

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 9, 1991

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 9, 1991.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

The hearts of people everywhere, O God, cry for peace and justice in our world. From many voices, young and old, from many lands and cultures, people pray that the terror of war may be put aside and that the present fear may be overcome by hope. May our abhorrence of hostility encourage each of us to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with You. Hear our prayer, O God. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] will please come forward and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CAMP 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

FMLN GUERRILLAS ATTEMPT TO KILL U.S. INVESTIGATORS

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, we have just learned that FMLN guerrillas in El Salvador have attempted to kill the eight U.S. Army investigators who were sent down there to investigate the murder of our U.S. Army helicopter crew last week. When our eight U.S. investigators were exiting the site of the atrocity, six FMLN guerrillas opened fire on them, attempting to murder them.

I think this clearly demonstrates once again that the FMLN Communist guerrillas are brutal killers. They are not interested in peace in El Salvador but, rather, in replacing the duly elected democratic government with a Marxist dictatorship. Hopefully, those Americans who have given aid and comfort and indeed financial support to the FMLN Communist guerrillas in El Salvador will rethink their position based on this additional evidence of this attempt by these brutal killers to kill U.S. servicemen.

PUBLIC OPINION SUPPORTS CONTINUING SANCTIONS, REJECTS WAR

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, based on four public hearings that I have held in the State of Vermont, and based on the mail and the telephone calls that my office is receiving, it is my belief that the people of Vermont are overwhelmingly convinced that the crisis in the Persian Gulf can be resolved in a nonviolent manner through the continuation of strong economic sanctions against Iraq—sanctions which are rapidly destroying the Iraqi economy and Saddam Hussein's war making capabilities.

As it happens I share those beliefs, and am convinced that at a time when this Nation has a \$3 trillion debt and is looking at the largest deficit in its history; has a banking system on the verge of collapse; a health care system no longer working for ordinary Americans; an educational system which is underfunded and failing; an industrial and manufacturing base which is rapidly becoming second or third rate compared to Japan and Europe—it is my belief that a war in the Persian

Gulf now, an absolutely unnecessary war, would be a terrible mistake that this country would regret for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns that I have had throughout this entire discussion on the Persian Gulf is that the President has refused to be straightforward with the American people and answer some of the tough questions that millions of Americans are asking. Later this afternoon, in 5-minute remarks, I hope to raise some of those questions—questions relating to potential casualties, the potential cost of such a war, and the nature of or relationship with such feudalistic dictatorships as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

SUPPORT URGED FOR WINDFALL PROFIT TAX ON OIL COMPANIES

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, while belts are tightening across the country and our constituents are scraping the coins at the bottom of their wallets to pay the heating bill, the oil merchants are filling their 10-gallon hats to the brim with cash.

Need convincing? Look at Chevron's release that their fourth quarter earnings would be around \$700 million. A \$2 per share dividend.

And look at the recent Department of Energy report which surveyed 17 major oil and gas producers and found their third quarter profits up 685 percent over 1989. During that very same quarter, almost half-a-million Americans lost their jobs.

It's a scandal, but we can stop it right now. Cosponsor my windfall profit tax, and do your part to keep the greedy oil companies honest.

THE OVERRIDING ISSUE FACING CONGRESS MUST BE THE GULF, BUT DOMESTIC PROBLEMS DEMAND AND DESERVE ATTENTION

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East grows more tense and more ominous as the January 15 deadline for the Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait approaches.

I am pleased that my colleagues and I here in Congress will have the opportunity to debate and discuss the role of the United States in the Middle East later this week.

□ 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.

I am further pleased that the House has a range of resolutions before it including resolutions urging the continued enforcement of economic sanctions against Iraq while diplomatic efforts to solve the impasse continue: Resolutions I support.

To resolutions giving the President some sort of vague, open-ended authority to take offensive action against Iraq: Resolutions about which I have reservations.

I also believe, however, that the crisis in the gulf should not serve to distract the Congress, the administration, and the Nation from addressing pressing domestic concerns as well.

The other day, the President used the "R" word, the dreaded "R" word: Recession.

The Nation is in recession. There is widespread unemployment around the country. These domestic issues—housing, homelessness, unemployment, health insurance, and our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, to name a few—need to be addressed by Congress despite our preoccupation with the gulf crisis.

DISTURBING DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BALTICS

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

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the deepest concern about new Soviet interventions in the Baltic States.

Whatever the gravity of events in the Persian Gulf or elsewhere, the current government in Moscow must understand that the American people will not allow themselves to be diverted from our historic identification with the Baltic peoples and the just cause of Baltic independence.

The United States stands unequivocally for the individual rights of minority groups within the Soviet Union. We can do no less for the collective national rights of the Baltic Republics.

Without brash bluster or meek equivocation, this Congress must leave no doubt that America's deepening rapprochement with Soviet Russia is inevitably jeopardized by new Muscovite coercion in the Baltics. Soviet troops have no business in Vilnius, no right to seize television studios or coerce parliaments. Democracy and self-determination are principles that must be respected as universal, not selective. They are the linchpins of justice in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has no choice but to identify in the starkest way possible with the common fate of the Baltic peoples, who appear to be living under a new reign of Stalinist-style terror.

□ 1210

UNDATED DECLARATION OF WAR A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

(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, The President of the United States yesterday requested that we provide him with an undated declaration of war. I feel that voting for such a blank check is a very, very dangerous precedent for this body, that really will only make it into a rubberstamp in the future, and I certainly hope we do not do that.

But for those who are very anxious to join the President in giving him this authority to commit American troops whenever he wants to combat, let me remind them there is even more they can do. Forty-seven years ago, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., resigned from the Senate, saying in his letter to his colleagues that the fact that the United States was entering a period of large-scale ground fighting gave him the definite conclusion that he felt that he should join and serve his country as a combat soldier. He was not only willing to vote, he was willing to go.

For those who are that anxious, I hope they consider ex-Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.'s plea.

CONGRESS SHOULD GRANT VOTE OF CONFIDENCE TO PRESIDENT

(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, now is the time for the Congress of the United States to grant a vote of confidence to the President of the United States. After all, the entire world in one way or another through the United Nations, through individual consultations, has granted that confidence to the President of the United States. Our Armed Forces in the desert of Saudi Arabia has given a vote of confidence to the President of the United States time and time again. The American people, in poll after poll, in a substantial majority, has indicated their confidence in the President of the United States.

What a shame it would be, it would be an utter betrayal, if the Congress of the United States would fail to grant that vote of confidence in the President of the United States.

This is the time to rally around the President. It is the right thing to do. It expresses to the American people that we cannot abide by the aggression of Iraq, and that the will of the United States and the international community will be done. Vote for the resolution supporting the President of the United States.

LET US NOT JUMP THE GUN ON WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, so much faith, perhaps unjustly, is put in polls. But as we stand on the verge of war in the Middle East, hopefully common sense and conscience will prevail over any polls. In my ad hoc de facto coffee shop and court house polling, conservative Hoosiers overwhelmingly reject any need to go to war in the Middle East at this time. My congressional mail has been running 10 to 1 against any offensive launch.

Yet national polls show a slim majority of American people willing to back an offensive war. However, support falls to just 44 percent with 1,000 casualties and to 35 percent with 10,000 casualties.

Although some highly placed congressional leaders think we will be in and out of this like a Grenada holiday, the odds are that our casualties will be in the tens of thousands.

As Admiral Crowe has said, "What is the rush?" The sanctions are working. Are the problems of jobs, productivity, health care, deficit reduction, the environment, and a truly peaceful new world order not more important than jumping the gun in the sands of the Middle East?

ENCOURAGE SURVIVAL OF SMALL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the failure of the Bank of New England and the shaky condition of our Nation's banks and savings and loan associations. However, it seems to me that we are attempting to solve this problem in exactly the wrong way.

It appears that the prevailing sentiment of the regulators is to merge the weak institutions into the larger and larger organizations. What we really need is a large number of small, conservatively run institutions. We would be better off with several thousand small banks, or several hundred small banks at least, rather than a few big ones. If one big institution fails us in New England, that is a major catastrophe for the taxpayers, where it would not be as great a problem if the institution were small.

Highly regulated industries, those in which there is much governmental interference, always end up with a very small number of very large companies controlling the market. On the other hand, when the free market is allowed to operate, the little man has a chance. This can be seen in the trucking industry, where there was a major deregula-

tion several years ago. Now there are thousands of small independent trucking companies, and there will be, until the regulators and the bureaucrats take over and run the small companies out.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will not let the same thing happen with the banks and savings and loans, and not let the regulators run the small financial institutions out of existence in this country.

PATIENCE IN PURSUIT OF WORLD PEACE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope and pray that the negotiations that are now going on in Geneva will be successful. This world does not need another war. We need a peaceful solution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the President of the United States in that effort. But I will not vote for a blank check as a declaration of war, as was done here in 1964 in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. It would be a mistake for the Congress to vote that kind of resolution through here again. All of us know the sad history of what happened there.

But it is important for us at this time to remain firm in our convictions, that we will resist aggression. It is important that we remain firm in our enforcement of the embargo that we have. I think with that firmness and that patience, we can successfully conclude this very strenuous session that we are now going through.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY MUST SUPPORT GULF EFFORT

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons support is eroding for our Persian Gulf policy in the country is allied contributions. Our constituents are not pleased with what our allies are doing in this effort.

Japan's trivial contribution of half of a billion dollars is just a fraction of the amount Sony paid for Columbia Records. Germany's contribution probably is comparable to the payroll of the Oakland Athletics.

What about our French colleagues? At the time that the Secretary of State is trying to negotiate an agreement, the last chance for peace, France launches its own peace initiative that will hardly help Secretary Baker's efforts. Who knows what this peace agreement is? Where was the consultation?

Mr. Speaker, Saudi Arabia, our friend, is placing restrictions on American troops on religious practices and other potentially eroding moral incentives.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure that this is not an American war, but that this involves the Western World. We have to protect Western interests. What we are having now with attitudes by the French, the Germans, the Japanese, and others, is that it is strictly an American war, and they want us to do the dirty work.

ALL PEACEFUL MEANS OF ACHIEVING U.S. OBJECTIVES MUST BE UNDERTAKEN

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today Secretary of State Baker and Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz are meeting in Geneva. The whole world is watching to see whether this meeting brings about a peaceful solution to the gulf crisis.

But if it does not, the Congress of the United States will have to consider whether or not to authorize the use of military force to drive Iraq from Kuwait.

In 1965, President Johnson asked Congress to adopt the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, giving him a blank check to send combat troops to fight in Vietnam. Today, President Bush is asking Congress to pass a "Gulf of Persia" resolution giving him a blank check to plunge America into a war with Iraq.

The President has said that anything less than approval of a blank check authorizing "all means necessary" to drive Saddam from Kuwait would encourage Iraqi intransigence and detract from the international coalition arrayed against Iraq.

I disagree. Before Congress authorizes the President to send young American men and women to fight and die, we must know that all peaceful means of achieving U.S. objectives have failed. Why should we go to war, when continued application of economic sanctions may be able to drive Iraq from Kuwait without firing a shot?

The Bush administration should give economic sanctions more time to work and assure there is true burden sharing, not phoney burden shirking on the part of our coalition partners. The administration must forge a national energy independence strategy that eliminates our overdependence on foreign oil and a principled nuclear nonproliferation policy that keeps countries such as Iraq from obtaining access to the bomb.

