deal seriously with the problems that confront us.

Racism is the unhappiest legacy of our Nation's history. We have struggled hard with this terrible legacy over the past decades, and we have made significant progress in lessening its terrible affects. But much remains to be done, and our ability to continue this work in the spirit of Dr. Martin Luther King, is enormously enhanced by the kind of serious, thoughtful and intellectually honest work that Leon Dash does. There is no greater service that someone can perform than to give to a democracy the information it needs if it is to deal honestly with its gravest problems. Leon Dash does this with excellence and commitment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that I was unavoidable detained for rollcall votes 13, 14, and 15. Had I been present I would have voted ''yes'' on H.R. 2657, S. 1341, and H.R. 2726. Thank you.

RECOGNIZING U.S. FIGURE SKATING CHAMPION RUDY GALINDO

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding achievement of my constituent, Rudy Galindo who—as of Saturday, January 20, in his native city of San Jose, California—became the reigning U.S. figure skating champion.

While that accomplishment alone is worthy of accolades and admiration, it is even more praiseworthy when one considers the personal tragedy and professional obstacles Rudy had to overcome to capture the gold medal at this year's national championship.

Rudy first rose to national prominence in the skating world when he and Olympic gold medalist Kristi Yamaguchi combined their talents to win the 1989 and 1990 pairs competition.

Following their success, both skaters embarked on solo careers. But Rudy had much more to contend with than the adversaries he would face on the ice.

Personal tragedy struck the Galindo family in 1993 when his father suffered a fatal heart attack and his brother died from symptoms related to AIDS that same year. Rudy had already lost his coach, Jim Hulick, to cancer in 1989. If that were not enough, another of Rudy's coaches, Rick Inglesi, died of AIDS in 1995.

Despite his personal loss and professional setbacks, Rudy persevered, even though the odds were often not in his favor.

To win the national championship, he had to best a field of nationally recognized skaters, including two former national champions.

Unlike many of his competitors, Rudy could not afford some of the advantages available to other skaters who had secured the financial backing of sponsors and skating organizations to subsidize their training costs.

Rudy paid for his own choreographer, his own costumes, and his own music, and got his sister, Laura Galindo, to serve as his coach. To cover the costs of his career, Rudy taught skating to children in his spare time. He lived with his mother and rode his bike to work.

In spite of the obstacles he encountered, San Jose's Rudy Galindo—bolstered by the highly charged cheers of a hometown audience—skated into the history books last Saturday night, becoming the first Mexican-American to win the national championship.

With the athleticism of a Michael Jordan and the grace of a Mikhail Baryshnikov, Rudy skated his way to the national crown, completing eight triple jumps while gliding to the music of Swan Lake. His artistic and physical talents earned him the only two perfect scores handed out by the judges at the competition.

Rudy disappointed only his competitors and the odds-makers who had labeled him a long shot.

But Rudy beat the odds, and in doing so he has joined the ranks of other great skaters from the Bay Area, most notably Peggy Fleming, Kristi Yamaguchi, Brian Boitano, and Debi Thomas.

On and off the ice, Rudy Galindo has demonstrated the courage and perseverance of a national champion.

TRIBUTE TO FAY PATTERSON

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and exceptional life of Mr. Fay Patterson, a dear friend, active member in the community, and veteran of three wars, who passed away January 8, 1996, at the age of 80.

Mr. Patterson was born in South Carolina on June 15, 1915. He served this Nation in the Army during World War II in both France and Germany. He was also a veteran of the Korean war and the Vietnam war. He was awarded the Bronze Star.

From 1944 to 1953, living in Savannah, GA, Mr. Patterson continued to serve the American people as a police officer. In 1959, he began 37 years of active residency in Seaside where he served as provost marshall at Forth Ord until he retired. He then worked as an airport police officer for the Monterey Peninsula Airport District until 1977.

He was interested in not only providing for the welfare of the Nation through his service in the Army, but also as an active member of the community. During the Christmas season, Mr. Patterson was especially generous in giving his time to help the needy and promote activities for the young.

Mr. Patterson was an active member of the NAACP, having served as chairman of the registration committee and as a board member of the local NAACP chapter. His participation in the American Legion, Kiwanis, Friendship Baptist Church, the Monterey County Sheriff's Department Advisory Committee and the Monterey County Board of Parol was strongly felt and will be sorely missed in his absence.

While serving as an assemblyman in the California State Legislature, I was privileged to present a resolution honoring Mr. Patterson for his dedicated service to the community. In conjunction with the resolution, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors presented a resolution for faithful service and a certificate for outstanding volunteer service. The city of Seaside also honored him with a proclamation for outstanding service. In 1985, the board of supervisors recognized his efforts to register thousands of voters.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patterson spent his entire life serving this country and helping his community. He was known to many and was a dear and close personal friend of mine. He was like a second father to me.

Please join me as I express my regret at the loss of Fay Patterson, and my profoundest condolences to his two sons, Ray and Fay, Jr., and his two grandsons, of whom he was extremely proud.

YOUNG MEN ATTAIN RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished group of young men from Rhode Island who have attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. The young men recognized for their noteworthy achievement include: Dennis L. Arnold, Steven Bailey, John James Joseph Banks, J. Nicholas Betley, Roger Alan Bonin, Brian T. Breguet, Benjamin T. Brillat, Jeremy S. Brown, James Adrian Butler, Benjamin Caito, Frank Caliri, Christopher J. Cardillo, Christopher J. Cawley, Joseph A. Chappelle, Kenneth C. Collins, Edward A. Darragh, Frank A. Denette IV, Christopher Joseph DiMase, Daniel J. Dorson, Erik Fields, Todd Michael Fisher, Vincent A. Fusaro, Michael Alfred Henry, Michael J. Hogan, Scott E. Hopkins, Vincenzo R. Iacobucci, Douglas Everett Jameson, Peter Eli Jetty, Michael R. Kachanis, Kevin A. Kazlauskas, Kurt J. Kazlauskas, Patrick Keenan, Brian Lafaille, David W. Lowell, Christopher Mark Lundsten, Frederick William Lumb, Luke A. Magnus, Anthony Mangiarelli, Nicholas Marsella, Andrew Paul McGuirl, Steven Barry Mendall Jr., Nathan E. Moreau, Eric Oldford, Keith E. Piehler, John H. Potvin, Andrew Qualls, Kent D. Rutter, Kevin Schwendiman, Mark N. Schwendiman, Craig E. Scorpio, Colin M. Segovis, Guy Scott Shaffer, Kevin A. Silva, Jeremy P. Skaling, James M.R. Sloan, Stanley Sosnowski, Jason E. Soules, Russell Wallis, Jonathan Watterson, Aaron Michael Wilbur, Robert Allen Wilcox, Mark S. Wong, and Rory W. Wood.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts receive this honor. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which must be from areas such as citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, safety, environmental science, and first aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must participate in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. The young men now earning the rank of Eagle Scout have distinguished themselves in accordance with these criteria.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting thee Eagle Scouts. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. Through its 85 years, this program has honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans.

