The House met at 12 noon. The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, just as we express our thanksgiving for all Your gifts to us, we place before You our petitions and pray that You will minister to us in the depths of our being. If our petition is for health, so grant us wholesomeness and strength for the day; if our petition is for courage, enable us to stand for truth and speak with an honest heart; if our petition is for comfort, grant us Your peace. Hear us, gracious God, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

EGYPT'S STUDIED INSULT

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time friend and supporter of Egypt, I was appalled to learn that the Government of Egypt has just issued a studied insult to the discredited discussions with Austria, it could invite Austria's distinguished head of government, Chancellor Vranitzky, who just concluded a most successful conference on the Middle East at this conference in the United States.

On the Contra aid issue, it appears that the President has decided not only to again propose Contra aid, but to increase the request after Colonel North's testimony. In justifying the aid the President also tells us that the Contras have finally gotten their act together and that they are making some military headway.

The point of all of this exercise is that Ronald Reagan has made a decision. That decision is to come out swinging at the Congress just as if we were all Sandinistas. On the budget, on military spending, on revenues, on the Persian Gulf, and now again on the Contras, goodbye to negotiations and cooperation.

At a time when our Nation desperately needs healing and unity and bipartisan cooperation between the President and Congress, Ronald Reagan has chosen to be Rambo instead of a leader and peacemaker.

SUNDAY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 3, 1987:

H.R. 1846. An act to make certain technical and conforming amendments in the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

On June 16, 1987:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution to observe the 300th Commencement exercise at the Ohio State University on June 12, 1987.

On June 18, 1987:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution recognizing the service and contributions of the Honorable William J. Cohen and...

H.R. 191. An act to authorize the expenditure of $130,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, for the operation of the Peace Corps.

H.R. 2166. An act to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, for other purposes; and...

H.R. 178. Joint resolution designating June 25, 1987, as 'National Catfish Day.'

On June 25, 1987:

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to designate the third week in June 1987 as 'National Dairy Goat Awareness Week'; and...

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution designating June 28, 1987, as 'National Catfish Day.'

On June 29, 1987:

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution designating the week beginning June 21, 1987, as 'National Outward Bound Week';

H.R. 2100. An act to designate the border station at 9510 Guidle Meridian Road, Houston, TX, as the 'Kenneth G. Ward Border Station'; and...

H.R. 2243. An act to designate the Federal Building located at 10 Causeway Street, Boston, MA, as the 'Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Federal Building.'

On June 30, 1987:

H.R. 191. An act to authorize the establishment of a Peace Garden on a site to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior.

On July 10, 1987:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution commemorating the bicentennial of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787;

H.R. 626. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Cherokee, De Kalb, and Etowah Counties, AL, and for other purposes; and...

H.R. 2450. An act to extend temporarily the governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

On July 11, 1987:

H.R. 1827. An act to designate the border station at 9510 Guidle Meridian Road, Houston, TX, as the 'Kenneth G. Ward Border Station';

H.R. 2166. An act to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, for other purposes; and...

H.R. 178. Joint resolution designating June 25, 1987, as 'National Catfish Day.'

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANTOS) laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation; which was read without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-337), I transmit herewith the nineteenth annual report relating to developments during 1984.

RONALD REAGAN.


ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to send to you the annual report of the National Science Foundation (NSF) for Fiscal Year 1986. This report describes research supported by the Foundation in the mathematical, physical, biological, social, behavioral, and information sciences, in engineering, and in education in those fields.

Achievements such as the ones described in this report are the basis for much of our Nation’s strength—its economic growth, military security, and the overall well-being of our people.

We face international challenges in science, engineering, and technology, but I am confident about our ability to meet those challenges. NSF has been and will remain a key part of the national effort to keep vital our great capabilities in research and productivity and to stay ahead of world competition through innovation and new discoveries.

I commend the Foundation’s work to you and hope you share my enthusiasm for the outstanding work it describes.

RONALD REAGAN.


THE U.S. DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT: TIME FOR CHANGE?
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THE U.S. DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT: TIME FOR CHANGE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:
effect, wrote the plans and budgets, after logging that led to the lowest-common-denominator positions. Now the Chairman, the only member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with the authority to set the auditable goals and specify the budget, is able to give the independent military advice and planning that are needed to work the services. The greater role envisioned for the Chairman now includes giving him specifically the responsibility for developing strategic and contingency plans and budget proposals. This responsibility was formerly held by the corporate body of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Second, to help the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs carry out his new duties, the Goldwater-Nichols Act gave him control over the Joint Staff, the group of about 400 staff officers that had previously assisted the Chiefs as a body. Today the staff helps him in much the same way that each service once helped the heads of his own service staff. Make no mistake about this; it is a significant increase in the authority, in the power of the Chairman to do the job that he has been given. Third, the act also created the new position of Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Vice Chairman and today that is General Herres, serves as Acting Chairman in Admiral Crowe's absence and carries out whatever duties the Chairman assigns him. Once again, just as each service chief has a vice chief, a trusted No. 2 he can rely on, so too the Chairman needs such a partner. And now he has him.