That is what America needs to do. Instead of passing blank checks for war, we must devote our full energies to putting together a strategy for peace

so that young American men and women will not be asked unnecessarily to give "the last full measure of their devotion" on the battlefield.

□ 1220

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT GO TO WAR WITH IRAQ

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that the President, Secretary of State Baker, have decided to go an extra mile in the attempt to resolve this disagreement peaceably. They are not going the extra mile, they are going the first mile in diplomacy.

This is the first attempt at diplomacy before the rush to war of this administration. We are going to be asked to support the President with an open-ended authorization to pursue a war. If we are going to do that, then let us just have an honest vote up or down on a declaration of war here on the floor of the House.

Why the rush to war? Mr. Webster, the head of the CIA, said sanctions are working. Is it because the President and his staff are so embarrassed that they opposed economic sanctions against Iraq 10 days before the invasion? Is it because Ambassador Gillespie 3 days before the invasion left open the door to invasion and mollified, attempted to placate Mr. Hussein?

There is no long term vision on the part of this administration. How are we going to achieve long term peace and stability in the Persian Gulf? It is not through a war against Iraq.

SUNDRY DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-24)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) 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 Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report two new deferrals and four revised deferrals by budget authority now totaling \$9,093,864,337.

The deferrals affect International Security Assistance programs, as well as programs of the Departments of Agriculture, State and Transportation.

The details of these deferrals are contained in the attached report.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 9, 1991.

A LESSON FROM HISTORY ABOUT SADDAM HUSSEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the duty of the Congress of the United States in these perilous times is to, within reason, rally around the President of the United States and his objectives, especially in the field of foreign policy. When we look at the geopolitical situation that prevails historically, there is no other choice but for the United States to lead in the repulsion of the aggression that has been instituted by Iraq against its neighbor.

It is important that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contain allusions to history as we begin the debate on the Persian Gulf. Why are there so many of us who feel the pressure of history and say that we must resist this aggression now before it becomes worse? Is there any precedent for being able to say that it could become worse?

I refer to the 1930's. As a newsboy I remember the headlines in 1938. I was in downtown Harrisburg, and the headline read, "Sudetenland Taken Over by Hitler," or some words to that effect.

What had happened was in March 1938 Adolf Hitler, the dictator of Germany—recall we are talking about a dictator today in Saddam Hussein, autocratic, self-appointed dictator—back in 1938 Adolf Hitler, a self-appointed dictator of that regime, took over the Sudetenland on the pretext, and here is where history comes into play, on the pretext that the Sudetenland residents, largely German, pleaded with him to be reunited with the motherland, so to speak, with Germany. So on the basis of some ethnic connection with the Sudetenland, Hitler marched in and took over that portion of Czechoslovakia.

In 1990 what happened is Iraq marches into Kuwait on some pretext that this was an ethnic connection that always existed historically, and that he, Saddam Hussein, had the right to incorporate Kuwait as the 19th province of Iraq.

What that similarity does is warn us of what is happening.

What happened then? In the summer of 1938 intense negotiations were going on. The entire world was worried about this naked aggression on the part of Adolf Hitler. What did they do about it? They met with him in France, England did, and in September 1938 as the Prime Minister of England returned home, in front of 10 Downing Street in London he pronounced peace in our time because he and the French Foreign Minister had granted to Hitler his request that he keep the Sudetenland. That is all he wanted, just a little bit of Czechoslovakia, no other aggression was in the books, and they could go home and recognize that no more ag-

gression would be perpetrated by Adolf Hitler.

It was not very long when he marched into Czechoslovakia. Anschluss took place with Austria, and then in September 1939 the world knows what happened, naked aggression, blitzkrieg into Poland, and then belatedly the Western allies, England and France, declared war on Germany when it was almost too late. It was too little and it was almost too late. And if it were not for the United States of America in standing by the side of Western civilization and of democracy, World War II could not have been won. The aggressor, Adolf Hitler, could not have been put down.

Those parallels are very important. Here we have Saddam Hussein with a stranglehold, potential stranglehold on the Middle East affecting our economy, the entire civilized world, and if this aggression prevails on Kuwait he can further his efforts to strangle the lifelines of Western civilization.

□ 1230

He must be stopped now before the Sudetenland of 1938 is repeated in the Kuwait of 1990, and the too little, too late efforts of the Allies during the 1939 cycle must not be repeated in 1991.

That is why we must support the President of the United States in every effort from embargo to diplomatic and political efforts, settlement, Arab League, League of Nations, United Nations, and I am sorry, the League of Nations failed to do its job before; the United Nations, whatever is required, but the President must be given the vote of confidence by the Congress of the United States.

GROWING THREAT AGAINST BALTIC STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in expressing my deep concern about the growing threat of Soviet totalitarianism in the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

In recent days we've seen a steady deterioration of the situation there with the takeover by Soviet troops of the largest printing plant in Latvia. Two groups of 10,000 Soviet troops also were recently dispatched to Lithuania and Latvia to round up young men for service in the Soviet military. A total of nearly 100,000 Soviet troops are now based in the region.

Such displays of imperial arrogance have shown me that the Soviet leadership is determined to turn back the recent moves these countries have made toward independence.

I fear these moves foreshadow a still tougher crackdown against the citizens of these Baltic nations who have sought nothing more than the right to determine their own future.

To address this threat to the sovereign peoples of the Baltic Republics, I and several of my colleagues have signed a letter urging President George Bush to make the cause of Baltic independence a cornerstone of United States-Soviet foreign policy.

We must send a clear message to Mikhail Gorbachev that he is jeopardizing United States-Soviet ties by refusing to respect the rights of the Baltic peoples to self-determination.

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM CENTRAL AMERICA

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week when the House convened for the first time, that is, the Congress convened for the first time and organized, we were under the impression that we would adjourn until January 23. Then it was announced late in the day that there would be pro forma meetings on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays until January 23. Then this Monday, while at home, we found out that the intention was to have a unanimous-consent request day before yesterday in order to have a Thursday session and a Friday vote on some type of resolution with respect to the intervention in the Middle East.

The record will show that I have spoken out since we came back after Labor Day in the last Congress. I have introduced a resolution pursuant to the 1973 War Powers Limitation Act in which I wanted to have a hearing by the proper committee in order that the Congress would respect the integrity of its own laws and would, in view of the fact that the clear and limp intention of the 1973 War Powers Limitation Act was the exact case now unfolding before us since August 3 and, like no other Presidential excursion and adventure, this was precisely what those of us who cosponsored and helped co-author the 1973 act had in mind effective in 1974. The President vetoed it, and we overrode his veto.

When it was announced that the purpose of this Friday's vote was intended to do something that, in effect, would amount to not calling the President to account for violating the very laws that the Congress has passed or at least be summoned to the Congress, rather than having the leaders of the Congress abjectly trail over to the White House to get their marching orders, totally abdicating the constitutional premise in which this body, the Congress, as set forth in article I of the Constitution was clearly intended to act and charged with the responsibility to act and in behalf of the national interest and in behalf of the basic American constitutional premise of the separation of powers, the coequality, the independence and that separation.

So I am totally dismayed, because I might say by way of explanation, and even though I have placed these documents in the RECORDS since September and October, I will not seek to replace them and reprint them and entail that cost at this time, but I will just refer to the fact that as soon as the President announced precipitously and with apparently no consultation whatsoever with the Congress, after his visit over the weekend upon the adjournment of the Congress in August, his announced intention to send Armed Forces of the United States to Saudi Arabia, I wrote a letter to the Speaker. That is all I could do as one individual Member of the House. I urged him to meet with the majority leader of the Senate and call back the Congress in order to obtain consultation, obtain an explanation from the President. I feared, and let me say that up to now, I have had confirmation, not rebuttal, of that fear, that this would simply be a reenactment or an attempted reenactment of our invasion of Panama in December 1989, and it has turned out to be.

Why do I say that? Because there is no thought whatsoever given to the nature and the after effect of the consequences of an invasion.

In Panama, for instance, we are in occupation of that country. Our military are governing it. We have over 10,000 of our military there in occupation running the government, and we dare not remove those soldiers, because I will assure the Members, my colleagues, not one American life will be safe.

We heard earlier some speakers refer to the occurrences in El Salvador, the smallest country in Central America. After \$6 billion and 10 years, we are no closer to any kind of what anybody in his right mind would call a successful conclusion. As a matter of fact, we are worse off. We find now that our military now openly are involved in what we had been saying was happening since 1980, and, mind you, that was the first time I spoke out on Latin America, and it was not President Reagan, it was President Carter. I predicted then, I said, "You cannot militarily determine the outcome of a purely native indigenous civil war." This is not an imposed insurrection by external forces, either Cuban or Russian.

I said the same thing about the Nicaraguan revolution.

So comes Panama. Nobody said we were in there to put down communism, for Noriega was one of our stalwart allies for a while in attempting to promote the so-called Contras, in trying to knock out the Sandinista regime. It was when he doublecrossed us that we then decided that we could not keep him on a payroll that was in excess of what we pay our own President.

Let us now look at Panama. We are still there. We dare not remove our troops. We installed a so-called govern-

ment by swearing in Endara at our military base. Is that democracy? Is that imposing democracy?

We dare not remove our troops that are now in excess of 10,000 in Panama, but if you read the newspaper stories in December and the month following, you saw pictures of our troops returning "mission accomplished."

□ 1240

We have imposed democracy. Our troops are out. However, that has not been true. Our troops never have been removed, and they better not be. There will not be one American life safe, I will tell Members that now.

Now, is that success? What about Noriega, Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega? Is he a prisoner of war? If so, what war? If he is, then we ought to be obeying the Geneva Convention. We are not. Is he then a prisoner for the purposes of trial in our domestic court? If so, we are in gross violation of the basic international laws of sovereignty. Like it or not, he was a head of what we said was a sovereign nation.

Honduras, we are in occupation of Honduras, still. However, let us go back to these basic things. What is the purpose of our intervention? Once that purpose becomes military, what is the mission of our military? What is the mission of the military? There was a time in 1987 when plans were elaborately drawn up for the invasion of Nicaragua. Fortunately, our professional military, to their everlasting glory, were able to prevail and say, "Hey, this is what it will take, and we have our limitations as a military. We can achieve our military goals if we spell out the mission, but this is what it is going to take."

Now, what do we do afterwards? Who is going to govern Nicaragua? Unless our troops are there to impose that government as we have in Panama? Fortune prevailed. In this case today, unfortunately, the administration has a political general, as a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that is bad. Throughout our history, in which the basic understanding is that we have a people's army. We were not going to have standing armies like the kings of Europe were accustomed to. We also were not going to have king-made wars. This is a reason why this provision was a most debated provision. If Members look at the annals and the record of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention, the most feared power was to give any man, call him chief magistrate, as they first did in the Convention, or President, as they finally ended up doing, or call him king. They did not want to be victimized any more by king-made wars. So, they said only "the Congress," as a direct agent and representative of the people shall have the power to declare war. It has the power to raise armies, and money for the purposes therefor.

Not the President. However, we live in a day and time when the President says, "I'm the Commander in Chief of the country." He is not. He is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, and that is all. This is where the Congress comes in, and the Congress is just about to, once again, cravenly try to have it both ways as we have it, and the Congress has had it since Korea.

When President Truman ordered the Armed Forces of the United States, based on a then conscription service draft, he acted contrary to the basic peacetime draft triggered by the declaration in December 1941, and forced unwilling Americans to serve outside of the continental United States without a declaration of war or "expressly provided by the Congress."