It is my sincere belief that these young men will continue their public service, and, in so doing, will further distinguish themselves and better their communities.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MRS. ISABEL GREENWALD

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and great sadness that I announce the death of Mrs. Isabel Greenwald on January 23, 1996. I join the members of the Greenwald family, Isabel's many friends, and the greater south Florida community in mourning her loss. The passing of this dedicated individual brings to a close a life committed to serving others. I rise in order to share with my colleagues some information regarding this distinguished individual.

Isabel was born in New York at the turn of the century. As an early signal of her commitment and drive to the community, she became one of the first female members of the New York State Bar Association. As an attorney in New York, she focused on protecting the rights of the family and preserving social justice.

Mr. Speaker, upon moving to south Florida, Isabel immediately undertook a leadership role in her new community. In response to her neighborhood's need, she became president of the Sunrise Lakes Phase III Condominium Association. For 21 years, her immense dedication and hard work paid off and she was able to successfully lead one of largest condominium associations in Fort Lauderdale through the rapidly changing south Florida environment. She became the person everyone went to when they were seeking advice on a troubling issue.

Upon her retirement as an attorney, Isabel undertook one of her greatest challenges by focusing her insatiable amounts of energy to helping out the neediest in her community. She began an organization of retired attorneys that provided pro bono legal services to the community and she lobbied Congress to pass legislation that would provide affordable housing for the elderly. This untiring effort just recently came to fruition as the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995 was recently enacted into law. In all of these endeavors, she approached her goals with the highest level of commitment and dedication.

During her lifetime, Isabel Greenwald earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues and others throughout the community. She was a social activist whose stature rests upon a lifetime of commitment to service, social justice, equality, and opportunity for all people. Those of us who knew her loved her deeply. She was a woman of intellect and dignity, a guiding light of the community, and she was very special to all who knew her. She will be impossible to replace and we will miss her very much.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, due to pressing personal business, I was unable to vote on the conference report on S. 1124, the Department of Defense Authorization bill.

Although this conference report did make important changes from the version which was vetoed by President Clinton, there remain serious policy issues such as the proposed restrictions of overseas abortion and the language requiring the discharge of HIV-positive personnel, about which I continue to have serious concerns. As such, had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

GILROY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HONORS MAN OF THE YEAR TOM CARR

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce in honoring Mr. Tom Carr of Gilroy, CA, for his extraordinary volunteer efforts. Mr. Carr has been named ''Man of the Year'' after also receiving ''Volunteer of the Year'' recognition from the city of Gilroy and the ''Elk's Distinguished Citizenship Award.''

What is so noteworthy about Mr. Carr is the pride that he takes in his community and his dedication toward keeping his city safe and beautiful. I am aware that Mr. Carr spends on average several hours each day eradicating graffiti from throughout the city. His work sends a signal, loud and clear, that we will not allow taggers to take over our neighborhoods. That is important, because fighting graffiti is a vital step toward keeping our streets safe.

Likewise, Mr. Carr has been a staunch supporter of our local police department by helping to raise funds for special projects that enable the department to better serve the public.

Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1996, at the Gilroy Chamber of Commerce's Annual Meeting and Awards Dinner, Mr. Carr will formally receive his award. At this time, I would like to invite my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in saluting this fine community volunteer.

DOD AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in support of the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization conference report. I would like to begin by thanking the chairman and the ranking member of the National Security Committee who worked hard to bridge their differences and produce a bill that the President will sign into law.

I would like to point out that I voted against this conference report back in December because of the objectionable language governing national missile defense policy and the restrictions on the President's constitutional prerogatives to make foreign policy. My vote against the initial conference report was the first time in my congressional career that I cast a ''no'' vote on a defense bill, be it authorization or appropriations. Moreover, the reservations and the objections to the original conference report by the respected Senator from Georgia, Mr. NUNN, cast serious doubt on the wisdom of enacting such restrictive and potentially harmful language.

As President Clinton said it last night, ''since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single Russian missile pointed at the United States and North Korea has frozen its dangerous nuclear weapons program.'' We have accomplished that because both Democratic and Republican administrations have worked tirelessly to ratify the START Treaty which significantly reduced the nuclear stockpile between the former Soviet Union and the United States. And now we are on the verge of further reducing weapons of mass destruction by embracing START II.

We cannot and should not do anything to endanger the prospects for ratification of START II. I voted against the conference report in December precisely because it amounted to an anticipatory breach of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Further, the language contained in the bill would have had a significant impact on Russian consideration of the START II Treaty which will reduce Russian nuclear weapons by 25 percent.

I am pleased to see that the language regarding the deployment of a national missile defense system was struck from the bill as well as the language restricting the President's ability to utilize U.S. troops for peacekeeping missions. It is clear by now that for all of the dire predictions and the harsh rhetoric aimed at the President's proposal to send troops to enforce the peace in Bosnia, the President's plan has largely been a success thus far. We have stopped the bloodshed and have ushered in new hope for the future of all Serbs, Muslims, and Croatians.

While I applaud the compromise that was made with respect to this conference report, I am dismayed that the conference committee neglected to delete the abortion language and the language that discharges those HIV-positive service members.

I think it is important for the Congress to take note that this was the first time in decades, a defense appropriations bill was enacted without an authorization bill being enacted first.

I support the compromise version of the conference report knowing that this bill authorizes more money than I would personally prefer. But given the realities of our current mission in Bosnia, the need to maintain military readiness and move forward with defense conversion efforts, I believe it is important that we pass this bill and have the President sign it into law.

IN PRAISE OF THE PBS AND MR. GEORGE COVINGTON

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a friend and fellow Texan, Mr. George Covington, on his upcoming appearance on the Public Television series ''People in Motion.''