Equally as important as the changes increasing the authority of the Chairman were those measures that increased the authority of the 10 unified and specified commanders. The National Security Act of 1947 led to the creation of a series of commands for each service. The Army has the Army, the Navy has the Atlantic Command, the Pacific Command and the Strategic Air Command, that would actually do the fighting in any future war. The services were required to rotate the commands, to redistribute the troops and then turn them over to the commanders in chief, the CINC's of the unified commands who would direct the actual combat operations.

Prior to the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, the service chiefs determined the heads of each service component under a commander in chief. This meant that the component commanders, the Army, Navy, and Air Force commanders working for the CINC were subordinate to the CINC only in a nominal sense. The actual lines of authority ran back to the service chief back in Washington who controlled their rewards and punishments including promotions.

Today this is no longer true as a result of the changes signed into law last year. Now each unified commander has veto power over his subordi-

nates for the first time. He also has control over all aspects of military operations, interservice training and supplies. As in the case of the Chairman, more authority, more power was given to the CINC in order to let them do the job originally envisioned for them.

Possibly the most significant and definitely the most contentious changes found in the Goldwater-Nichols Act were those in title IV. They required the Secretary of Defense to establish an occupational category for officers involved in joint operations. In the past, officers detailed to joint duty, for example those working on the Joint Staff at the Pentagon, or working on the staff of a unified commander, were subject to pressures from their services to conform to service policy. Promotions, tenure duty assignments, and even whether or not an officer serving in the joint arena promoting a policy at variance with his own service's interests ran the risk of putting himself in jeopardy at promotion time. As a result, it was not hard to understand why bright, ambitious officers sought duty on their own service staffs rather than on the Joint Staff, serving in a joint billet could prove hazardous to their careers.

To break that reality, the Goldwater-Nichols Act included a number of provisions designed to strengthen the appeal of serving in the joint arena. It created a group of joint specialista whose primary duty will be joint operations. To protect their promotions, the service boards considering these officers must include at least one officer with a joint specialty who will be named by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Even more important is that a joint promotion board, acting in concert with the joint chief of staff, will approve the promotions of officers involved in joint operations. In addition, the new act also requires the Secretary of Defense to designate at least 1,000 critical joint duty assignments that must always be filled by joint specialty officers. The act requires that an officer may not be selected for the joint specialty until he completes a joint education program and a full joint tour. These and other provisions in title IV show the importance given by Congress to improving the joint, multiservice perspective.
under one set of rules must be grandfathered so they are not unfairly disadvantaged under a new set of rules.

The 1980s will be a crucial reconstruction period. And in the legislation we crafted last year, we put in a provision, a waiver, for the Secretary of Defense to use over this period. It allows him to exempt officers with critical combat skills, such as Navy nuclear officers, from the school sequencing requirement.

Before we go about changing last year's legislation those of us who championed the issue of reorganization are all anxious to see the Administration implement the recommendations of the Reorganization Act. If after it is put into effect, and problems can be documented, I am fairly confident that we would be more amenable to making changes. After all it is only 9 months since the bill became law.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE
Looking to the future, I think I can make the following predictions with a fair amount of confidence. Congress will continue to monitor the efforts at implementing the Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act and the recommendations of the Packard Commission. This oversight role is probably the most effective role played by Congress. Having key administration officials come over to Capitol Hill and testify is one way to get them to pay attention to an issue, any issue, be it toxic waste or defense organization.

On other defense matters, I think it can be said that a new generation of Members and other committees that now have charge of the public duty and to the stewardship granted by these great institutions want to see full implementation of the Reorganization Act. The Pentagon and at defense contractors will continue to monitor the efforts at implementing both the Goldwater-Nichols Reorganization Act and the recommendations of the Packard Commission. This oversight role is probably the most effective role played by Congress. Having key administration officials come over to Capitol Hill and testify is one way to get them to pay attention to an issue, any issue, be it toxic waste or defense organization.

The truth of the matter is that the Reagan defense buildup is over. It has been for 2 years now.

The administration requested a reasonable level of growth for defense this year, 3 percent after inflation. While the defense needs of the Nation call for such an increase, the current budget crisis we face simply will not permit it. We will be doing well just to maintain current spending levels after inflation.

As a result, in an era of tight budgets, Department of Defense priorities will have to be rearranged. Those priorities of the past few years, research and development and procurement, will give way to the readiness accounts, personnel, and operations and maintenance. And this will be the pattern followed over the next few years. The two Armed Services Committees are quite aware of the conditions that led to the "hollow" army of the late 1970's. That is why we are determined to move immediately and aggressively to restore readiness and operation and maintenance accounts.

I think we should be aware of some other changes taking place today. Today, in the 1980's, there are three key actors in the defense drama: the Pentagon, the defense industry, and Congress. From a passive role 25 years ago, it has now embarked upon a quite active one. This is the result of two traumatic events in recent American history, Vietnam and Watergate.

One of the most important struggles going on now is the effort on the part of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate to reestablish their primacy in the area of defense. It will be a long effort to convince other Members and other committees that the Armed Services Committees are serious about overseeing the Department of Defense. Many of the senior members of the two Armed Services Committees in the era of strong committee chairmen, when the committees were much less disposed to question the executive branch and the Department of Defense.