There were the phrases that had to be placed in the first peacetime draft law in 1940, and redefined in 1941, but we had Congresses then that did not have the key, so those Members said, "All right, we will have for the first time a peacetime draft." Some are called, some are not called. Those that are called, we will have a Sailor and Soldier's Relief Act so that after their service they will have their job to come back to. If they are paying on a home, they shall not pay more than 6 percent. That is still the law. Let me assure Members, all of the financial entities are trying ways to get out of it.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, that is exactly the appeal I have had from fellow Members just south of Washington, DC, in the State of Virginia, in areas where we have a concentration of military, or heavy concentration of those that have just been called in as reservists, because mortgage companies—both primary as well as secondary—are trying to get around it. However, those men who wrote that law were looking out for the people. Therefore, they sunset it. It would last only 1 year. Therefore, in the summer of 1941, when it was about to expire, they finally passed it by one vote, and only after a southern Member appended this phraseology.

Notwithstanding any of the herein-after above, no person subject to the terms of this act shall be compelled to serve against his will outside of the continental United States, except in a declaration of war, or expressly provided so by the Congress. Then it passed by one vote. Then a few months later, we had Pearl Harbor. Then we had a declaration of war the day after. However, everyone forgot about that when we were supposed to have won World War II. My whole thesis since I have come to the Congress in 1961 is that World War II has not ended. There was no peace treaty. Even now, we have over 325,000 military in Germany alone. Even now. The sequela war in Korea, that has not ended. Why? We have over 45,000 military in South

Korea, and if we add the 40,000 civilians with them, we have over 80,000 Americans in South Korea, even after we have had not one, but four violent demonstrations against our military presence in South Korea. What is the military mission of our military in South Korea? What is the military mission of our over 300,000 in Germany? Can we not see where we are headed, colleagues, when we talk about war?

Without the Congress even having had a chance or willing to, but wait until the President has preempted and co-opted anything. What are we going to do Friday? Say, "Oh, yes, Mr. President, we are in favor of the U.N. resolution"? Here is a President that advocated the United States getting out of the United Nations, just a few years ago. All of a sudden he is saying, "Hey, all I want you to do is just say 'Approve the U.N.'; that is, if Saddam Hussein does not get out of Kuwait by the 15th, then it will be all right for us to use force"?

Again, what is the military mission of our now close to 450,000 military in Saudi Arabia? What is their mission? Is it to go in and roll back Iraq from Kuwait? And then what? Leave Saddam and his warmaking capability intact? Well, then you have other imponderables, you have other countries like Israel, that might have a word or two about that.

□ 1240

You know, after all, just about 3 weeks ago Israel blew up a missile. It did not bother to advise the United States. What was the meaning of that?

Well, anybody who knows the subject matter of the Middle East will tell you what the meaning was.

So what do we have at this moment? Let us put aside the question of what is the military mission. In effect, what we have done, Mr. President, is that you have exchanged about 200 or 250 civilian workers, most of them oil corporation employees, if not all, so-called hostages, for 450,000 of our soldiers as hostages. They are now hostage to the dictates, the caprice, the whims of other rulers and other nations.

Mr. President, by getting personal and even Colin Powell making speeches in September and October against Saddam Hussein, since when have we had a Joint Chief getting into the political arena like that?

But above all, Mr. President, why do you want to reduce yourself to name calling with a guy like Saddam Hussein to the same level? I do not understand.

But what have we done? We have got 450,000, close to that by now. That is like if you have the city of Seattle and moved it into the middle of the desert. That is what we have done.

The ecological impact will be absolutely catastrophic in that area, the most sensitive ecologically speaking.

In the meanwhile, one of my colleagues, a very distinguished Member, honored, mentioned, "Oh, please don't make this an American war." It is. You are not going to have a Russian soldier shooting an Arab Muslim. You are not going to have a German soldiers in there shooting at an Arab Muslim. It will be an American soldier, and when we do, this notion that it is going to be a limited war 6 days a week, and I was horrified when I heard my distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee say last night on TV that he feels sure the casualties would not exceed several thousands, which was acceptable. Acceptable to whom? Nothing is acceptable when you have an unnecessary war.

If ever the history books will record, as surely as I am speaking, that this was the most of unnecessary wars, this will be one, if it reaches that point.

Frankly, you have got to be realistic. Where else are we headed?

So the issue is not going to be, Mr. President, hey, you come over here and consult. The issue is going to be, are you loyal to the President or are you not loyal to the President? And of course, the options are gone. Why? Because you now have 450,000 of our soldiers in those sands. What are you going to do, deny them money, deny them arms?

The Congress wants to have it both ways. It wants to sit back, as they have done since August, and say, "Well, let's see how it works out and then if it doesn't work out, we jump on the President."

Well, let me tell you something, my colleagues, You could do that in the fifties. You could do that in the sixties and you could do that even with the little excursions of Mr. Reagan in which we lost two aviators going out to try to kill Qadhafi, and let me point out to you that Qadhafi is still alive and in power, and in fact, has made more treaties than he ever had before with the surrounding Arabic, Islamic world.

Let me tell you by way of conclusion, if hostilities break out, you will not confine them.

It is like a revolution. Once it starts, there is nobody can tell you how many are going to get killed or where it is going to end up.

So what is the military mission? You are going in, roll back Iraq, for what, Kuwait? That will arouse the Muslim world to a unity they have never had, and particularly the Arab Muslims and the Islamic world, the entire Islamic world. It will not be confined to the Middle East. It will be worldwide.

Pakistan has the bomb. Let me assure you, it will be more likely than not they will let them have it in the Middle East.

Second, is the military mission then not only to roll back from Kuwait, but go in and destroy Saddam Hussein and

his war power machinery? What about after?

What will that do to the Arabic Islamic fundamentalist movement, including Iran?

We have already had a clear demonstration. We had the two countries that had been locked in the most murderous, the most bloody war in the 20th century, Iraq and Iran. Iraq ended up victorious. We helped them and others. They ended up with over 5,500 tanks. They ended up with what started out as 2 and now 35 crack brigades, called the Republican Brigades, crack. They fought in that desert. They died in that desert. They know it. And they have a million-man army, a million. When they started out in the war against Iran, it wasn't even a fifth. Iran had to plea for armistice; but after the invasion of Kuwait, Saddam Hussein had the agility on the basis of the Islamic brotherhood to bring in the Islamic leaders in Iran and proclaim a sort of fellowship. That ought to signify something to our geopoliticians; but instead of this, and I will conclude, let me tell you what you are facing.

Did we go in to protect oil, as it was first said on August 3? If so, once hostilities break out, let me tell you what we are going to face. We are going to face \$80 a barrel oil; but more importantly, our geopoliticians somehow or other, talking about backed-up policies, and if they have trouble with the Saudi kings, are prepared to talk about deposing and installing a more democratic government. The Saudi kings are informed of that, so being true born as they are of that great tribe of Arabs known as Bedouins, have mined the oil pipelines. They are all dynamited. Their production is very simple. If we go, the oil lines go with us.

So many friends, what is it that we want our military to do? What is their military mission, Mr. President?

Have we not learned anything in our past ventures from Korea, to Vietnam, to Central America, once we summoned the military?

I spoke for 14 months after President Reagan detailed the marines to Beirut and I asked that simple question. What is their military mission?

Finally, at a press conference he said they are there as peacekeepers and to shore up the Gemayel regime. I then took the floor, and anybody who wants to and is interested in looking at the record instead of what I am saying now, and I said if that is the case, they cannot be peacekeepers because the Gemayel regime is one of four factions bitterly fighting. You cannot come in on the side of one and be a peacekeeper.

Second, they are militarily exposed. They are in a saucer bowl bottom with the rim full of hostile forces.

□ 1300

Well, the rest is history. But who is thinking of the 241 marines who died in that excursion? What was the military purpose?

The marines are not, the soldiers are not politicians; they are not diplomats, they are warriors, and always it has been true since—and these are the words I used on October 28, the last day of the session, at 3 a.m. in the morning, when I said: "If the trumpet giveth an uncertain sound, who then shall be prepared to do battle?"

HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to establish a House Commission on Congressional Reform. The Commission would be made up of 12 former Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker and the minority leader, and would be charged with developing, over a 6-month period, recommendations that would enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the House, and improve its capacity for lawmaking, oversight, and representation.

The time has come to take a good look at the House of Representatives. The American public has a deep and growing dissatisfaction with this body. While there has historically been no shortage of critics of Congress, recent public opinion polls suggests that Congress' approval rating has dropped to a low point in recent memory. The calls for term limitations for incumbents reflect this dissatisfaction, but I believe they address the symptoms and not the underlying ills of this body. It is time to reexamine the operations of the House, and close the public confidence gap.

At the same time when the Congress is being looked to as a pattern by emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and around the world, the American people are finding serious fault with the body. Recent public opinion polls have found an approval rating of only 24 percent. There is concern that Congress is unable to address the pressing problems of the day in a responsible manner. There is concern that the view of the American people are not adequately represented in the legislative process. An increasing number of our constituents perceive Congress as irrelevant. And since we are a democratic body entrusted to represent our constituents and guide this Nation through the perils of the modern world, this is a serious indictment.

The resolution that I offer today is not meant to add to the criticism of Congress. Instead, it is directed at the

opposite result. I have great respect for the qualifications and commitment, the dedication and sense of duty, of the Members of the House of Representatives. I have been privileged to serve with men and women who have made great contributions to this Nation, both individually and collectively. Many of the depictions of the House in the media disregard the positive aspects of Congress. But this body can work better. I believe that we can all agree on that.

The time has come for a comprehensive reexamination of the structural and institutional aspects of the House. It is not just our prerogative to make the House more responsive to the people, it is our obligation. By enhancing the operations and effectiveness of the House, I believe that we can strengthen public confidence in the institution.

Why should we look to an outside commission for recommendations on enhancing the performance of the House of Representatives? One reason is common to all institutions—it is difficult for sitting members of an institution to offer an objective and impartial review of its own operations. A second reason is the demands of Members' schedules, which are substantial. Representatives today simply cannot devote full time to one issue. A subject as complex as improving the legislative process requires the thorough and thoughtful study and reflection that only those with experience and time can bring to the task.

Congress does and should devote the bulk of its energy to addressing the pressing substantive matters—such as the events in the Persian Gulf today—while a commission could focus exclusively on improving the institution of the House of Representatives itself. To be sure, many legislative interests are involved when Congress addresses various reforms. A commission made up of a select group of former Members, who do not have a personal stake in the outcome of reform, can develop fair and objective recommendations for change.

The Commission could, for instance, take a fresh look at the area of campaign financing reform, a topic that has seemed intractable in recent years. Developing a reasonable solution to campaign financing would be enough in itself to justify the Commission. And the Commission would not postpone, but instead would supplement the efforts of House committees with jurisdiction over this and other areas. The resolution specifically provides that the Commission's recommendations are to be referred to the appropriate House committees for consideration.

The crux of the House Commission on Congressional Reform, its essential element, is that it is comprised of former Members of the House of Representatives. Commission members would have a perspective only obtained

through service in this body—they would understand the imperatives of the election process, the operations of committees, procedures on the floor, legislative time pressures, and the many other facets of the job of U.S. Representative. Some Commission members would likely have experienced the successes and failure of past efforts to enhance the operations of the House, and could bring this to bear on today's Congress.