George has spent the past 20 years establishing himself as one of this country's most vocal advocates for the millions of Americans with disabilities. He worked for and has been a member of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities. He served on the staff of former Speaker Jim Wright as the speaker's disability specialist and for Vice President Dan Quayle, as Special Assistant for Disability Policy. With my office, he designed and implemented the first fully accessible mapping of Capitol Hill and the monuments. This project, the Tactile Capital, provided hand-held braille and table-top scale maps of Washington, DC, that brought our Nation's capital into focus for the first time for millions of visitors with low or no vision.

He is an internationally recognized speaker on universal design, disability rights, and photography. That last entry is particularly noteworthy, because George has been legally blind since birth and now has only 5 percent usable vision. His career has spanned the fields of law, journalism, education, government, and disability civil rights. But he is the first to tell you point blank that he does not want the burden of being ''inspirational'' to able-bodied people—and add that this is the wish of most people with disabilities.

It is for this reason that George's appearance is so very appropriate and important to a series like ''People in Motion.'' He has spent most of his life fighting negative images, myths, and stereotypes about people with disabilities.

Last year PBS broadcast the first installments of this unique series. In April, PBS stations around the country will air three new episodes of ''People in Motion.'' Like the premier episodes, these seek to break through the standard media representation of people with disabilities, and will help change forever the way most of us see those with a disability. With a census estimate of 49 million Americans falling into this constituency, I suggest that it is important for us to learn more about these fellow citizens.

I want to commend PBS for its commitment to ''People in Motion'' as well as recognize the important contribution of local public television stations planning to air this series. I urge you to watch this outstanding series, so that we may all applaud the work of people like George Covington and the foresight of PBS programming.

ROGER ERICKSON'S DEPARTURE FROM THE WCCO GOOD MORNING SHOW

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to Roger Erickson, one of Minnesota's special radio personalities, as he steps down from hosting WCCO Radio's Good Morning Show. Although Roger Erickson is not retiring, as of February 1, 1996, after 35 years on the WCCO Station Good Morning Show, he will hand over control of the program to his new on-air partner, Dave Lee.

Just a few years ago, Charlie Boone, a long-time cohost, stepped out of this special Good Morning program and, in a way, Erickson's departure marks the end of an era. I have no doubt, based on the good talent of Dave Lee and the format, Good Morning will remain a Minnesota early morning tradition. But the warm surround sound of Roger Erickson's dulcet tone crooning ''Good Morning'' or school announcements will be missed.

Over the past three and a half decades, Roger Erickson has become a preeminent voice in Minnesota morning radio. Roger has relayed the news with insight and compassion and entertained us with stories and humorous sketches. His school closing announcements have become a Minnesota institution: Generations of children have listened breathlessly to Roger on cold winter mornings hoping to hear their school called. Roger's warmth, spontaneity, and imagination have earned him thousands of loyal listeners. Some conjecture has it that in his youth he was a character in a Charlie Brown comic strip.

Roger Erickson's radio shows have been popular not only because he is a gifted broadcaster, but because he truly understands Minnesota and the culture of subtle Scandinavian humor. Roger was raised on a farm in Winthrop and studied speech and theater at the University of Minnesota. He was determined to work for WCCO Radio and, in 1959, took a job as Bozo the Clown on WCCO-TV in Minneapolis to get his foot in the door at the station. Within 2 months he was offered a WCCO Radio job, and he has continued there ever since, enthralling local audiences with spoofs like ''Minnesota Hospital,'' ''Charlie's Cafe Mediocre,'' ''Air Lutefiska,'' and, most recently, fishing stories from two characters, Gill and Finn.

WCCO Radio prides itself on its Good Neighbor approach to broadcasting and Roger Erickson exemplifies the very best of the Good Neighbor tradition. Although we will miss hearing Roger's voice every day on the Good Morning Show, we are pleased he is continuing his work at WCCO in other capacities and wish him the very best in all his endeavors.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Tribune, Jan. 4, 1996]

NO MORE SCHOOL CLOSINGS FOR ERICKSON AS HE LEAVES COHOST ROLE AT WCCO

(By Noel Holston)

Shouldn't there be an honorary school closing or something?

WCCO Radio's Roger Erickson says he has had enough of the early-to-bed, early-to-rise lifestyle that's been his for almost 35 years. He plans to give up his cohost role on 'CCO's ''Good Morning Show'' on Feb. 1.

Erickson will continue to participate in prerecorded ''Good Morning'' features, such as the ''Minnesota Hospital'' spoofs. He'll still do personalized plugs for certain advertisers and work on Saturdays with Charlie Boone. But he's handing over the helm of the weekday show to Dave Lee, who has been part of it for the past four years.

I'll still be around the station four or five days a week,'' Erickson said Wednesday. ''I may even do some live stuff occasionally.

''I won't be doing school closings, my one claim to fame,'' he added.

Erickson said he had been talking with general manager Jim Gustafson for some time about cutting back. ''Roger actually wanted to make this change sooner, but he graciously agreed to wait until now,'' Gustafson said.

Erickson lists his age at 47, but that's in Jack Benny years. He's actually closer to 67, and he concedes that his wife, Margaret, has been after him for years to make some adjustments that would allow him to stay up a little later than his usual 7:30 or 8 p.m.

Erickson said he has never seen ''ER,'' let alone ''Late Show with David Letterman.''

''I hear there are people who eat dinner as late as 6 o'clock,'' he said. ''Is that true?''

''You really don't have a life at night,'' he continued, more seriously. ''I know I'm not the only one. I know there are a whole lot of people doing a variety of jobs who have those kind of hours, so I'm not going to sit here and complain. I've had just a great run. I've loved doing that morning show.''

Erickson, born and raised in Winthrop, Minn., studied theater at the University of Minnesota.

He gushes about the great early training he got doing radio drama for campus station KUOM–AM.

Erickson left a Stillwater radio station in 1959 to take his first job in Minneapolis, which wasn't as one would guess, at the Good Neighbor of the North—or even on radio.

''I auditioned at WCCO about 2,000 times,'' Erickson recalled. ''I knew it was where I wanted to be, but I'm sure that, like most radio stations, they listened to the tape and then they put it aside. So I never got a call. And then the Bozo opportunity came up.''

The Bozo opportunity?

Erickson said the original Bozo the Clown, Chicago broadcaster Larry Harmon, syndicated his show's format to TV stations around the country, which had only to hire a live clown to talk to kids and introduce the provided cartoons.

''I thought, 'This is the opportunity I'm looking for. I'm going to go into [radio] through the back door. I'm going to go in through television.'''