However, a new generation of Members is coming into its own, and they are quite eager to come to grips with the many issues that are involved in defense. Congress would do itself well to allow these Members who devote the greater portion of their duties to defense, to take the lead in overseeing the workings of the Defense Department. This would be the middle course to take: neither excessive reliance on the executive branch nor excessive congressional interference that has been the norm since Vietnam.

We in the Congress have our challenges set out for us. Because of Congress, much has been done to reorganize the Department of Defense, but we should not stop there. We must make sure that what we have done works, and we must reaffirm our own role in the scheme of things.

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

IN DEFENSE OF MY HONOR, INTEGRITY, AND COMPETENCY

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue what I call "in defense of my honor, integrity, and competency," as a Member of U.S. House of Representatives representing the 20th Congressional District of the State of Texas, which today consists of most, but not all, of the city of San Antonio, TX, but which for the first 8 years of my almost 26 years of service here consisted of the entire country. In fact, I had the honor of representing the second largest or the most numerous district in those 7½ or 8 years in the Congress before the implementation of the Supreme Court decision of 1962 of one man-one vote, the phrase that popularly designated that great decision of the Supreme Court. And I am certainly one of those that welcomed it, because I had the second largest number of citizens in any given congressional district to represent, but I was given the same budget as my next-door neighbor who had less than 300,000 to represent.

So I for one was grateful for that decision because it has at least partially enabled those of us attempting to fulfill this role of representation to carry out our duties, which is a tough role, especially if one really seeks to be worthy of that descriptive honor, "Representative," particularly in districts such as mine that have all of the social, ethnic, racial, and economic complexities on a microscopic scale that you find on a larger scale in the Nation or in the State of Texas as a whole.

So I have, through the course of my stewardship granted by these great citizens every 2 years, endeavored to first of all predicate my role on the basis of efficiency, total, and complete honesty and candor, both as to the discharge of the public duty and to the personal discharge of this duty in association with this name and title of "Representative"; second, on another fundamental premise that has yet to be written historically, for it was at that time a country in exile within a city, and I was born into a family of what today
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would be called refugees but in that
day and time were just called horses of "Meskans" coming in to eat up
the substance of the country. So in that context I grew up, and naturally it was
expected that it was a question of time and process that one would try
the issue. There was no time at which it would never be be-
longed. And that was a very, very long
sojourn. Were it not for the interven-
tion of the war, tragic as it was and
costly as it was, but it did tumble bar-
riers. The emergence into light of the
tics was in that vein of one of the first
bearing a name such as mine to break
through the then tightly controlled
and still to a certain degree tightly
controlled political, social, and eco-
nomic curtain that existed in our
home society.

So I have reported that as a Member
of this body and, therefore, am
charged with the responsibility of not
only using considerably in last few
years and which I
found for capital cases, including
murder, and others whose bodies
have not.

Yet, here is a district attorney
taking a case which there is no record
in the annuals of Bexar County Juris-
diction, or I doubt anywhere in Texas,
where a simple assault case of this
nature would be filed on a district or
county level.

If so, every single barroom fight,
every single brawl, every single street
encounter would be clogging beyond
belief the dockets of these courts, so that usually these are
court matters, municipal court
matters, or the justice of the peace
court, so the district attorney kept
complaining to all who would listen
that he could have never, ever
mentioned that to him, even in the beginning, except
for the fact that he was under great
pressure from the newspapers.

The newspapers in San Antonio are
something else. They are both absent-
tee-owned. One is a Rupert Murdoch
publication now; the other is a Hearst
publication.

Also, to complicate those of us serv-
ing strictly on a local level, and being
really the only local voices over which
we have any control, every single means, whether it is radio or
television are all absentee-owned in
San Antonio, so that plus the fact that we
still have the last vestiges, the only
city I know in the entire United
States, or for that matter, I guess in
the English-speaking world, that still
has in its most intimate and important
activity such as the utility, the old
rotten borough system where the
type do not have any direct control
of this great monopoly, the monopo-
lies that have the power to ration the
water, the light, the gas which in
today's context of urban living is as
necessary as the oxygen we must have
to live with; and yet, those lone voices
such as mine that I raised on the city
council for the first time, and after 3
years of bitter struggle in which at-
tempts were made to frame me, scare
me off the city council, physical assau-
ls and threats such as a car coming up as I was parking my car in
the back alley of my house at that
time.

Somebody fired three .38 shots into
the garage door. I mean, it was impos-
sible to have missed me, so obviously
the intention was to frighten and to
scare me, and I guess this is where
the newspaper's pressure from the newspapers.

In fact, on December 4, I was there
hosting two very great and honorable
colleagues. One was a retired ser-
gent major who had served in the
Army for 30 years and 7 months with
great honor and heroism, both in
Korea and Vietnam, and whose retire-
ment ceremony I could not attend,
though invited, at Fort Sam Houston,
which is located in the very center of
my district, on October 17 last, be-
cause we were in session here. When
the House is in session, for the past
25½ years I have made it a point to be
here. So my record of attendance is
99.9 percent. That one-tenth of 1 per-
cent occurred when my mother was
dying. I mean, I was called, but certainly no
thing on earth would have kept me
from her bedside.