Several former Members, men and women who had distinguished careers in the House and who have a wealth of knowledge about this institution, come immediately to mind. House alumni such as Richard Bolling and Barber Conable, Tip O'Neill and Mel Laird, Robert Giaimo and John Rhodes, William Brodhead and Ed Bethune are among the many potential Commission members. Some members could even be drawn from those who have just recently left the House, such as Lindy Boggs or Bill Frenzel. Of course, it would be up to the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint Commission members, but the Commission could represent a cross-section of the geographic and political spectrum—north to south, east to west, liberal to conservative.

The common denominator would be that these former Members would understand the day-to-day reality of House membership, would care deeply about the integrity of the institution, and would recognize that there are fundamental problems that need to be addressed.

The House Commission on Congressional Reform would conduct a careful and thorough review of the operations of the House, and function in a non-partisan manner. Public dissatisfaction with Congress makes it clear that improving the way Congress works would advance the interests of both parties. Increased partisanship in the House will only cause a further decline in the American people's confidence in their elected leaders.

During the great debates preceding the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln said of the union, "a house divided against itself cannot stand." In the months ahead, if partisanship is allowed to divide this body and stifle the changes that are needed to make Congress more responsive to the American people, that division will imperil this House. The Commission, as an independent and nonpartisan group, could avoid the partisan wrangling that can delay needed changes.

Critics of some past efforts to examine the operations of Congress saw reform efforts as a misplaced search for structural solutions to what were at their core political problems. The House Commission on Congressional Reform would avoid this because it would be composed of former Members of the House who would bring with

them a breadth and depth of historical understanding, practical experience, and institutional perspective. They would be aware of past efforts and would develop recommendations capable of mobilizing consensus and providing incentives for current Members to implement them.

The time has come for an independent review of the House of Representatives, and I hope that you will join me in support of the House Commission on Congressional Reform.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD several articles that suggest the need for a House Commission on Congressional Reform.

H. RES. —

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

"House Commission on Congressional Reform Act."

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to address the need for a historical and institutional perspective on ways to improve the operation of the House of Representatives, to increase its responsiveness and efficiency, and to build its capacity for lawmaking, oversight, and representation.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the House Commission on Congressional Reform (in this resolution referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. DUTIES.

The Commission shall develop comprehensive and impartial recommendations for the House of Representatives that would improve—

- (1) institutional integrity,
- (2) accountability to the public,
- (3) efficiency,
- (4) effectiveness, and
- (5) any other aspects that would serve to increase public confidence in the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—6 members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 6 members shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERS.—An individual appointed under subsection (b) shall have served in the House of Representatives, and shall not be a Member of the 102d Congress.

(d) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) QUORUM.—8 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(4) CHAIRPERSON; VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be designated by the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives at the time of appointment.

(g) COMPENSATION.—

(1) MEMBERS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall each be paid at a rate equal to the rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay or compensation, except for nec-

essary travel expenses, by reason of their service on the Commission.

(h) EXPENSES.—Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Commission may incur expenses in connection with its functions under this resolution.

SEC. 6. DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Commission shall, without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code, have a Director appointed by the Commission and paid at the rate of basic pay for level III of the Executive Schedule.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF STAFF.—The Commission may appoint personnel as it considers appropriate without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments to the competitive service. The staff of the Commission shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, related to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) STAFF OF GENERAL SUPPORT OFFICES OF CONGRESS.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any general support office of the Congress of the United States is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that office to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this resolution.

SEC. 7. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of this resolution, sit and act at the times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Commission may secure directly from any Committee, Subcommittee, or support office of the House of Representatives information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act.

(c) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

(d) SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, administrative support services as the Commission may request.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Commission shall transmit to the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives its recommendations not later than 6 months after the date of passage of this resolution, and the Speaker shall refer these recommendations to the Committees of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over the matters covered for appropriate action. The report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with specific recommendations and implementing language for the legislative or administrative action it considers appropriate.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submitting its report pursuant to section 8.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1991]

HOW TO FIX CONGRESS—ADVICE FROM THE ALUMNI

(By David S. Broder)

The alumni are worried that dear old Alma Mater is getting a bad name. It's the Con-

gress of the United States we're talking about, not Old Siwash or Winssockie or Euphoria State. Interviews with more than a score of former representatives and senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, show a bad case of anxiety about the "rep" that Congress has these days.

A Republican, former representative William H. Hudnut III, now mayor of Indianapolis, said the public has the impression that Congress "is a rudderless ship, that its members are squabbling all the time, and that they are afraid to bite any bullets or make any hard choices."

A Democrat, former Illinois representative Abner J. Mikva, now a federal circuit court judge in Washington, pointed to the decline in reelection margins and the passage of term-limitation measures last November and said of his former colleagues: "If they can't read that handwriting on the wall, they need eyeglasses for sure."

That refrain is voiced all across the political spectrum, from liberals like Adlai E. Stevenson III, John C. Culver and Gary Hart to conservatives like John J. Rhodes, Melvin R. Laird and James T. Broyhill.

Former Senate Republican leader Howard H. Baker Jr., of Tennessee, whose father, mother and father-in-law all served in Congress before him, summed up the general sentiment by saying, "I've seen Congress's reputation go up and down for many, many years. But I've never seen it lower than it is now. I think there will be a massive wave of anti-incumbent sentiment unless the problem is addressed."

The definition of "the problem" varies from person to person. And when the old grads are asked what practical steps Congress could take to improve its standing with the public, they offer a variety of suggestions. But in this unscientific sampling of notable alumni, the single action most often mentioned is to change the way the campaigns for Congress are financed.

"I cannot say how important I think it is," said former representative Dick Bolling, who believes that financing lies at the heart of most of Congress's other problems. Agreeing, former senator Thomas Eagleton said, "I don't care what ethics bills you pass, if you don't do anything about campaign-spending reform, you haven't done anything at all."

Bolling and Eagleton are both liberal Democrats from Missouri. But this is no longer just a liberal lament. Former Nevada senator Paul Laxalt, the chairman of Ronald Reagan's presidential campaigns, said, "There's far too much emphasis on money and far too much time spent collecting it. It's the most corrupting thing I see on the congressional scene."

Laxalt said, "The problem is so bad we ought to start thinking about federal financing" of House and Senate campaigns. "It was anathema to me," as it has been to most conservatives, he said, "but in my experience with the [Reagan] presidential campaigns, it worked, and it was like a breath of fresh air. . . . A lot of us who retired [from Congress] did so because we just didn't have the stomach to go out and hustle for money the way you have to do now."

Hudnut, also an opponent of public financing in his House days, agrees with Laxalt now—and also favors caps on campaign spending, a provision that congressional Republicans and President Bush have adamantly opposed. "It's obscene how money is driving politics," Hudnut exclaimed.

Former House speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill of Massachusetts also is angry about former colleagues who "pile up a million or

more bucks" in campaign funds—and then dare anyone to challenge them. "It's good for people to have a challenger, to have to come home and explain their records," O'Neill said. "Otherwise, they get arrogant, they go international, they forget the people at home."

It's not just the amount of money enveloping Congress that concerns these alumni; many also object to the kind of campaigns being waged. "The negative campaigning and the smears," exclaimed former senator Abraham A. Ribicoff (D) of Connecticut. "It's no wonder they have so little respect for Congress when people see the candidates for Congress stooping to these tactics. The attitude is simple disgust."

Two prominent Republican alumni—former senator Bill Brock of Tennessee and former representative Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin—argue that the best way to insulate Congress from special-interest PAC (political-action committee) money is to route all such campaign funds through the parties. Laird argues that most organized giving today is "really to buy access" to the lawmakers. Brock, a former national GOP chairman, agrees that following the PACS to contribute only to the parties would reduce the access game—and strengthen party discipline.

Tighter party control is necessary if Congress is to tackle the tough problems, several alums say. "When I was in Congress, we had a lot of party discipline," former New Hampshire representative Perkins Bass (R) said. "There's no discipline I can see today." Pointing to the rank-and-file House rebellion that autumn against the budget agreement endorsed by leaders of both parties, Bass said, "Congress can't take on the entitlements or the other tough budget choices, because there's no discipline."

On the opposite coast, Washington Lt. Gov. Joel Pritchard (R), who served for 12 years in the House, remarked that "in Congress today, everyone runs for office as a political entity of his own. Without a strong party connection, there's no coherent philosophy for them to connect to; it's everyone for himself."

Others who agree that Congress needs more discipline think it has to come from inside the institution. Former House majority whip Tony Coelho (D) of California said, "The reforms that came in after the 1974 election spread out the power so much in Congress that it's very difficult for the leadership to lead. It's frustrated efforts at leadership and actually encouraged them to avoid responsibility."

Brock and Stevenson, Ribicoff and former senator James R. Pearson (R) of Kansas were partners in Senate reform efforts, several years apart. Today they still think internal changes clarifying lines of responsibility and reclaiming the leaders' and committee chairmen's vanished clout would enable Congress to do its job better. Congress, said Stevenson, "is suffering from an excess of democracy," Brock said. "They have to restore the authority of committee chairmen and get some hierarchical structure."

Two respected alumni argue that Congress might be more respected if its members just buckled down and worked harder at their jobs. "More work by individual senators is needed, and less reliance on staff," said former Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield (D) of Montana. "Congress should not be taking all of August off each year. And it ought to work five days a week to keep the legislation from piling up."

Former senator Margaret Chase Smith (R) of Maine, who prided herself on not missing

a roll-call vote, said, "Congress can't do its work with the amount of absenteeism there is. The public thinks they think about holidays and salaries than they do about passing legislation."

But Howard Baker takes exactly the opposite view. "They ought to reduce sessions to six months a year, so they have time to know what their constituents are thinking. Congress is not acting in the role the Constitution prescribes for it. It is meant to be essentially a big national board of directors, making broad policy, but increasingly it's becoming an elected bureaucracy with its fingers into everything."

However long the sessions or the workdays, several alumni say Congress has to organize its time better. Slashing staff, cutting the number of committees and subcommittees—and thereby reducing the schedule conflicts for individual members—were suggested by many of those interviewed. Former senator Charles McC. Mathias (R) of Maryland said, "Modern times have imposed a massive workload on Congress and it requires discipline. Not new rules, but enforcing the rules they've got would speed up things enormously."

Summarizing suggestions made by several others, former senator Daniel J. Evans (R) of Washington, who opted out after only one term, called for a two-year budget cycle, with the first year setting spending priorities and the second focusing on oversight of how the funds are being spent. Evans also favored "slashing severely" at the committee and staff undergrowth and scheduling significant floor debates for late afternoon and early evening hours to increase senatorial attendance. "If you had real debate," he said, "it would help educate the public on these issues, but we have virtually none of that now."

It has struck many of the alumni that one reason for Congress's bad reputation is that so many members bad-mouth Congress in their own reelection campaigns. "I think members of Congress are basically solid and sound," said former senator Robert Stafford (R) of Vermont. "But every two years, they spend all their time telling the public what boos their colleagues are at best, and what crooks at worst. No wonder the public believes it."

Others, however, say the character problem is not just a campaign myth—and must be addressed before Congress' reputation can improve.

"When I started," said John Rhodes of Arizona, the former House minority leader, "we had a feeling we had to be concerned about the country. But now I think there are more and more members who are primarily concerned about their own reelection. We used to say, 'You only have one political death, but you can choose when to use it.' They don't want to risk [anything] at all."