Erickson auditioned to be Bozo at WCCO–TV, Channel 4, and got the job. Two months later, the radio station offered him a job as well.

After a couple of years of night work, WCCO teamed Erickson with Maynard Speece (''a great storyteller who regularly challenged the parameters of Minnesota taste'') on the 5 to 7 a.m. shift and with Charlie Boone in the afternoons.

''I would run over [to Channel 4] between 7 and 9 and put on the [Bozo] makeup and the costume and do some live spots for maybe Hostess Twinkies, take the makeup off, run back,'' Erickson said, ''Charlie and I would start working on our afternoon show, work up to 1 o'clock, go on the air 1 to 3. About 3:30, I go back over to television, prepare the Bozo show, which went from 4:30 to 5. And at least once or twice a week, I'd visit a store as Bozo the Clown, with about a thousand kids lined up. And I wouldn't have had it any other way. It was fantastic.''

Boone and Erickson eventually became the morning team, and their weekday partnership lasted until 1992, when Boone cut back his hours. They reigned supreme in the mornings for almost three decades, challenged only by the Knapp and Donuts team on KSTP–FM in the '80s and finally edged out in, the '90s by Tom Barnard's morning crew on KORS–FM. The ''Good Morning Show'' remains one of WCCO's strengths.

Erickson dropped out of Monday mornings last fall, a move designed to lighten his workload and give heir apparent Lee an opportunity to flex some different muscles.

''I feel very comfortable leaving now,'' Erickson said. ''It's in good hands.''

ENDING COLA INEQUITY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of great importance to our Nation's military retirees: COLA equity.

The thousands of veterans and military retirees in my district have repeatedly asked that the inequity in COLA's for military and Federal civilians be ended—most recently during a veterans' town hall meeting I held last week.

This House has been unprecedented in dedicating itself toward ending the problem of inequity in military cost of living adjustments for military retirees. Early last year, legislation was introduced by my colleague, Mr. JIM MORAN, to end COLA inequity. The House also included a provision ending the disparity in COLA's in the budget reconciliation bill—a provision which, unfortunately, was removed by the Senate. In response, my Republican colleague, Mr. BILL YOUNG, introduced a new, fast-track bill to accomplish the same task. I am proud to have cosponsored both Mr. YOUNG's and Mr. MORAN's bills, and I applaud the tenacity with which the House leadership has pursued this important matter.

A provision to end the COLA inequity problem was included in the conference report of the Department of Defense authorization bill, which the House approved today. While I strongly supported the provision, I could not support the entire bill, a bill which mandated a $7 million increase in defense spending over the President's original budget.

This spending increase comes at a time when other Federal programs—especially programs serving veterans—are suffering from serious budget cuts. For example, last year's Veterans Affairs budget, which provides for medical care for millions of veterans and military retirees and the construction and improvement of VA medical facilities, was cut by nearly $1 billion from 1994. At the very least, we cannot speak about mutual sacrifice in ending the deficit at the same time that we actually increase spending in defense.

I will continue to support the House's legislative efforts to remove the COLA inequity once and for all. Our Nation's military retirees deserve no less.

OUR 2 CENTS' WORTH

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the first day workplace and civil rights

laws have been applied to this body. Now Congress is required to play by the same rules as everyone else.

But there is still at least one special exception the Congressional Accountability Act did not eliminate: Congress gets paid during Federal shutdowns while other Federal employees do not.

We can clear up this matter by passing H.R. 2658, a bill I introduced which would suspend Member's salaries during Federal shutdowns and furloughs. It is only fair that Congress be treated like every other Federal employee. If we are serious about playing by the same rules that govern everyone else, we need to pass this now.

On January 3, 1996, Carol Ann Rinzler and Perry Luntz wrote an excellent and eloquent article for the New York Times which accurately describes this problem. I have enclosed it below so all of my colleagues can better understand the magnitude of this issue:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 3, 1996]

OUR 2 CENTS' WORTH

(By Carol Ann Rinzler and Perry Luntz)

Almost exactly a year ago, Congress passed the Congressional Accountability Act, a much ballyhooed measure that requires the House and Senate to abide by the workplace and civil rights laws they enact for the rest of us. Alas, like so many things in life, this long-overdue legislation turns out to be less than meets the eye.

In an effort to minimize the effects of the Government shutdown on their constituents, Republicans in the House proposed last week that furloughed Federal employees go back to work without being paid, surely a new idea in free-market, conservative economics.

Afterward, someone asked Representative Tom DeLay of Texas, the House majority whip, whether he would consider giving up his own salary during the crisis. No way, said Mr. DeLay, explaining that, like every other member of Congress, he isn't a Federal employee—he is a ''constitutional officer.''

Well, we've reread our copy of the Constitution, and frankly the distinction seems a bit arcane to us.

True, members of Congress are specifically mentioned in the Constitution, Article I, Section 6 says that ''Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.'' Cabinet members and Federal judges also get a mention, later on, but other workers—curators at the Smithsonian, say—do not.

But every Federal paycheck originates in an appropriation requiring money from the Treasury, whose funds come, in large part, from income taxes. That should give everyone of us the inalienable right to put in our 2 cents. Or to take it out.

Members of the House and Senate earn a base salary of $133,600 a year (those in leadership positions get more.) And don't forget the generous benefit package: life insurance, health insurance, per diem travel and a nifty pension. Mr. DeLay's base salary alone costs each of America's more than 115 million individual taxpayers 1.2 cents a year.

As conscientious citizens, we have always paid our taxes, regardless of our political gripes. Even though one of us was teargassed in 1971 by an overzealous guard at the Nixon White House, protecting it from throngs of balding, middle-aged Vietnam War protesters and their children, the Internal Revenue Service got paid the following year anyway.

This time, however, we plan to draw a line in the sand. Having voted to obey its own laws, members of Congress should be man (or woman) enough to live up to that requirement. Before Tom DeLay votes for trimming Medicare, he should whittle down his own Government-financed health insurance. If he expects Federal workers to show up for free, so should he.

Until then, he can forget our helping to pay his salary. Come April 15, our joint tax return will be 2 cents short. That ought to send a message: keeping Congress in line is a hard job, but somebody has to do it.

COMMENDATION FOR THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. BLAKE

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Honorable Edward J. Blake, who is retiring from the Court of Common Pleas on January 31, 1996.