I say that because, given the years
that I have served, 3 years on the city
council level in a public elective capac-
ty, and it was provided for in the
Representative branch of the Government.
They are provided for in the Constitu-
tion, and it was provided for in the tra-
dition of the Mother Parliament, the
English or the British Parliament.
Through experience, it was known
that the executive and the king would
try to intimidate members by arrest,
false and otherwise, or by threat and
corruption of the economic type, so they
learned that one of the basic constitu-
tional provisions in that form of Eng-
lish constitution was that no member
would be arrested elsewhere for any-
thing said in the course of debate or
proceedings of that great Mother Par-
liament.

We have that in our Constitution,
and in Article I, section 6, there is a
very short phrase. Nevertheless, earli-
er this year, to be exact, on May 4, the
local State district attorney saw fit,
and from his description of it, I was
agonizing
considerations, to file a charge
of simple assault, and as classified in,
Texas jurisprudence, criminal juris-
prudence, a simple assault, class A,
resulting from an encounter that was
widely publicized that occurred last
December 4, 1986, at a restaurant that
I had been using or attending as a
guest for almost 40 years and which I
have used considerably in last few
years.

In fact, on December 4, I was there
hosting two very great and honorable
colleagues. One was a retired ser-
gent major who had served in the
Army for 30 years and 7 months with
great honor and heroism, both in
Korea and Vietnam, and whose retire-
ment ceremony I could not attend,
though invited, at Fort Sam Houston,
which is located in the very center of
my district, on October 17 last, be-

There are now pending in the
records of Bexar County over 15 yet
to be solved homicides, murders, young
women disappearing totally, obviously
murdered, and others whose bodies
have been found, but whose murderers
have not.

Yet, here is a district attorney
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in the annuals of Bexar County Juris-
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for the fact that he was under great
pressure from the newspapers.
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Also, to complicate those of us serv-
ing strictly on a local level, and being
really the only local voices over which
we have any control, every single means, whether it is radio or
television are all absentee-owned in
San Antonio, so that plus the fact that we
still have the last vestiges, the only
city I know in the entire United
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activity such as the utility, the old
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type do not have any direct control
of this great monopoly, the monopo-
lies that have the power to ration the
water, the light, the gas which in
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necessary as the oxygen we must have
to live with; and yet, those lone voices
such as mine that I raised on the city
council for the first time, and after 3
years of bitter struggle in which at-
tempts were made to frame me, scare
me off the city council, physical assau-
ls and threats such as a car coming up as I was parking my car in
the back alley of my house at that
time.

Somebody fired three .38 shots into
the garage door. I mean, it was impos-
sible to have missed me, so obviously
the intention was to frighten and to
scare me, and I guess this is where
the newspaper's pressure from the newspapers.

In fact, on December 4, I was there
hosting two very great and honorable
colleagues. One was a retired ser-
gent major who had served in the
Army for 30 years and 7 months with
great honor and heroism, both in
Korea and Vietnam, and whose retire-
ment ceremony I could not attend,
though invited, at Fort Sam Houston,
which is located in the very center of
my district, on October 17 last, be-
was my county that gave the State delegation that went to the State capital of Austin, TX, and formulated the 17 different acts that were the most militant against organized labor in the history of any English-speaking-world leading up to the Civil War.

Fortunately, it took some years, but at least even the Texas Supreme Court declared most of those acts unconstitutional, though some are still on the books. They came from my county.

One bill would punish by death anybody proclaiming to call himself a Communist. Fortunately, that did not get enacted, because they had enough common sense over in the State senate; but I am giving this as an example of what has come out of my county, so that when I won election to the State senate in 1956, which was totally unexpected—I did not expect to win, and nobody else expected me to win with no organized support—the reason I was able to win against the man that was considered unbeatable, and this is why I tell all and sundry, the people of this country are an elite. Economically we are in the upper 9 or 10 percent of the country.

The so-called Hispanic now, but which has been called variously Latin American, this is what it was 30 years ago, and now it is Hispanic, anything to keep it from being called Mexican, which it really is, Mexican-American, although I abhor hyphenated Americanisms, and I have abhorred this all along.

I have never traded on racism or ethnocentrism. I am the only one with a name such as mine that has stood up and fought against what I have called reverse discrimination.

At a time when it certainly was not any more popular to say that in 1970, 1971 and for which I almost got killed, of all places in Boulder, CO, and I did not see any civil liberties people, I did not see any of the ethnic or racial minority civil rights groups protesting that, and it did not make any difference, because here I am still elected a public official in a free, open election as to the dictates of those citizens who take their duties seriously.

Fortunately, those are the overwhelming sources of supply, and I ran with a total expenditure of $750 of which $250 I borrowed in 1955 and the only member of that city council who got reelected and the first member of the city council under this form of government who was elected as an independent in 1855, and in 1956 I resigned and announced to run for the Senate.