Former senator Gary Hart (D) of Colorado also draws a sharp contrast between the older members who were around when he came in 1974 and the younger ones who entered in the 1980s. "It has gone down in terms of caliber, breadth of vision and quality," he said. "It's going to be hard to get back to the broadgauge, big-picture, constitutionalist type of senator; they don't run in the kind of election campaigns we have today."

Former senator William Proxmire (D) of Wisconsin, a maverick who prided himself on his low-cost campaigns, is critical of the focus on reelection. "Being a senator is such a marvelous job," he said, "they do whatever they can to hold onto it. It becomes a prior-

ity for them, and their families, and their staffs, and even their colleagues pressure them, because their chairmanships depend on their party staying in control. And once the No. 1 objective becomes being reelected, you can rationalize all sorts of things . . ."

If reelection pressures are the problem, is term-limiting the answer? Some alumni say yes. Conservatives Broyhill and Hudnut are for the idea, and so is liberal former representative Shirley Chisholm (D) of New York. "There's anger and a lack of trust I've not seen before," she said, describing her sense of the public attitude toward Congress. "We need new blood—a new transfusion. Too many of them have Potomac fever and forgot how they got there."

But even those who voluntarily cut short their own congressional careers tend to reject the idea of limiting tenure by law. "When you decrease the tenure," said Rhodes, "the influence of unelected staff members goes up." Laird calls term limits "a repudiation of our whole philosophy of representative government." Former representative James R. Jones (D), whose home state of Oklahoma has passed term-limits for the legislature, calls them "crazy," but adds, "The only way to avoid them is for members of Congress to start acting as if the Constitution already included a limit on terms. If they would show more courage and candor, it would do wonders."

Finally, some alumni suggest that the public itself may have to take responsibility for Congress and its flaws. "From my perspective," said John Culver, "term-limitation is the latest manifestation of public irresponsibility. Many people don't vote. Most of those who do vote don't want to vote against their own congressman. So they look on term-limitations as a way of changing people without the bother—or the responsibility—of voting them out."

Culver said he agreed that today's Congress—"made up of wonderfully attractive people"—seems "more preoccupied with reelection than the old Congresses made up of people who were, frankly, less than distinguished." But, he said, "an informed electorate is the cornerstone of a democracy, and that's the responsibility of the people, not of the members of Congress. In the end, the public is going to get what it demands. This Congress is about what the people deserve—maybe a little better."

[From the Congressional Monitor, Dec. 17, 1990]

VETERAN MEMBERS CITE ILLS OF CONGRESS

As the 101st Congress two months ago struggled to complete its work, the American electorate and many members had this question on their minds: What on earth is wrong with Congress?

Members strode to the chamber microphones day after day to report with frustration that their constituents were demanding to know why Congress couldn't get anything done.

Years of divided government, an over-emphasis by members on re-election campaigns, and major changes in the budget-making process and congressional power structure were among the key culprits cited by veteran lawmakers during recent interviews.

"I think it's getting worse, much worse," said retiring Sen. Gordon J. Humphrey, R-N.H.

Term Limits: "Serving in Congress has become much too valued by incumbents because the pay is so high and the prerequisites are so great," and members are

putting their re-elections ahead of the country, Humphrey said. "That's why I'm beating the drums" for term limits.

When members stay too long, "you lose your perspective; you lose your idealism," said Humphrey, who came to the Senate in 1979 and is leaving Washington for a seat in the New Hampshire Senate.

Retiring Sen. William L. Armstrong, R-Colo., who also started his Senate service in 1979, also suggested term limitations as a solution to some of Congress' problems. If members knew they had only a certain amount of time on Capitol Hill, he said, "it would change the whole focus of their work here."

Campaign Demands: Rep. Neal Smith, D-Iowa, who came to Congress in 1959, cited modern House campaigns as a significant factor in Congress' disabilities. "The cost of campaigns is so great," he said, requiring members to fly home to their districts frequently for appearances.

Demanding re-election campaigns, however, constitute only one of many hurdles to efficiency and progress in Congress, members said.

Budget Morass: Senators and House members in both parties blamed the 1974 budget act, which overhauled congressional budget procedures, for the type of struggles that impeded congressional and White House efforts to craft a deficit-reduction package this year.

That law requires Congress to adopt a budget resolution with spending and taxation targets before passing its annual authorization and appropriations bills, and sets deadlines for action on various aspects of the budget-writing process. But it contains many loopholes, members pointed out.

"I thought it was a good idea and voted for it, much to my regret," Rep. James H. Quillen, Tenn., ranking Republican on the House Rules Committee, said of the 1974 budget bill.

This year was even worse than usual, Quillen said, with "Republicans fighting Republicans, Democrats fighting Democrats, and very few supporting the president." The lawmaker said, "I think it's definitely the change in the system."

Like others, though, Quillen expressed little optimism for change in the near future. "It would take something spectacular," he said, such as automatic, across-the-board budget cuts kicking in and the government coming to a standstill for weeks.

Smith, chairman of the House Appropriations State, Justice, Commerce Subcommittee, also complained that the current budget process delays work on the spending plans, and cited the White House-congressional budget summit as a troublesome impediment.

The summit involved the White House in the appropriations process "at a lower level. It's not supposed to work that way," Smith said, adding that the White House should not step into the debate until the end.

Rep. Edward Madigan, R-Ill., said, "One of the best things that could be done would be to repeal the budget act."

Smith and others also cited a recent history of divided government, with Republicans holding the White House and Democrats controlling Congress, as a source of problems: "They're [the American public] not quite sure that they want either party to have full responsibility. . . . It's not an accident when they vote that way 20 years out of 24," said Smith.

Cumbersome Structure: The revamped budget process was not the only internal

congressional change that muddled the legislative waters, some longtime members said. Quillen complained that too many subcommittees have been created, spreading the power among too many lawmakers: "You get a lot of fingers in the pie."

"Back 28 years ago you had committee chairmen who ruled the rules. They ruled with an iron fist," Quillen said. Now, he said, there are "too many wielding too much power. It's been diluted."

And Armstrong, noting a larger bureaucracy in Congress, said, "I guess I think things are a little bit more tangled up than they used to be."

Those tangles are not limited to the budget area, Armstrong said. For example, senators don't look at the qualifications of presidential nominees anymore, he complained, but end up "arguing with him or her about the details of how they're going to do the job." It gets to "the level of the absurd," he said.

President's Fault? While President Bush and many voters blamed Congress for a lack of leadership in this year's budget follies, lawmakers in both parties leveled the same charge at the president, saying he was at least partly responsible for the budget gridlock.

"I really don't blame members as much as I blame the presidency," said Rep. Patricia Schroeder, D-Colo., who has served in the House since 1973.

Many members of Bush's own party complained that he had abandoned the party's traditional themes—particularly its opposition to higher taxes—for his own political gain. Humphrey complained of "a lack of leadership" from the president, who he said tried to bury the differences between the two parties, causing other Republicans to suffer.—By Dinah Wisenberg.

[From the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Oct. 27, 1990]

ADJOURNMENT; PUBLIC'S PATIENCE WEARS THIN AS CONGRESS WINDS DOWN (By Janet Hook)

The adjournment of the 101st Congress may bring a cease-fire in the months-long war between Congress and the White House, but it will send lawmakers out to face another formidable adversary: an increasingly hostile electorate.

At the end of the session, Congress may be able to take pride in enactment of a sweeping rewrite of the Clean Air Act, a politically popular child-care bill and a five-year deficit-reduction plan.

But those accomplishments may be lost on voters disgusted by the spectacle of budget paralysis, ethics scandals and political flip-flops that have eroded the credibility of government throughout the 101st Congress.

The long-delayed adjournment is itself a dubious distinction: At least in the postwar era, Congress has never been in session this close to Election Day. Three times since World War II Congress has adjourned 17 days before voters went to the polls. The 101st Congress passed that milestone when it stayed in session beyond Oct. 21.

101ST CONGRESS IN MICROCOSM

Final approval of the painstakingly wrought budget deal was the most daunting hurdle to be cleared before Congress could adjourn. But as the budget negotiations dragged on, other obstacles were knocked down. Appropriations bills cleared one by one. Other major bills with de facto "must-pass" status moved: clean air, housing and farm bills.

In some ways, the final days before adjournment were emblematic of the entire two-year term of the 101st Congress.

The Congress that was replete with sex scandals, investigations and resignations ended with five senators facing ethics hearings in November and a House member, Donald E. "Buz" Lukens, R-Ohio, suddenly quitting Oct. 24 after sexual misconduct charges.

The Congress that couldn't override President Bush's vetoes ended with the Senate sustaining his veto of contested civil rights legislation by one vote.

And the Congress that spent months consumed by the government's budget crisis was careering from one missed deadline to the next until the very last week.

But for all the preoccupation with austerity, the Congress that began with a noisy fight over a government pay increase ended with lawmakers getting a quiet raise. As of Jan. 1, members will get a cost-of-living increase tied to the 4.1 percent hike for federal workers. House members also will get the 25 percent hike they approved in late 1989 when they forswore honoraria, barring a last-minute reversal. Although senators will make less, salaries in both chambers will shoot over the \$100,000 mark.

HANDICAPPER'S NIGHTMARE

As the week of Oct. 22 began, adjournment seemed like a mirage, an inviting image that evaporated each time Congress approached it. As one Senate aide put it, "This is the last week, but it may be two weeks long."

Rep. John P. Murtha, D-Pa., hedged his bet when he put money into a pool on when Congress would adjourn. His optimistic money was on Oct. 27, 11:59 p.m., he placed a second bet on a Dec. 23 adjournment.

The pessimist looked like the wise man Oct. 23, when a meeting of House Democrats disclosed a deep rupture in the party over how to proceed in the budget talks. That was a dark stroke in an already grim picture of disintegrating consensus: Republicans have been scrapping with each other for months. Bush was deriding Democrats on the campaign trail, and emergency funding of the government was about to expire at midnight Oct. 24.

But as the prospect of another government shutdown loomed, the political ground shifted, Democrats, having enjoyed a stunning political reversal that put Bush and the GOP on the defense in recent months, finally decided it was time to stop pressing their advantage and go home. They dropped their insistence on a surtax for millionaires, and Republican leaders begged Bush to accept a proffered compromise.

Although the end was in sight, that wasn't enough to put a floor under the public's plummeting confidence in Congress. A Wall Street Journal/NBC poll published Oct. 26 found that 71 percent of those questioned disapproved of Congress' role in the budget affair.

But getting the budget deal through and completing the pileup of other business pushed Congress into another weekend session. That was the latest—and with luck the last—in a string of protracted workweeks that have kept lawmakers from home-state constituents, campaigning and contributors.

Rep. George "Buddy" Darden, D-Ga., missed his three major campaign events this fall, including one held without him the day the House held 19 back-to-back roll call votes. Legislative business forced Rep. W.G. "Bill" Hefner, D-N.C., to miss a big fundraiser; but at least his featured guest, House

Speaker Thomas S. Foley of Washington, could go ahead without him.

With public hostility lapping at the shores of Capitol Hill, gallows humor became the order of the day for lawmakers resigned to the protracted session.

Rep. William Lehman, D-Fla., likes to tell his colleagues that he ran for Congress in 1972 because he wanted to move up into a more respectable profession. Now, he says, he thinks he'd get more public esteem if he went back to his old job; selling used cars.

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

Mr. WELDON, for 60 minutes, on January 10.

Mr. WOLF, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. KANJORSKI, for 60 minutes, on January 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 30 minutes, on January 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. HORTON.

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

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. JOCOBS.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. WEISS in two instances.