Judge Blake was born in Philadelphia on May 18, 1926, to Philip and Agnes Blake, and he was graduated from Saint Joseph's Preparatory High School in June 1944. From August 1944, to January 1946, he attended the Pennsylvania Maritime Academy, and was thereafter commissioned as an Ensign in the U.S. Naval Reserve. In September 1946, Judge Blake entered the prestigious Saint Joseph's College and earned a bachelor of science degree upon his graduation in May 1950.

Following his graduation, Judge Blake volunteered for active military service during the Korean war. As a damage control officer on the U.S.S. *Sutherland*, he participated in the Inchon invasion in September 1950. Judge Blake was honorably discharged from active duty in 1951, but he remained a member of the Reserve fleet and eventually attained the high rank of lieutenant commander before his discharge from the reserves in 1972.

Judge Blake's legal career was just as distinguished as his military achievements. Judge Blake attended the University of Pennsylvania Law School where he was to become class president. After graduating with honors, Judge Blake was appointed chief law clerk to the Court of Common Pleas No. 2, a position he held until 1962. From 1962 until 1964, he served as chief deputy court administrator of the court, and court administrator from 1964 until 1974.

In 1966, during his tenure as court administrator, the Court of Common Pleas entered the electronic age with the implementation of a computer system. As a direct consequence of his efforts, the court's ability to manage its caseload substantially improved, and the results were published in Computer Streamlines Caseload at Philadelphia Common Pleas Court, which Judge Blake coauthored.

Gov. Milton J. Schapp appointed Judge Blake to the bench of the Common Pleas in 1971, and he was elected in full term on November 6, 1973. In 1983 and 1993, Judge Blake was retained by the voters of Pennsylvania for succeeding terms in office.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court appointed Judge Blake as administrative judge of the trial division of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County on April 11, 1986, and during his tenure, the disposition of cases improved even though the filing rate for civil cases increased dramatically.

On December 18, 1990, Judge Blake was elected as president judge. During his term of office as president judge, the criminal section of the trial division of the Court of Common Pleas was finally relocated to the newly completed Criminal Justice Center. This was a long-term project which was conceived, and nurtured due primarily to the efforts of Judge Blake.

Judge Blake's accomplishments, as a dedicated officer in the Army and a distinguished judge in the courtroom, has earned him respect and praise from his peers. I join his family and friends in wishing him an enjoyable retirement.

HONORING THE 85TH BIRTHDAY OF WILLARD MUNGER

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I want to honor Minnesota State Representative, Willard Munger, who is 85 years young and marking his 40th year as a member of the Minnesota Legislature. Willard is a Minnesota original—a Minnesota natural resource—whose work honors his family, the State of Minnesota, and our Nation.

Willard Munger represents the best of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party's tradition of service to the State of Minnesota. He is currently tied with former Representative Day as the longest-serving member of the House and he has no intention of retiring now. The Munger vision and tenacity have shaped our State and generations of lawmakers. I'm proud of the 6 years I served in the Minnesota House of Representatives with Willard Munger. Willard Munger, as a sage and chairman, introduced me to the task and role of environmental lawmaker. What a teacher and what a friend Willard Munger was to me and past, present, and future generations of lawmakers.

Willard Munger reminds us again and again of our stewardship responsibilities. He established a pragmatic proactive progressive public service tradition and standard of public interest decisions that are sustained by sound science—both political and natural science. Willard first was the conscience speaking out courageously against powerful interests and finally a fiery new chairman. Today his advocacy remains constant. He is not complacent, but is rightfully viewed as mainstream by the careful work on law and policy that he has written and helped enact and will continue to advance.

Willard was one of the first people to raise questions about the use of pesticides, PCBs, and mercury. He began addressing issues like recycling, energy conservation, nuclear power, wetlands, soil erosion, environmentally safe mining practices, and hazardous waste long before these policy matters became politically popular.

Willard Munger's environmental vision has helped make Minnesota a natural leader in the areas of natural resource conservation and protection. Among his achievements are the enactment of the Minnesota Environmental

Policy Act, the Resource Recovery Act, the Critical Areas Act, the Power Plant Siting Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Waste Management Act, Reinvest in Minnesota, the Solid Waste Reduction and Recycling Act, and the 1991 Wetlands Conservation Act. I was very privileged to work on some of these very measures in Gov. Wendell Anderson's ''Minnesota Golden Years,'' 1971–1976. Willard was also instrumental in establishing the Western Lake Superior Sanitary District in the 1960's, which provided wastewater treatment along the St. Louis River and ended a major source of pollution in Lake Superior.

The tireless efforts of Willard Munger on natural resource policy over the past 40 years have rightfully earned him the title ''the environmental conscience of the Minnesota Legislature.'' I was pleased to participate in a joint Minnesota House of Representatives and Senate program organized by former Minnesota Gov. Elmer L. Anderson, January 18, 1996. It is fitting that Minnesota has declared January 18 ''Willard Munger Day.'' He has made and continues to make a difference. On behalf of today's and tomorrow's generations I thank Willard for standing up for what is right and wish him the best in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR S.S. RAY OF INDIA

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to pay tribute to a superb diplomat who has done a great deal to improve relations between the world's two largest democracies, the United States and India. Ambassador Siddhartha Shankar Ray, India's envoy to the United States since 1992, will be leaving Washington on February 20 and returning to domestic politics in his country. While many of our colleagues are sad to see Ambassador Ray finish his tour in Washington, we all gratefully acknowledge his many contributions to the improved climate in Indo-U.S. relations.

Ambassador Ray's appointment to Washington with the status of a Federal Cabinet Minister is indicative of the great confidence his Government has in his abilities. That confidence was well-placed. During Ambassador Ray's years in Washington, he was tireless in his promotion of India, not only as the world's largest secular democratic nation, but as a major emerging market for United States consumer products and business investment.

The last 4 years have been trying times in South Asia. Sharing a long border with China and facing an insurgency in Kashmir supported by outside forces, India has had its share of challenges. Throughout these years, my colleagues and I could always rely on Ambassador Ray to articulate India's concerns with eloquence and precision.