What was the picture? The picture was that you had less than 113,000 qualified electors, that number, if you put both the racial as well as the ethnic minority together and the qualified electors from those two groups they would not have constituted 10 percent. So how could I have been elected after three recounts, three recounts, by 309 votes?
I have never been arrested for anything, including a traffic violation. As I stated in the beginning, I believe that no one had any confusion as to what is mine and what is the people's or somebody else's.

As the Latins used to say, I mean the one about the Roman law, the difference between the meum and the tuum, and I have never had any confusion as to that and this is why after 35 years in public elective office I can say with great pride and satisfaction, even though according to our standards of ethics in America, I am not much of one because of the size or lack of size of my bank account, but I am not either any richer and I am not any poorer than when I first got into politics.

I could have had a choice of being an engineer because I studied engineering first, or an attorney, because I got my law degree, but chose not to practice law. And the reason was that my experience in the juvenile court, forever, forever, made up my mind in that respect.

So where are we here today? It is intimately connected with this great visit we were privileged to make to Philadelphia this last weekend to commemorate the Constitutional Convention. So many newspapers reported the first Congress because this is the 200th Congress, but at the end of this Congress and the beginning of the next one will be the real commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the First Congress, and that will be March 4, 1989.

Where are we in America today? That is the issue. Will we at this critical juncture, will we reaffirm these basic principles or will we not?

I have been speaking out in the case of the assassination of the Federal district judge John Wood, because it was the first crime of its kind in the history of the Federal judiciary. So I had criticism of what you are talking about. But what was my greatest satisfaction is when 2 years later in May at home I had a call, and it was from the Director then of the FBI, Judge Webster, who said, Congressman, I am calling you exactly 3 hours in advance before we announce the first four indictments in the case of Judge Wood. And the reason I am calling you is because you are the one that deserves the credit for having enabled us to have finally received the resources, and for having kept the case and the situation on the case alive over this difficult 2-year period.

What is my experience with the FBI? Very questionable, because in 1976 the FBI reported on October 30 that they had information of a $35,000 contract on my life. And then they would not give me any information, so
it took 3 years and going through the Freedom of Information Act, and also the advent of Judge Webster, because his predecessor, Director Kelly, had refused. But Judge Webster said, yes, if you want to go through the Freedom of Information Act, we will be glad, and all you have to do is pay for the cost of the copying, which was $26.75. And lo and behold, here comes this massive document that shows that there is a dossier on me, since I was in the State Senate, and that sharing the platform with then U.S. Senator Ralph Yarborough at what, the State convention of the AFL-CIO.

Then a note from the agent in charge in San Antonio to the Director, J. Edgar himself, stating Senator Henry B. Gonzalez, liberal Democrat, just elected yesterday to the Congress with Communist help. I could not believe it. A congressional race during the first year of John Kennedy's term, a national issue. Like al Guard and the Somoza regime and the same limitation of resources. In just this century seven times. We have invaded that place in which through example, and not by force, a nation has to happen. We are on the verge, and all we have to do in my book is to regain our senses, but individually in the case of our leaders in Congress, not the Commander in Chief, because for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives and the Senate we mandated a war powers limitation act. Senator Ralph Yarborough at what, the beginning of increased activities. What folly. What contradiction. Why should we not be saved from being the laughing stock?

Then one of the speakers today during 1-minute speeches addressed the question of the Persian Gulf crisis in Egypt. That has been growing for some time. But my colleagues, you have 2,000 American warriors in the Sinai right now. I have been speaking out for 2 years about the peril they are in. They are hostages. They are hostages, yet how many of our fellow Americans know that?

Let me say, my colleagues, if what I fear easily can happen in that Sinai with almost 2,000 of our men there, vulnerable, exposed, and really hostages, happens, then it will be you, the Congress, not the Commander in Chief, because for the first time in the history of the House of Representatives and the Senate we mandated a military deployment.

This is why I rose to protest it in December 1982, when that resolution was approved. But who cares about those men? The only time you heard about such an operation was when the 225 soldiers were killed. The headlines and these makeshift, incredibly worthless craft for economy reasons, they tell us, crashed at Gander in Newfoundland. These were the men that were coming over for a Christmas vacation and died because we continued to subvert all but the best of intentions, economy, balanced budget, so-called, a practice that I have reviled since Vietnam since our soldiers were being transported in these private craft, and the armament was being transported in our military, safer craft. And the only way a soldier could ride in a military craft was in a body bag coming back dead from Vietnam, just like it is today. And I rose and spoke then. And it was not a Republican President, those who accuse me of partisanship. It was a great friend and neighbor, Lyndon Johnson, and I got the same reply when I made the inquiry of the Defense Department and they said just 2 years ago from the Assistant Secre...
tary of State who said why, oh yes, even in time of war we will utilize 90 percent private craft, unregulated, just like such lines as the Southern Airline, the Aero Airline, because those are CPLUS operations. Yet, they took our regular Defense Force, the Air Force, and they were able to walk away because, as in the case of the accident last October 7 at Kelly Air Force Base, which is in my district, the Air Force personnel have no control over the airworthiness of that craft.
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It has no control over the crew because it is private and the FAA is supposed to be but the FAA testified before our committees after the Gander disaster that they themselves were not equipped to regulate. So what it means is that the Congress can't even discuss the constitutional responsibility. This is what we are supposed to be celebrating the 200th anniversary of Friday and this is why I say that God does not vouchsafe that we will preserve it until 1869. Only we, by whatever force, that we must either through fear or though favor we do not want to exert the constitutional responsibility of hemming in, reigning in an unrestrained President when his own folly is unbelievable, as is the case of the 241 marines in Beirut.