Mr. STUDDS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 10, 1991, 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:

222. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting FmHA single family housing legal services contracting activities, fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1480(d); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

223. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on a plan for a comprehensive and workable plan for the abatement of lead-based paint in privately owned housing, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4822; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

224. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Singapore for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-13), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

225. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Iceland (transmittal No. DTC-13-90), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

226. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense equipment sold commercially to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. DTC-9-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

227. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, notification of a proposed license for the export of defense equipment sold commercially to Israel (Transmittal No. DTC-12-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

228. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Education, a report covering the disposal of surplus Federal real property for education by individual transactions from October 1, 1989, through September 30, 1990; to the Committee on Government Operations.

229. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

230. A letter from the executive secretary, Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

231. A letter from the Director, Human Resources, Department of the Army, transmitting the annual report for the U.S. Army nonappropriated fund employee retirement plan for the year ended September 30, 1989, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

232. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

233. A letter from the Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity

Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

234. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

235. A letter from the President and CEO, Farm Credit System Assistance Board, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

236. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

237. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

238. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

239. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Compliance With the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

240. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

241. A letter from the Executive Director, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

242. A letter from the National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

243. A letter from the Acting Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

244. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

245. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

246. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

247. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

248. A letter from the Director, The Federal Domestic Volunteer Agency, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

249. A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

250. A letter from the Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

251. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

252. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

253. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

254. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

255. A letter from the Paralyzed Veterans of America, transmitting a copy of the annual audit report of the Paralyzed Veterans of America for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1166; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. A letter from the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting proceedings of the 38th National Convention of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., held in Cedar Rapids, IA, August 18-30, 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 776; 44 U.S.C. 1332 (H. Doc. No. 102-25); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

257. A letter from the American Legion transmitting the proceedings of the 72d National Convention of the American Legion, held in Indianapolis, IN, August 28-30, 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49 (H. Doc. No. 102-26); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

258. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the limitation imposed on amounts of premium pay for overtime to any individual employed by, or assigned to, the Indian Health Service, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1611; jointly to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

259. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending September 30, 1990, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

260. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting information on the assignment or detailing of GAO employees to congressional committees, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 734; jointly to the Committees on Government Operations and Appropriations.

261. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a study of volume performance standard rates of increase by geography, specialty, and type of service, pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 6102(d)(3) (103 Stat. 2185); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of Jan. 3, 1991]

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Summary of Activities, a report of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, House of Representatives, 101st Congress, 2d Sess. (Rept. 101-1025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 468. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway demonstration project in the vicinity of Montgomery, AL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LENT, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. HUITO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. McGRATH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DICKS, Mr. REED, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York):

H.R. 469. A bill to provide automatic extensions of time for the filing of tax returns, and the performance of other tax-related acts, by members of the Armed Forces of the

United States serving in Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 470. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release the restrictions, requirements, and conditions imposed in connection with the conveyance of certain lands in the city of Gary, IN; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HERTEL:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to designate the week of February 10-16, 1991, as "Children of Substance Abuse Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution designating August 12 through 18, 1991, as "National Parents of Murdered Children Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the 22 article of amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution condemning the deliberate and systematic activities of the military authority in Suriname to subvert constitutional democracy in that nation to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the necessity of allies of the United States paying their fair share of the costs associated with Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Res. 26. Resolution to establish a Commission of the House of Representatives on Congressional Reform; jointly to the Committee on House Administration and Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FISH introduced a bill (H.R. 471) for the relief of Fred M. Lombardi and Marguerite M. Lombardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 3: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 303: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ROE, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 321: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GEJDNENSON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WISE.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. McMILLEN of Mary-

land, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LONG, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 1: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. ESPY.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. BOXER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

8. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Ebenezer United Methodist Church, Washington, DC, relative to human rights in El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9. Also, petition of the city of Sweetwater, FL, relative to Puerto Rico's political future; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

10. Also, petition of the office of the Governor, State Capitol, Salem, OR, relative to a six-county pilot program that would substitute private and public sector jobs for current food stamp, AFDC, and unemployment insurance benefits; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Agriculture.

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OLD HICKORY: ON EXHIBIT

BOB CLEMENT

TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, as the 38th individual to serve the district first represented by Andrew Jackson, I would like to bring to the attention of you and my colleagues an outstanding exhibition that recently opened here at the National Portrait Gallery.

For the first time in a major exhibition, Andrew Jackson's remarkable life is displayed through a selection of portraits, cartoons, engravings, memorabilia and broadsides. The great issues of his Presidency—the fight over renewal of the Bank of the United States, South Carolina's attempts to nullify Federal law, and the alleged "spoils system"—are highlighted. In addition, there are many portraits and personal possessions documenting Jackson's military career.

This is a terrific exhibition and I encourage my colleagues and their families to see it. The exhibition will be at the National Portrait Gallery through January 13, 1991. The gallery is located at 8th and F Streets, NW and is open 10 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. daily.

For your information, I have included a review of the exhibition which appeared in the Washington Post on January 2:

OLD HICKORY: PORTRAITS IN POWER

(By Sarah Booth Conroy)

The durability of fame is not always easy to understand.

Two great advantages in keeping one's listing in the annals of history are a large corpus of written work, such as that by Thomas Jefferson, and a great number of portraits, such as is the case with Andrew Jackson.

Now the Smithsonian's National Portrait Gallery offers, through Jan. 13, "Old Hickory: A Life Sketch of Andrew Jackson." As is its habit, the Portrait Gallery does a grand job at showing the man behind the face on the \$20 bill.

Jackson's distinctive physiognomy is shown in or on more than 70 paintings, engravings, political cartoons, vases, ribbons, gold medals, a treasury note, the frigate Constitution's figurehead, a tortoiseshell comb and an ivory cameo brooch. His image is fleshed out by maps, letters, dueling pistols (used), gold spectacles, white beaver hat and his general's uniform. His wife, his friends and his enemies are also portrayed.

"We 'know' the mature Jackson better than practically any of his contemporaries through the extraordinary pictorial record," writes Alan Fern, the Portrait Gallery's director, in the informative catalogue. Jackson was the first president from the "ordinary citizenry" to win the post, Fern adds, "in a hotly contested election."

The seventh president had many faces, most surely on exhibit here. He was a swash-buckling politician and soldier. The people hailed him as the victor of the Battle of New

Orleans in the War of 1812. Admirers hailed him as territorial governor of Florida. The taxpayers praised him for paying off the national debt, for the first and the last time.

"Even after Old Hickory died, some men tried to vote for him as President during the crisis of 1860," Jackson biographer Robert V. Remini explains in the catalogue introduction, "as though by their collective vote they could raise him from the grave to help the nation escape the horrors of approaching disunion, and civil war."

Yet this exhibit is not an apotheosis. Nor should it be. Jackson forced the removal of American Indians from east of the Mississippi on the unspeakably cruel "Trail of Tears." The Senate censured him for abusing executive powers. The voters blamed him for the Panic of 1837. Proper society shunned him as sullied by sex scandals. Curator James G. Barber adroitly gives the details in the fascinating and full captions in both show and catalogue.

Jackson's "bayonet diplomacy" appeal is easy to see in the 1819 conquering hero and his horse painted in oil by Thomas Sully. Another painting by Sully is the prototype of the \$20 bill. In 1845, a month after Jackson's death, Sully painted yet another romantic portrait of the idol, pompadour rampant.

Sully and others painted Jackson fresh from defending his conduct in the Seminole War of 1818. Jackson had put down Indian uprisings in Florida, expelled the Spanish and executed two British subjects. Charles Wilson Peale painted him as a handsome, thoughtful man. But his son Rembrandt Peale gave Jackson a somewhat dubious, pursed mouth that seems to be sewn shut, rather badly.

Later Hiram Powers and Ferdinand Petrich made busts of Jackson. A statuette of Clark Mill's bronze statue of Jackson now in Lafayette Square repeats the salute of man and horse to his troops before the New Orleans battle.

No contemporary president should feel vilified by cartoonists after seeing what Jackson elicited. David Claypoole Johnston drew Jackson in 1828 with naked corpses for a face, more bodies for his epaulet, cannons for coat collars, a tent for a hat. He borrowed his caption from Shakespeare's "Richard III": "Methought the souls of all that I had murder'd came to my tent."

Rachel Donelson Robards Jackson appears rather daunted in the watercolor-on-ivory portrait by Louisa Catherine Strobel. Jackson was said to have worn the miniature about his neck. Ralph E.W. Earl painted Rachel as dour and disapproving in an 1827 oil, appropriately accompanied here by her famous remark. "I assure you, I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of God than to live in that palace at Washington."

Rachel Jackson had been married to Lewis Robards, who sued for divorce in 1790. The Jacksons claimed they thought the divorce final and married in 1791. But when it became generally known that she wasn't properly divorced, they had to marry again in 1794. Of course, her so-called bigamy was used to discredit Jackson in the 1828 election. She died, some say of mortification,

just after he was elected. The exhibit does include the Jacksons' 1794 marriage bond, but there is no trace of a 1791 marriage document, Barber says.

Plump, pretty Peggy Eaton in her bonnet and bow smiles with a certain self-satisfaction from Henry Inman's oil on canvas. Like Andrew and Rachel Jackson, Peggy and John Henry Eaton met when he lodged in her father's boarding house. At that time she was married to John B. Timberlake. Ten years later, after her husband was rumored to have committed suicide, Peggy and Secretary of War John Eaton were married on Jan. 1, 1829.

Jackson, remembering the innuendoes about his own wife's virtue, defended Peggy's. Even so, the wives of some Cabinet members refused to attend White House functions with the Eatons.

Jackson's enemies are in force here, as in life. Jackson hated Speaker of the House Henry Clay after he denounced Jackson for his invasion of Spanish West Florida. George P.A. Healy painted Clay's head as barely escaping from his big bow tie, his hair disheveled, his eyes steadfast, his mouth holding tight to his thoughts.

John Quincy Adams, defeated for a second term by Jackson, was painted by Jackson, was painted by Chester Harding with a wise-old bald head and a stiff-collared neck. It's not difficult to see why, despite Adam's learned experience and Jackson's impulsive follies, Jackson was the people's choice.

His friends are in the show too. Francis Preston Blair is of special interest. The editor of the Washington Globe was the cook of Jackson's Kitchen Cabinet, as his unofficial advisers were called. Blair repaid Jackson's friendship by lending him money in 1842. Jackson, in turn, left his "papers and reputation" in Blair's keeping. Blair's house on Pennsylvania Avenue is now the president's guest house. His descendants still flourish in the area.

The poignant portrait of Pushmataha may be the exhibit's most haunting image. Charles Bird King painted the Choctaw chief in a marvelous tall feathered hat and golden epaulets, his costume to meet the Marquis de Lafayette in 1824, shortly before his death. Pushmataha had counted himself as a friend of Jackson, but later charged that he and his tribe had been deceived, that the territory they were offered west of the Mississippi was wasteland.

The exhibition, supported in part by a grant from the Tennessee General Assembly, will go from the National Portrait Gallery, Eighth and F streets NW, to the Tennessee State Museum in Nashville.