But, Mr. Speaker, these past 4 years have also been extremely exiciting times. India, under the leadership of Prime Minister P.V. Narosimha Rao, has embarked upon a historic economic reform policy that has opened up unprecedented opportunities for United States companies, large and small, as well as for Indian entrepreneurs. At the same time, the end of the cold war has forced all nations to rethink their security arrangements. Both of these historic developments are leading the United States and India to seek greater cooperation and partnership on many fronts. Many Members of this body were greatly impressed by the Prime Minister's address to this Chamber in 1994 in which he addressed many of these same points. The appointment of a statesman with the stature and experience of S.S. Ray—with his years of service as an attorney, Member of Parliament, Cabinet Minister, and top posts at the state level-shows the degree of importance that the Government of India attaches to its relations with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we will also miss the Ambassador's extraordinary wife, Mrs. Maya Ray. Prior to their service in Washington, both Mr. and Mrs. Ray enjoyed distinguished legal careers as barristers, as well as Members of Parliament. Mrs. Ray's contributions to her husband's work in Washington will indeed be remembered with fondness and appreciation.

In my capacity as cochairman of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans, I look forward to working with Ambassador Ray's successor during this period of strengthened partnership between our two great nations, building on Ambassador Ray's excellent work.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my good wishes and those of my colleagues to Siddhartha and Maya Ray as they enter the next phase of their careers back home in India. Their many friends in the Congress and throughout our Nation hope they will return to visit frequently.

AMERICA NEEDS A NEW RUSSIAN POLICY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the departures of Andrei Kozyrev, Anatoly Chubais, and Sergei Filatov from the Yeltsin administration and the appointment of a Brezhnev-era hardliner to be foreign minister should be the final wake-up call for the Clinton administration.

These reformers have been all but powerless for a long time, but their presence has allowed the administration to claim that Russia is on the right track and that any criticism of Russian policy would embolden the hard-liners. We see now that the hard-liners were emboldened long ago and are now in complete control.

For over 2 years, Russia has been engaged in a myriad of activities that range from the legal to the illegal to the morally repugnant, but all of which are contrary to United States national interests. These include Chechnya, nuclear dealings with Iran and Cuba, intimidation and subversion of nearly every former Soviet State, violations of numerous arms-control agreements, and strategic nuclear modernization, among many others.

All of this has been met by the Clinton administration with silence, arms control concessions, and a steady flow of U.S. taxpayer dollars. In other words, appeasement. True to its unvarnished record in history, appeasement has failed again. It is time for a new approach.

A more realistic policy toward Russia would involve several things: First, we must stop the mindless policy of giving foreign aid to Russia, especially its government. At this very moment, the Clinton administration and the IMF are preparing a $9 billion infusion into the Russian treasury. In addition to fostering complacency among economic policymakers in Russia, our aid, especially multilateral loans and Nunn-Lugar, has been subsidizing the dangerous activities listed above.

Second, we should give immediate and concrete assurances to qualifying countries in central Europe that they will become full members of NATO in the nearest possible future. With Primakov as Foreign Minister, there can be no doubt that Russia will attempt at least to ''Finlandize'' the former Warsaw Pact countries. It is silly to oppose NATO expansion with talk of drawing lines in Europe. There already is a line, and because of it, stability has been fostered in those countries west of it. Quite frankly, the farther east that line is, the better. Furthermore, the virtual military reabsorption of Belarus by Russia has resulted in the stationing of Russian border troops on the Polish border. They have already moved the line—to the west.

Third, it is high time we start to resist Russian policy in the near abroad and the Third World. For over 2 years, Russia has been methodically sapping the sovereignty of its neighbors, and is clearly moving toward reestablishing some sort of Russian-dominated union. Using classic Soviet-style divide and rule tactics, Russia has helped topple the democratic government of Azerbaijan, brought Georgia to heel, and pushed Armenia to allow Russian bases on its soil. Russia continues its illegal occupation of Moldova, routinely violates Lithuanian territory, and has threatened annexation of the Baltic States. This uncivilized behavior is not only outrageous, it is potentially highly destabilizing to Europe. The same can be said about Russia's renewed affinity for some of the world's worst rogue regimes, such as Iran, Cuba, Syria, and Iraq. We must make it plain to the Russians that their membership in Western organizations is directly linked to their international behavior. Right now, they don't make the grade.

Fourth, we must extricate ourselves from our slavish devotion to arms control. To the Clinton administration, what this means is that any agreement is a good agreement, Russian violations of existing agreements are to be hushed up, and protecting American citizens from ballistic missiles is bad. Thus, recent and clear Russian violations of the Biological Weapons Convention, CFE and START I and many others, have been excused. The administration's only response has been a rash drive to ratify the flawed START II and a stubborn insistence on unilateral adherence to the ridiculous ABM treaty, from which we can walk away legally anytime.

Mr. Speaker, the key issue is not whether Russia has 3,500 or 10,000 nuclear warheads. What is in our interest and what will ensure the security of our European friends is a Russia that behaves in civilized fashion internationally. So far, not a thing the Clinton administration has done has goaded Russia in this direction. Indeed, the administration has tolerated and even condoned, as in Chechnya, uncivilized and dangerous Russian behavior.

The past 3 years of behaving as though we feel guilty that we won the cold war have

yielded us a Russia that thinks and acts much like the old Soviet Union. Unfortunately, we can have little hope that the Clinton administration will meet this challenge with a reorientation of its Russia policy because this would be to admit that Ronald Reagan got it right on the cold war. After all, Strobe Talbott wrote in 1990 that the cold war doves were right all along, and he has been trying to prove this bizarre conclusion ever since.

Some of these naive policies can be overturned by us in Congress, Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful we will. For instance, we can cut off aid, and I would urge support for my legislation, H.R. 519, that would do exactly that. We can back-burner START II, and I would urge the Senate to do that. And we can force the President to withdraw from the ABM Treaty, and I would urge everyone to cosponsor our colleague MARTIN HOKE's excellent bill, H.R. 2483, which would do exactly that.

The rest, alas, will have to wait for January 1997, when, hopefully, we will have a more clear-eyed team in the White House.

RESTORE COLA EQUITY FOR MILITARY RETIREES

HON. LINDA SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives passed legislation that is of utmost importance to the veterans who have honorably served our country. I'm speaking of the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization bill that restores COLA equity between military and civilian retirees.

Historically, Congress treated Federal civilian and military pensioners the same under the law. However, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 contained a provision delaying Federal civilian retirees' COLAs until April for fiscal years 1994–96. In contrast, military retirees were delayed until April of 1994 and until October for fiscal year 1995–98. I found this to be a flawed policy. Inflation does not discriminate and neither should the U.S. Congress.

The bill we approved today restores COLA equity for military and civilian retirees. While the House approved this measure on December 15, it was vetoed by the President. We should not play politics with COLA's. A system which puts COLA's on different schedules for different groups is bad public policy. It is also a disservice to dedicated Americans who served this country, often in harm's way.