I took this podium for 14 months to ask the President, "Mr. President, what is the mission of the Marines in Beirut?" Of course, this is the first President of the six I have worked with who does not answer a Congresswoman's letter. I first wrote him a letter with what is the mission of the Marines in Beirut? Of course, I then wrote him a letter and when he did not answer I then took to the floor.

I know that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our prime, top military experts, had advised unanimously against the deployment of the Marines in Beirut under those circumstances. And yet the Commander in Chief willfully, callously, calculatedly, tried to do it. Do you think I trust that judgment anymore?

Well, the polls say that maybe the American people do. I do not know. All I know is that I would never.

All history shows that this leadership, false as it is dangerous in dangerous moments to our country; what he prepared to do now against the obvious overwhelming opinion of not only the Congress but the public? To put our whole flag and its might, honor, and this Congress did not call to account the Commander in Chief who was faithless, who has at all times, as it is said "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who then shall prepare for battle?"

Who then shall prepare for battle? Certainly our President's trumpet has been more than uncertain; it has been cracked and thereby not only uncertain but deviologic in its sound.

Domestically, these same forces that are listened to that defined who is a Communist in Central America, if you ask Mr. J. Peter Grace, who by his own admission has very, very strong authoritarian tendencies and outlooks, any labor group who protests labor conditions is a Communist.

DEMOCRACY AND THE ECONOMY IN CHILE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Olver). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to respond to this afternoon to an article by David Gallagher entitled "The Complex—and Little Understood—Challenge of Chile," that appeared in the June 12, 1987, issue of the Wall Street Journal. The likely but unfortunate impact of Mr. Gallagher's arguments is to undermine those efforts in Chile and abroad that seek to restore democracy to that country.

Because the Wall Street Journal has been unwilling to print by prepared response of June 25, 1987, in the length of an article or letter necessary to respond adequately to his views on the economic and military situation in Chile, I am required to use this forum—the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives—to address important issues related to a restoration of democracy in Chile.

DEMOCRACY AND THE ECONOMY IN CHILE

In a Wall Street Journal article published June 12, David Gallagher asserts that the popular understanding among journalists, academics, and economic successes. Further, he suggests that many in the United States are too quick to oppose the Pin-
ochet government because they hear only the opposition's side of the story. Mr. Gallagher argues that the deregulation of the economy achieved under General Pinochet has set the country "on course to break the mold of underdevelopment," and has thus made him "less popular" with the Chilean people than United States and Chilean politicians like to admit. Finally, he stresses the opposition's failure to produce a workable alternative.

THE STATE OF THE CHILEAN ECONOMY

Mr. Gallagher is correct in noting that the Pinochet government's privatization policies have been beneficial to the Chilean economy. However, the government's economic management has been only a qualified success, according to a great many observers, including the prominent MIT economist Rudiger Dornbusch, Dr. Dornbusch writes: "The remarkable fact is that per capita consumption in Chile today is where it was in 1980. Chile's large external debt was incurred during the period immediately after 1979, when the Pinochet government fixed the exchange rate in an effort to bring down inflation. Because inflation in Chile remained high relative to world standards, the real exchange rate appreciated and Chile lost competitiveness in world markets. The relationship between the Pinochet government's economic policies and Chile's export-oriented economy was a large-scale misallocation of resources and an outward flow of capital. In a paper presented at a Washington Office on Latin America Conference last September, Dr. Dornbusch writes: "The true extent of General Pinochet's present popularity is difficult to determine, since the polls taken by the junta will not permit free elections. Instead of democracy in Chile, General Pinochet has proclaimed "protected democracy," an ideological approach which indicates that democratic institutions will eventually be restored to Chile not through democratic processes such as elections, but only under the guidance of the military. In their discussions of "protected democracy," the chiefs of the three branches of the armed forces and the head of the national police will select a single candidate for a plebiscite in 1997. If approved by what appears will be a largely preselected electorate, this candidate will serve until 1997.

There is substantial evidence that General Pinochet intends this candidate to be himself. For example, he has promised to do "whatever is necessary to prevent a clique of irresponsible politicians from taking over the country," and has begun his campaign by increasing his travels and publicity, according to an article in the June 22, 1987, edition of The New York Times.

Continued military rule will strengthen the Communists, who use military rule as an excuse to remain a viable option on the political spectrum. Such a bolstering of the Communist position is, of course, contrary to the intentions of the military; thus it is no surprise that three of Chile's top military leaders have expressed doubts that a military figure is the ideal candidate for the plebiscite.