AVOIDING WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF

HON. BERNIE SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the following text is an article which I have written for sev-

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

eral Vermont newspapers on the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

AVOIDING WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF
(By Representative Bernard Sanders)

Clearly, there is no issue of more importance to the People of Vermont and the nation than the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

Since my election to the Congress, I have held 4 public hearings on the Persian Gulf, in Brattleboro, Rutland, Burlington and Montpelier. The turn-out for these hearings was extraordinary, with over 650 Vermonters coming out to voice their opinions. During the same period, some 400 Vermonters have written me about the crisis. While many different analyses were made, and many different views offered, the overwhelming sentiment of the Vermonters who attended these hearings and who wrote to me has been, "The crisis in the Persian Gulf can be resolved in a non-violent manner. We do not need to go to war."

Here, briefly, are my own views regarding the very serious crisis in the Persian Gulf:

First, Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait was illegal, immoral and extremely brutal. The goal of U.S. policy, and United Nations policy, must be to see that Iraq completely withdraws from Kuwait. Whatever concerns that Iraq has with regard to its relationship to Kuwait can and should be discussed and negotiated—but only after Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait. Further, given the very unstable and volatile situation in the Middle East, it is my view that the possession of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons in that area, by Iraq or any other nation, creates an extremely dangerous situation for the future. I will push to see that the United States and United Nations do all that it can to rid that region of these dangerous weapons.

Secondly, I have very deep concerns regarding President Bush's movement toward a major war without the consent of the United States Congress. On this issue I have a very conservative point of view. To my mind, our Constitution is absolutely clear that it is the Congress of the United States, and not the President, which declares war. If the President sends 500,000 American troops into war without Congressional approval, he is making a mockery of the Constitution and the separation of powers in our government which protect our democratic rights. In this regard, I fault not only the President but the Congress itself. At this moment, (and hopefully this will change) it appears that the Congress lacks the political courage to stand up and be counted on this issue which could have such an enormous impact on this nation. I intend to do whatever I can to make Congress accept its responsibility in this situation, and prevent the President from taking this country into a major war by himself.

Thirdly, it is my view that all of the goals that we wish to accomplish in the Persian Gulf can be attained without a war. The United Nations, and every major power on earth, are in strong opposition to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, and are demanding their withdrawal. The international economic sanctions against Iraq are working—impacting not only the Iraqi economy but that nation's ability to make war. In my view, we must continue the strongest economic pressure possible against Iraq. If we do, and are patient, we will secure our goals—without the loss of thousands of lives.

It is also my view that the military presence in the Persian Gulf should be that of a peace-keeping force, with strong multinational support, under the United Nations.

The function of that peace-keeping force should be to prevent further Iraqi aggression and uphold the economic sanctions supported by the United Nations. I am deeply concerned that over two-thirds of the troops on the front lines will soon be American soldiers. If a true peace-keeping force were stationed in the Persian Gulf, with widespread support from many nations, the total number of American troops in that area could be significantly reduced.

Fourthly, I am deeply concerned that the President has not been straight-forward with the people in terms of what this war will mean to the economy of the United States, to our tax-payers and to our general standard of living. A war with Iraq could easily cost \$100 to \$200 billion. Where will this money come from? It is likely war will mean new taxes for the middle class and poor. War would also mean cuts in Social Security, and further cuts in Medicare. We could expect reduced funding for education, environmental protection, children's programs, health care, housing, infrastructure repair, agriculture, economic development and all of the other areas that the President and Congress have neglected over the last ten years. In other words, in all likelihood, a war will accelerate the economic decline of the United States into a second rate industrial nation with a lower and lower standard of living. That's not a direction for this country that I intend to support.

Fifth, it doesn't take a genius to perceive that there is something absurd about the prospect of tens of thousands of American soldiers dying to defend feudalistic governments such as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait which, themselves, have no respect for democracy, religious freedom, the rights of women and other values that most of us share. It is nothing less than a disgrace that American soldiers are unable to practice their religion or openly celebrate Christmas or Chanukah because the Saudi government is opposed to religious freedom.

Lastly, it goes without saying that the United States needs a new energy policy which will emphasize conservation and the creation of new, sustainable forms of energy such as solar power. This new energy policy could not only break our dependency upon Middle-East oil, but would also make a great deal of sense from an environmental point of view.

SIDNEY J. FRIGAND

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to note news of the formal retirement of Sidney J. Frigand from a distinguished career in public relations and public service. This month Sid Frigand will leave his position as assistant executive director of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, concluding over a decade's thoughtful leadership in the bistate authority. This gentle and respected man, who with his wife Evelyn is a constituent in Greenwich Village, over the years set a standard for conscientious government service by which public officials and civil servants might be judged. When he was welcomed to the port authority by its former executive director, Peter Goldmark, to serve as director of public affairs

during a troubling period in that agency's history, it was noted that Sid's arrival "underlined the importance attached to regular and open public communication. * * * Sid undertook to build an effective public affairs program there, and in the years that followed became a respected source of counsel, a sort of institutional public conscience, who has served the agency, the region and community well.

Sid Frigand's government career includes his service as press secretary to Mayor Abraham Beame and director of public affairs for New York's Metropolitan Transit Authority. He also was deputy executive director of the New York City Planning Commission and director of public relations for the New York City Commission on Intergroup Relations. In all, some 35 years have been devoted to the conduct of a better and conscientious government.

Mr. Frigand began his professional life as a reporter for the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, armed with a degree from Brooklyn College. His move into the realm of public relations/affairs—via a private sector firm—came during the period of great development and growth in the profession that is essential to today's modern, information-based society. In 1956 Sid took his first assignment in what would become a long and respected career of public service. As in other parts of the country New York City was experiencing tremendous expansion. There became a clear need for the gathering and sharing of information by government in the rapidly-changing environment. People like Sid Frigand helped meet this need and, in the process, helped define effective public affairs in government. Sid was brought into many of his new posts to create a public affairs program, and notably the public was no token concern to him but a matter of good government. In a city and for agencies that directly affect millions of lives, he established programs with the emphasis on open discussion and a responsiveness to public—especially community—concern.

A native New Yorker, Sid Frigand's concern for the quality of life in the area extends beyond his work at city hall and in public agencies. His membership in civic and cultural organizations is extensive, including the New York Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the New York Board of Trade, the Steering Committee of the Association for a Better New York, and vice chairman of the Harbor Festival Foundation. He is on the Board of Directors of both the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council, and the New York Hall of Science of which he is especially proud.

A father and grandfather, Sid Frigand's regard for the potential of the young mind and his strong belief in the value of responsible government is reflected in his close association with higher education institutions. He has shared his interests and enthusiasm with students as a lecturer and visiting instructor at the Pratt Institute, New York University, Brooklyn College and the New School for Social Research, as well as others. His honors include the "Page One Citation from the New York Newspaper Guild, the Christopher Award of the Christopher Society, and the Headliners Award of Missouri's Lincoln University School of Journalism."

Sidney J. Frigand is retiring. His wonderful family of which he is justly proud—Evelyn,

daughters Nancy and Lisa, and son Steven—should have more of his time than they managed to enjoy over his decades of public service. But we can take solace in the fact, and I am pleased to know, that given his interest in the city and his professional talents, he will remain active in community concerns. I wish him good health and happiness for years to come.

LIVERMORE HIGH SCHOOL
CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as we start 1991, Livermore High School is beginning to celebrate a century of excellence in educating young people. This fine high school in my congressional district was the first chartered high school in California. From the beginning, the community was rightly proud and supportive of their school.

I would like to extend my congratulations to all the people who have contributed through the years to building Livermore High School into the first-class school it is today. Dedicated teachers and administrators have challenged and nurtured the young people who have attended the school.

The following excerpt from an article written by F.R. Fasset and published in the Livermore Herald in 1986 describes the formation of the school:

LIVERMORE UNION HIGH SCHOOL No. 1

The state act providing for the establishment of union high schools was approved March 20, 1891. The board of trustees of the Livermore school at once sent invitations to every school district in Murray Township, calling a meeting for April 4, for the purpose of organizing a union high school at Livermore. At the meeting representatives were present from the Pleasanton, Inman, May, Green, Townsend, High land, Vista, Harris, Midway, Mocho, and Livermore districts.

The movement was heartily concurred in by all the districts represented, excepting Pleasanton and Midway, and steps were taken to proceed with the organization without delay. According to the provisions of the law the question had to be submitted to the voters of each district. This election was held on May 23, 1891, and in the nine districts voting upon the proposition, there were only four votes recorded against it. The matter was pushed along as rapidly as possible, and Livermore Union High School No. 1 was formally organized on July 6.

The school was opened on August 31, in one of the rooms of the Livermore Public School building with E. H. Walker teacher, and the following pupils: Minnie Bading, Emma Budworth, Nora Armstrong, Lottie Colestock, Maude Durand, Lottie Famariss, Augusta Harris, Belle McGeashen, Daisy Righter, Nina Wright, Effie Bagley, Nettie Anway, Will Bailey, Chester Young, and George Furbush.

Being the first school of the kind organized in the state, it naturally attracted a great deal of attention, and, following our example, many union high schools were organized during the summer of 1891. Centerville and Hayward, in our own county, were among the first.

Our people were not only proud of their school from the first, but they were determined it should have a building that would be not only suitable to the wants of the school, but an ornament to the town and an example of the enterprise of our citizens. An election for this purpose was held on August 27, 1892, and "tax yes" carried by a large majority. The contract for the erection of the new building was let to J. F. Meyers, Esq., on December 31, 1892, and was completed in season for the opening of the school in August, 1893.

HONORING LEONARD F. ROTHKRUG, ESQ., "THE PRIDE OF LONG ISLAND AWARD"

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years the Pride of Judea has been a human service agency that revolves totally around people—those receiving services, those providing them, and those who support them. The pride is a friend to those who have no friends.

This year's community awards dinner is a time when the Pride of Judea honors outstanding individuals for their humanitarian efforts in serving the Queens and Nassau communities.

This year's recipient of "the Pride of Long Island Award" is Mr. Leonard F. Rothkrug, Esq., a man with a lifetime of community dedication from a family that has given generations of devotion to making the world a better place to be.

Mr. Speaker, Leonard Rothkrug began his community service as a young person in Bensonhurst, Brooklyn, where his family was among the principal founders and supporters of the Jewish Community House of Bensonhurst, where he is still an active supporter.

In the following years, Leonard and his wife Nancy lived in Forest Hills, Queens where they became acquainted with the Pride of Judea Children's Home on Dumont Avenue. They naturally became supporters.

Eventually, the Rothkrugs, known by many as the "first family" of zoning and land use, moved to Great Neck. They were, as ever, involved in the social and political lives of their home, and remained committed to an active philanthropic life. The Rothkrugs are the recipients of a number of awards and citations for their selfless works.

Mr. Speaker, Leonard Rothkrug was a supporter and original founder of the Zoning Advisory Council of the city of New York, indeed, he served as president for 10 years. This non-profit group monitored zoning laws for the good of the community. Mr. Rothkrug taught zoning law at the School of Architectural Design. His law firm has worked on significant charitable projects, such as hospitals, young people's centers, schools, houses of worship, and other houses of worship.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to join Pride of Judea in saluting Leonard Rothkrug. This man is a builder in many senses: architecturally, socially, politically, and spir-

itually. And he has helped build a better future for our children. I salute him.

HONORING HISPANIC VETERANS
OF FOREIGN WARS

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize five Hispanic veterans of foreign wars who were honored this past year. On Thursday, November 8, 1990, the Business Leadership of Olvera Street hosted the second annual "Salute to Hispanic Veterans" at El Paseo Restaurant in Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to recognize the men and women who have served this great Nation in its hour of truth. Americans of Mexican decent have been, and continue to be, the most decorated group for their acts of bravery and sacrifice in the field of combat. As one veteran to another, I salute the following men for their commitment to democracy: Lt. Col. Charles M. Arce, Vietnam veteran; Mr. Danny Galindo, World War II veteran; Mr. Joe Manriquez, Vietnam veteran; Mr. Pete Margarito Valdez, Vietnam veteran; and Mr. Manuel R. Zabala, World War II veteran.