I urge the President to quickly sign this legislation. The veterans in Washington State deserve nothing less.

NORTHERN MARIANAS DELEGATE ACT

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Northern Marianas Delegate Act, to provide for a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives to represent the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands became the newest territory of the United States and an American commonwealth in 1976. This commonwealth is comprised of the northern islands in the Mariana Island chain, the principal islands being Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. Guam is also a part of the Mariana Island chain, and it is fitting that the people of Guam have the honor today to share in the introduction of this bill for our Pacific neighbors, and for our brothers and sisters of Chamorro heritage in the Northern Marianas who share Guam's indigenous identity.

It is important that the Northern Marianas be accorded representation in Congress, not just for fair and just representation of an American community whose interests are affected by the actions of Congress, but more importantly for what the people of Northern Marianas can contribute to the Nation through their Delegate.

The American relationship with the Northern Marianas began just over 50 years ago when American forces fought on the beaches of Saipan and Tinian, and at great human cost expelled a colonial power that had acquired these islands as part of a Pacific empire. The Americans, in the years to come, established the seeds of democracy that have resulted in this new American commonwealth. This commonwealth, whose roots to America are traced to a violent military encounter in World War II, is the first American soil acquired by conquest in this century. That the people of the Northern Marianas have freely chosen to become a part of the American family is a great credit to the United States; that they do not enjoy full participation in the political process as citizens should be a matter of great concern to all of us.

Today the American citizens who live in the Northern Marianas contribute to the Nation and participate in the life of our Nation in all the same ways that every other American citizen does in his own community. They pay taxes, serve in the military and work hard for the progress of their communities. They are part of the fabric of our great Nation.

Participation in this American democracy is not based on a particular citizen's tax contribution to the Treasury and it is not based on a preordained size of a community. It is based on a community's commitment to our democratic form of government and our Nation. Our American citizenship has as its foundation a promise of fair and equal treatment by our Government and that promise extends to Congress where fair and equal treatment demands that the Northern Marianas be represented by a Delegate.

The bill that I have introduced today mirrors the legislation which granted Guam and the United States Virgin Islands representation in 1972 and the legislation which granted American Samoa representation in 1980. The Northern Marianas will join the ranks of Delegates representing these islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, and the Northern Marianas will add its voice to those who represent American citizens who do not reside in the 50 states, but who do reside in a diverse group of American communities on American soil.

In introducing this bill today I commend the work of the Resident Representative of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Mr. Juan N. Babauta, and his staff. I also commend the unity of purpose in the leadership of the Northern Marianas expressed by Senate Joint Resolution No. 9–6 of the Ninth Northern Marianas Commonwealth Legislature, the Majors of Saipan, Tinian, Rota, and the Northern Islands, and the Municipal Councils of Saipan, Tinian, and Rota in the adoption of resolutions requesting the United States Congress to grant Delegate status to the Resident Representative to the United States. I further commend the leadership of the Honorable Diego T. Benavente, Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Honorable Jesus R. Sablan, President of the Senate of the 10th Commonwealth Legislature, as well as the Honorable Crispin I. Deleon Guerrero, in their support of this bill. I hope that the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate will act on this legislation in this session, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Northern Marianas Delegate Act.

TRIBUTE TO A.G. GASTON

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1996

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute of Dr. A.G. Gaston, a leader among men, who recently died in Birmingham at the age of 103.

Dr. Gaston was a pioneer, who developed businesses in Alabama in an age when blacks simply did not do such things. Dr. Gaston was a pioneer in the area of building a business empire which propelled him to become Alabama's first black millionaire.

Dr. Gaston's life reads much like a literary rags-to-riches story. He was born on July 4, 1892, in Demopolis, AL, the grandson of slaves. Early in his life he moved to Birmingham and began working a variety of jobs before serving in the U.S. Army during World War I.

When the war was over, Dr. Gaston and his mother got the idea of starting their own business by preparing box lunches, and the rest is history.

From a meager beginning, Dr. Gaston eventually started a funeral business, from the funeral business emerged the Booker T. Washington Insurance Business in 1923, and from the insurance company came nine corporations with combined assets of more than $35 million. Among Dr. Gaston's other corporate ventures were: Vulcan Realty & Investment Corp.; Citizen's Federal Savings & Loan; Zion Memorial Cemetery; Smith & Gaston Funeral Homes; Wenn & Wagg Radio Stations; A.G. Gaston Senior Citizens Home; Booker T. Washington Business College, and A.G. Gaston Motel & Lounge—now A.G. Gaston Gardens.

Dr. Gaston's interests were not limited to just his business ventures. Dr. Gaston is also well known as a trailblazer in the area of civil rights and equal justice for all men and women.

When Dr. King was in Birmingham, he stayed at the A.G. Gaston Hotel and when Dr. King was arrested and put in jail for marching for equality by Police Commissioner Bull Conner, it was Dr. Gaston who bailed him out, so he could continue his fight for freedom.

However, his kindnesses to Dr. King were not accomplished without personal cost, his home was firebombed and his hotel was burned, yet still he continued, for A.G. Gaston never was a quitter. He was a visionary, a pioneer, and a role model for our youth.

Dr. Gaston had a deep and abiding love for the future of our community, our youth. He created the A.G. Gaston Boys & Girls Club to help give our youth direction and purpose.

He recognized, earlier than most, that our youth are the key to either the success or failure of our Nation. Unlike most people, who merely ''amen'' an idea, Dr. Gaston put his own money into the Boys and Girls Clubs, as well as numerous universities and colleges.

America needs more men and women like Dr. A.G. Gaston. He will be missed by all of us who share his love of youth, his zest for life, and his deep concern for his fellow man.

Dr. Gaston will be sorely missed.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S331–S354

Measures Introduced: One bill was introduced, as follows: S. 1524. **Page S346**

Measures Passed:

Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 1494, to provide an extension for fiscal year 1996 for certain programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S350–53**

Lott (for D'Amato/Mack/Bond) Amendment No. 3118, to make a series of amendments. **Pages S350–51**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Lawrence Neal Benedict, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cape Verde.

Joseph J. DiNunno, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

Ronnie Feuerstein Heyman, of New York, to be Member of the National Council on the Arts.

Barry R. McCaffrey, of Washington, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

Robert B. Rogers, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Shirley W. Ryan, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability.