THE STATUS OF THE DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION

The moderate, democratic opposition parties in Chile have no opportunity to engage in democratic debate or to build consensus through a democratic process. Expecting these parties to have one candidate or one economic or political plan for Chile is similar to assuming that the democratic and Republican parties in the United States could agree, absent a nominating and electoral process upon the next President and a single platform.

The opposition needs a reactivation of the democratic process, so that it can publically debate the economic problems facing the country and arrive at a solution acceptable to the majority of Chileans.

The most urgent task of the democratic opposition is to present clearly to the Chilean public their alternative to the present government. They must come forth with specific proposals on such issues as property rights, the legal status of antidemocratic forces, and human rights abuses in order to show the more conservative members of Chilean society that they would be an effective partner in building democracy.

CALL FOR U.S. ACTIONS

In the absence of any tangible movement on the announcement of a consensus plebiscite candidate acceptable to broad segments of the democratic opposition, the hour is drawing near when the United States must put its full support behind the call for free elections in Chile.

The relationship between the United States and Chile over a century and a half has been that of two friendly democracies with common values. Except for this relatively brief period, the two nations have shared common values and interests. The United States aspires to relate to Chile in the coming centuries in the traditional manner, as two friendly democracies with common values.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

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. COMBEST) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.)
Mr. DANNEMEYER, for 60 minutes, on July 28, 29, and 30.
Mr. INHOFFE, for 60 minutes, on July 21.
Mr. SHUMWAY, for 60 minutes, on July 27, 29, and 30, and for 60 minutes, on August 4 and 6.

(The Following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)
Mr. ANUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BOXER of Michigan, for 60 minutes, on July 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:
(The Following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. PEASE.
Mr. ANDERSON in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan in 10 instances.
Mr. BONER in five instances.
Mr. BOXER.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. FLORES.
Mr. STARK in two instances.
Mr. LEVINE of California.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT
Mr. ANUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did July 16, 1987 present to the President, for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:
H.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to designate July 16, 1987, as "Snow White Week."

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tommorow, Tuesday, July 21, 1987, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:
1773. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Army's proposed letter(s) of offer to Sweden for defense articles estimated to cost $50 million or more (Transmittal No. 87-29), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.
1774. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting copies of Final Regulations—Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Hawaiian Natives Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1332(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.
1775. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting copies of Final Regulations—Regional Centers Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.
1776. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting copies of Final Regulations: Clearinghouses for the Handicapped President's bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
1778. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice that the Department of Defense has provided defense articles and services to the Philippines under the authority of P.D. 86-13, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
1779. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Army's proposed letter(s) of offer to Sweden for defense articles and services estimated to cost $14 million or more (Transmittal No. 87-29), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
1780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the President's bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
1781. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the United States's response to the United Kingdom's most-favored-nation agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
1782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's notice of an altered Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(c); to the Committee on Government Operations.
1783. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's report on an amended system of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(c); to the Committee on Government Operations.
1784. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the inventory of accounts with spending authority and permanent appropriations (GAO/AFMD-87-44A, June 1987); to the Committee on Government Operations.
1785. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the inventory of accounts with spending authority and permanent appropriations, 1987" (GA/AFMD- 87-44A, July 1987); to the Committee on Government Operations.
1786. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on salinity control on public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the Colorado River Basin, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1932(k)(3); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
1787. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed revision to the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, relating to the lease of certain lands from the Isleta Indian Tribe for a geological interpretation station to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the proposed revision to the acreage limitation rules and regulations, 43 CFR 431-63; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on procurement from small and other business firms for October 1986 through April 1987, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 6509(b); to the Committee on Small Business.

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting the United States' report on trade between the United States and the nonmarket economy countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1242(b); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting notification that the President, pursuant to section 652 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended and section 514 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1987, proposes to use the authority of section 610(a) of the act to transfer funds available under section 219 of the act (Israel prototype desalting plant) to the economic support funds account of the Jordan Water Development Program, (Presidential Determination No. 87-18); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Operations.

A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification that the Department of the Interior proposes to consign with the Departments of Agriculture, Army, and the Tennessee Valley Authority a letter announcing the President's authority under section 606 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1984 and the effects of agricultural water projects, which policy will address the double subsidy issue directly and will improve the credibility of Reclamation projects; jointly, to the Com-
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 2121. A bill to authorize and direct the National Park Service to assist the State of Georgia in relocating a highway affecting the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in Georgia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 100-234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 2121. A bill to authorize and direct the National Park Service to assist the State of Georgia in relocating a highway affecting the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park in Georgia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 100-234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

[Omitted From the Record of July 15, 1987]

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 2685. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to improve security procedures, and for other purposes; with amendments, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary for a period ending not later than October 15, 1987 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendments as fall within the jurisdictions of those committees pursuant to clause 1(h) and (m), rule X, respectively (Rept. No. 100-223, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

[Submitted July 29, 1987]

Under clause 5 of rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:


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. RODINO:

H.R. 2869. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code to improve the treatment of claims for certain re­ tiree benefits of former employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 2970. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide protections against catastrophic medical expenses under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUCKABY:

H.R. 2971. A bill to provide continuing au­ thority to the Secretary of Agriculture for recovering costs associated with cotton classing services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 2972. A bill to provide for a 10-year fixed term participation period for socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns under the Small Business Act, to provide for expedited certification of such concerns, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Small Business and Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

165. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to an increase in the minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

July 20, 1987

H.R. 136: Mr. Kolbe, Mr. Boulter, and Mr. Robert F. Smith.

H.R. 192: Mr. Martinen, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Porter.

H.R. 378: Mr. Hochbreuer.

H.R. 618: Mr. Molloy.

H.R. 762: Mr. Owens of New York and Mr. Torricelli.


H.R. 1036: Mr. Towns, Mr. Volker, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Beverly, Mr. Horton, Mr. Oberstar, Mr. Roe, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Kolbe, and Mr. Richardson.

H.R. 1104: Mrs. Boxer.

H.R. 1115: Mr. Mavouolle, Mr. Molloy, and Mrs. Meyers of Kansas.

H.R. 1349: Mrs. Martin of Illinois, Mr. Delay, Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Bellenson, Mr. Worthy, and Mr. Staggars.

H.R. 1711: Mr. Gereason.

H.R. 1728: Mr. Mead, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Skeleton, and Mr. Baker.

H.R. 1782: Mrs. Byron.

H.R. 1832: Mr. Hutto, Mr. Ireland, and Mr. Price of Illinois.

H.R. 1887: Mr. Kotte, Mr. Colombo, Mr. Espy, Mr. Rowland of Connecticut, Mr. Harris, Mr. Coleman of Missouri, Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Patterson, Mr. Penn, and Mr. Martin of New York.

H.R. 2138: Mr. Frank and Mr. Hughes.

H.R. 2243: Mr. Gurganus, Mr. Solomon, Mr. Gallow, Mr. Cardin, and Mr. Fawell.

H.R. 2344: Mr. Florio, Mr. Shaggy, Mr. Worthy, Mr. Porter, Mr. Towns, and Mr. Udall.

H.R. 2881: Mr. Darden, Mr. Tallon, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Grant, Mr. Ray, Mr. Martin of Ohio, Mr. Tarkan, Mr. MacKay, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Tauke, Mr. Worley, and Mr. Lancaster.

H.R. 2911: Mr. Owens of Utah.

H.R. 2920: Mr. Oakes, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Schuster, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Aspin, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Neal, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Owen of New York, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Kostmayer, Mr. Weldon, and Mr. Wexman.

H.R. 2928: Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Dowdy of Mississippi, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Fauntroy, Mr. Atchue, Mr. Hoag, Mr. McCandless, Mr. Magee, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Morrisson of Connecticut, Mr. Moakley, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Harris, Mr. Porter, Mr. Morella, Mr. Corlello, Mr. Slaughter, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Sundquist, Mr. Chapman, Mr. Garcia, Mr. Burton of Indiana, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Bilello, Ms. Pelosi, Mr. Hayes of Louisiana, Mr. Coleman of Texas, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Applegate, Mr. Bosco, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Frank, Ms. Slughofer of New York, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Foglietta, and Mr. Florio.

H.R. 362: Mr. Pelosi, Mr. Thomas of California, and Mr. Savage.

H.R. 2128: Mr. Clay of Missouri, Mr. Miller of Washington, Mr. Smith of Florida, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Hutto, Mr. Matsui, Mr. Shumway, Mr. Spartz, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Nelson of Utah, Mr. Donald E. Lukens, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Guerini, Mr. Carper, Mr. Torricelli, Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania, Mr. Owens of New York, Mr. Lewis of Florida, Mr. Tepican, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Nowak, Mr. Eggreich, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Dannemeyer, Mr. Coburn, Mr. Delahunt, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. McGaill, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Horton, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Dwyer of New Jersey, Mr. Fawell, Mr. Chapman, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Lagomarsino, and Mr. Henry.

H.R. 300: Mr. Dyson, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Stallings, Mrs. Meyers of Kansas.

H.R. 3158: Mr. Conte, Mr. Berman, Mr. Miller of Washington, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Lewis of California, Mr. Gray of Illinois, Mr. Kostmayer, Mr. Lopez, Mr. Foster, Mr. Lechman of Florida, and Mr. Flake.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota and Mr. Barnard.

H. Con. Res. 143: Mr. Towns, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Espy, Mr. Foglietta, Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Atkins, Mr. Evans, Mr. Fauntroy, and Mr. Cantwell.

H. Res. 141: Mrs. Boos.

H. Res. 205: Mr. Roe.

H. Res. 210: Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Henry, Mrs. Meyers of Kansas, Mr. Parish, Mr. Neal, Mr. Schaffer, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Dannemeyer, and Mr. Upton.

H. Res. 213: Mr. Archer, Mr. Dzigubravi, Mr. Dornan of California, Mr. Hayes of Illinois, Mr. Howard, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Falcetti, Mr. Lantos, Mr. Siskorske, Mr. Torricelli, and Mr. Towns.