26 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

3 Army nominations in the rank of general.

6 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Pages S353–54

Nominations Withdrawn: Senate received notification of the withdrawal of the following nominations:

Chris Evert, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service, which was sent to the Senate on June 6, 1995.

Christine Hernandez, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service, which was sent to the Senate on June 6, 1995.

Kirsten S. Moy, of New York, to be Administrator of the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, which was sent to the Senate on February 24, 1995.

Cherry T. Kinoshita, of Washington, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, which was sent to the Senate on January 5, 1995.

Stanley K. Sheinbaum, of California, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board, which was sent to the Senate on January 5, 1995. **Page S354**

Messages from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Received on Tuesday, January 23, 1996:

A message from the President of the United States transmitting the report of the State of the Union Address; ordered to lie on the table. (PM–111). **Pages S309–13**

Messages From the President: **Pages S309–13, S345**

Messages From the House: **Pages S345–46**

Measures Referred: **Page S346**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Page S346**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S346–47**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S347–48**

Additional Statements: **Pages S348–49**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 5 p.m., and adjourned at 6 p.m., until 12 noon on Thursday, January 25, 1996. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S353.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs met in closed session to receive a briefing on Ambassador Albright's recent trip to Africa from Madeleine K. Albright, United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 2872–2877 1 private bill, H.R. 2878; and 1 resolution, and H. Res. 341 were introduced. **Pages H836–37**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 2100, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System, amended (H. Rept. 104–452); and

H. Res. 342, waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 104–453). **Page H836**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designates Representative Hobson to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H775**

Defense Authorizations: By a yea-and-nay vote of 287 yeas to 129 nays, Roll No. 16, the House agreed to the conference report on S. 1124, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, and to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces—clearing the measure for Senate action. **Pages H789–H800**

H. Res. 3340, the rule which waived points of order against the conference report, was agreed to earlier by a voice vote. **Pages H782–89**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appears on page H800. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at noon and adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Committee Meetings

TRAVEL AND TOURISM PARTNERSHIP ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials and the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations held a joint hearing on H.R. 2579, Travel and Tourism Partnership Act of 1995. Testimony was heard from Greg Farmer, Under Secretary, Department of Commerce; Judd Buchanan, Chairman, Tourism Commission, Canada; and public witnesses.

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Continued hearings on the White House Travel Office. Testimony was heard from the following former officials of the White House Travel Office; Billy R. Dale, Director; Gary D. Wright, Assistant Director; Barnaby L. Brasseux, Assistant to the Director; John P. Dreylinger, Assistant to the Director; Robert T. Maughan, Communications Officer; John P. McSweeney, Assistant to the Director; and Robert S. Van Eimeren, Assistant to the Director.

LANDMINE THREAT IN BOSNIA

Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Research and Development and the Subcommittee on Military Procurement held a joint hearing on the research and development response to the landmine threat in Bosnia. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Capt. Joseph Mazzafro, USN, Joint Staff (J–2); Maj. Gen. Clair F. Gill, USA, Commanding General, U.S. Army Engineer Central/School and Fort Leonard Wood; Thomas Reeder, Intelligence Analyst, National Ground Intelligence Center; Col. Dennis Barlow, USA, Director, Policy and Plans, Humanitarian and Refugee Affairs, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict; John M. Bachkosky, Deputy Under Secretary, Advanced Technology; George T. Singley, III, Deputy Director, Defense Research and Engineering; A. Fenner Milton, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Science and Technology, Department of the Army; Brig. Gen. Roy E. Beauchamp, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development and Engineering, U.S. Army Materiel Command; John Reingruber, Assistant for Science and Technology, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict; and Claude Manley, Deputy Director, Navy Joint Explosives Ordnance Technology Division, U.S. Navy Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head Division; and a public witness.

PROVIDING EXPEDITED PROCEDURES

Committee on Rules: Ordered reported, by voice vote, a resolution waiving clause 4(b) of rule XI (requiring a ⅔ vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported by the Committee on Rules) against certain resolutions reported by the Rules Committee before March 16, 1996. The waiver applies to special rules providing for consideration or disposition of any measures, amendments, thereto, conference reports thereon, or amendments reported in disagreement from a conference that: (1) make general appropriations for the fiscal year 1996; (2) include provisions making further continuing appropriations for fiscal

year 1996; or (3) include provisions increasing or waiving the public debt limit.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Met in executive session to appoint members to investigative subcommittees concerning the Preliminary Inquiry voted on Representative Barbara-Rose Collins and the Preliminary Inquiry voted on Representative Newt Gingrich.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1996

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold oversight hearings on the management of the National Forests, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight's Subcommittee on Postal Service to examine proposals to reform the United States Postal Service, focusing on international postal operations, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters, to resume hearings to examine certain issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, 10 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and Environment, hearing on title VI of the Clean Air Act and the impact of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, 11 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, hearing regarding the rise of international organized crime, 9:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on National Security, Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment of the Committee on Science and the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans of the Committee on Resources, joint hearing on leveraging national oceanographic capabilities, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, executive, to consider pending businesses, 1 p.m., HT–2M Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight's Subcommittee on Postal Service to examine proposals to reform the United States Postal Service, focusing on international postal operations, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Thursday, January 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 4 p.m.), Senate may consider conference reports, if available, and any cleared legislative and executive business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, January 25

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.J. Res. , Balanced Budget Downpayment.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barcia, James A., Mich., E69
Bilbray, Brian P., Calif., E67
Borski, Robert A., Pa., E79
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E78
Deutsch, Peter, Fla., E76
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E72
Farr, Sam, Calif., E76, E78
Fazio, Vic, Calif., E77
Frank, Barney, Mass., E75
Gekas, George W., Pa., E73
Hefner, W.G. (Bill), N.C., E74
Hilliard, Earl F., Ala., E81
Johnson, Nancy L., Conn., E69, E70
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E74
Lightfoot, Jim, Iowa, E75
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E71, E73, E74, E75, E77
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E69
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E68, E70
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E80
Radanovich, George P., Calif., E71
Rahall, Nick J., II, W. Va., E67
Reed, Jack, R.I., E76
Schroeder, Patricia, Colo., E70
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr., Fla., E74
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E67
Smith, Linda, Wash., E81
Solomon, Gerald B.H., N.Y., E80
Torricelli, Robert G., N.J., E72
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E81
Vento, Bruce F., Minn., E78, E79
Ward, Mike, Ky., E72
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E77
Wilson, Charles, Tex., E77

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.