HISPANIC VETERANS HONOREES FOR 1990
LT. COL. CHARLES M. ARCE

Lieutenant Colonel Charles M. Arce attended Officers Candidate School at the Infantry School at Fort Benning and received a Commission as Second Lieutenant in March of 1966.

Following his Commission, he attended Jump School and was later assigned as platoon leader for the 3rd Battalion, 506th Infantry, 101st Airborne in the Republic of Vietnam. He was wounded during the 1968 TET offensive, was evacuated from the war zone and sent to the United States. He subsequently was assigned to the Combat Development Command Infantry Team. During his assignment at Ford Ord, he commanded "D" Company, 2nd Battalion, 1st Basic Combat Training Brigade. He returned to Vietnam in 1970 and held two primary assignments: Military Assistance Command Vietnam Advisor, followed by an assignment as Rifle Company Commander, Company "A".

Upon completion of his second tour, Lt. Col. Arce was selected for the Infantry Officers Advance Course and was selected as Assistant Administrative Officer for the 1st Basic Combat Training Brigade at Fort Ord. His present assignment is Provost Marshall for the 40th Infantry Division. Lt. Col. Arce has received numerous awards and decorations for over 30 years of service, including the Bronze Star with Valor, the Purple Heart, Combat Infantryman Badge, Army Commendation Medal with 3rd Oak Leaf Cluster and the Vietnam Cross of Gallantry.

DANNY GALINDO, WORLD WAR II VETERAN

Mr. Danny Galindo joined the Army Air Corps and was immediately sent to Pilot and Navigation schools in Florida. In 1943, he was elevated to 2nd Lieutenant and piloted twin engine B25 bombers and large craft on short flight and long distance flights over enemy territory, throughout Africa, Italy, and Germany.

Throughout his military career, Mr. Galindo made over 50 long distance recon-

naissance and bombing runs and was shot down in Italy. He was rescued by allied land forces and immediately sent out again on long range enemy bombing runs. After being shot down a second time over enemy territory, he was responsible for saving his crew and evacuating them to friendly lines.

In 1944, Mr. Galindo received the Distinguished Flying Cross for his bravery. In that same year, his aircraft was hit by German fire, this time his crew was not saved. He bailed out over enemy lines and was captured by the Germans. While on a death train to an undisclosed German camp, Danny Galindo made his dramatic escape when he jumped off the train and hid in small villages and forests as he made his way back to the allies friendly lines. As he reached the Coast he was rescued by a United States submarine.

Sent out again with his bombing crew, his crew again experienced tragedy. They crash landed in German enemy territory and were captured, chained and were imprisoned at Stalag Luft, Germany. There he was imprisoned for one year until 1945 when he escaped and made his grueling trip to the Russian Military Zone where he was later turned over to the Canadian troops in La Harve, France. Mr. Galindo joins the ranks of men who have received numerous awards, commendations and medals.

JOE MANRIQUEZ, VIETNAM VETERAN

In 1969, at the young age of 18, Joe Manriquez joined the United States Army's 101st Airborne Division "Screaming Eagles." During that first year, he was assigned to the Northern I Corps near the DMZ in South Vietnam.

In one incident Mr. Manriquez singlehandedly engaged 47 North Vietnam soldiers after they had ambushed his entire unit in a rice paddy. In the aftermath of the attack, he emerged as the one survivor out of 30 American soldiers. For his bravery under fire, he received the South Vietnamese government's highest honor, the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry, while the U.S. military awarded him a Bronze Star with Valor.

Joe Manriquez re-enlisted for a second term and served as a door-gunner. In one incident, in a chopper mission, Manriquez is credited with having saved the helicopter and hundreds of U.S. soldiers, and was awarded the Aircraft Crewman's Wings, an Air Medal with Valor, and his second Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry. In an earlier defense, Manriquez was involved in a daring rescue of three officers who were mortally wounded during a surprise mortar attack. For his courageous and quick thinking he was awarded a Combat Infantryman's Badge and yet another Bronze Star with valor.

Manriquez was involved in numerous other campaigns in which he distinguished himself for acts of bravery above and beyond the call of duty. He had entered as a Private First Class and when discharged in 1971, had attained the rank of Specialist 4th Class. Joe Manriquez finished his military career with 21 medals, and is believed to be the highest decorated veteran in the state of California.

PETE MARGARITO VALDEZ, VIETNAM VETERAN

Mr. Pete M. Valdez is a 20 year United States Army veteran who was born and raised in East Los Angeles. He is a retired United States Army Ranger.

Mr. Valdez was stationed and served in many parts of the Continental United States; Hawaii, two tours in Europe and three tours of duty as an Airborne Ranger Infantryman in the Republic of South Viet-

nam. While serving in the military, he earned over 25 awards, badges, combat decorations and numerous commendations for war and peace time service which included the Purple Heart, two Bronze Star Medals and the Vietnam Cross of Gallantry.

While in the Army, Mr. Valdez job ranged from Buck Private in an Airborne Infantry Company to Platoon Sergeant, and Platoon Leader of an Airborne Ranger Infantry Platoon. Valdez also worked at a number of Army schools as an instructor, starting with parachute school, Jump Master School, and Desert Warfare Instructor at the National Training Center. Valdez completed over 2,000 parachute jumps.

Mr. Valdez is currently assigned to the Personnel and Training Bureau, Reserve Coordination Section at the Los Angeles Police Academy where he presently serves with the Los Angeles Police Department.

MANUEL R. ZABALA, WORLD WAR II VETERAN

Manuel R. Zabala was a member of the United States Army, Company K, 405th Infantry Regiment, 102nd Infantry Division.

As a Private First Class, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy in Germany. On February 24, 1945, when a supporting tank was hit and set afire during an attack upon the town of Hottorf, Germany, Private Zabala fearlessly ran forward through heavy enemy fire to the vehicle, removed its five occupants and after administering first aid, assisted in their evacuation to the rear.

When hostile fire disabled a second tank, he braved the intense heat of the burning vehicle and removed the wounded occupants to safety. Noticing that one of the men was suffering from a shattered leg, he performed the necessary amputation using his trench knife as a scalpel. Then, with the help of several comrades, he evacuated all of the wounded men 1000 yards across fire-swept terrain to an aid station.

Private Zabala's courageous unselfish actions and unflinching devotion to duty are actions of the highest traditions of the military service and above and beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to rise with me to salute these outstanding veterans.

ADJUSTING TO SAVINGS AND LOAN REALITY

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Robert H. McKinney, former Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board—when that institution was run properly—is must reading for all Members.

We who live in Indianapolis are proud to share with Mr. McKinney the same hometown: [From the Indianapolis Star, Nov. 29, 1990]

ADJUSTING TO SAVINGS AND LOAN REALITY (By Robert H. McKinney)

The savings and loan industry as we know it has outlived its usefulness, and it must adjust or die. Since the thrifts' traditional markets no longer are viable, there is no more need for a separate industry.

This has been recognized by forward-looking savings and loans that are now capitaliz-

ing on strengths and discarding weaknesses. They no longer are making residential mortgage loans for their portfolios unless they can do so at a very low cost compared to competitors.

Mortgage banking can be viable for thrifts of the 1990s, but it must be made more efficient and less costly. Thus, Congress requirement that thrifts continue emphasizing residential lending is an invitation to even more disaster. There is nothing new here, as Congress continues its role of ill-timed interference.

But all is not lost. The present thrift industry can bring new strengths to the financial market place. Here are a few of the strengths that visionary thrifts can capitalize on in the coming years.

A loyal depositor base accustomed to personalized service; a strong mortgage loan customer base; expertise in real estate finance, particularly residential lending; and low overhead operations, giving the industry the ability to operate at lower margins.

But long-term weaknesses remain. Among them are dependence on residential lending with decreased profit margins caused by commoditization; deposit costs inherently higher than those of money market funds and commercial banks; and lack of expertise in sophisticated forms of banking.

As we move toward a unified bank-thrift structure, Congress, banks and thrifts must move quickly to address the financial industry's strengths and weaknesses.

The first priority is deposit insurance reform. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. is demonstrating increasing weakness, which worsen as economic conditions wreak havoc on the fund, as they did with the savings and loan insurance fund.

Many ideas have been put forward, and we are awaiting results of congressional and administration studies. None of the ideas advanced so far has satisfied all the objectives for deposit insurance reform.

But certain elements are important: reduction or elimination of insurance of brokered deposits; an equitable method of premium assessment, possibly risk-based, applied equally to all financial institutions; and a return to the original concept of insurance for individuals, not businesses.

The strength of our deposit-gathering institutions is of fundamental importance. Our banking system must be able to compete on a global basis. At the same time we must provide financing for housing and for commercial and industrial development.

But these efforts are being thwarted by increasing regulatory costs and restrictions. Banks and thrifts must compete directly with money market funds for deposits but face multiple social and economic national mandates. This disparity needs to be rectified.

The timeworn but accurate phrase "level playing field" demands attention to the underlying reasons for deposit insurance in contrast to the purpose and minimal regulation of money market funds.

There are far too many thrifts and banks operating today. Size is not an absolute determinant for success, but in many lines of business it is mandatory. Management skills are the prime prerequisites. The current rate of rapid disappearance of banks and thrifts will continue as the strong get stronger and the weak disappear.

Since there is no longer a need for a separate thrift industry, Congress should provide a readily available means for conversion from a thrift charter to a commercial bank charter. This will speed the evolution toward

a homogeneous banking industry, with the merger of the Office of Thrift Supervision into the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The Federal Reserve Board should continue as the regulator for bank holding companies, since this provides an effective check and balance in the regulatory scheme.

No business survives without a public need. The savings and loan industry has rendered a valuable service to the nation. But its day is past. The industry must offer its historical strengths to the unified financial marketplace while learning the ropes of commercial banking. The synergies that result will benefit consumers, the industry and the global markets of the 1990s.

**JAMES E. NIXON, NEW PRESIDENT
OF INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS
ASSOCIATION OF ILLINOIS**

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate Mr. James E. Nixon of Galesburg, IL, on his election as president of the Independent Accountants Association of Illinois. Mr. Nixon has been a respected accountant and businessman in western Illinois for many years.

Following is the acceptance speech given by Mr. Nixon at the IAAI's 1990 State convention:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH GIVEN BY JAMES E. NIXON, PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS ASSOCIATION OF ILLINOIS

I accept the presidency of this association with both a sense of pride and a sense of purpose. A sense of pride because I know we have accomplished much—we continue to offer top quality educational programs, top quality treasury card review courses and we have many members that are vitally interested in the success and improvement of the organization.

A sense of pride because I realize that I am looking at and talking to the most conscientious and dedicated professionals in the state. This sense of pride is tempered, however, with an offsetting sense of purpose with the realization that we have not done near enough. There is much to be done and I believe it is time that we give serious attention to and begin to act on many of these matters.

It seems appropriate in this modern age to have a theme that fits the particular situation. Always having a desire to be appropriate, I came up with what I believe to be a fitting theme for this 1990-91 years. Many of you will remember the three R's of past school days—reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic. I hope that you will also remember this year's theme—the three C's: Commitment, Continuity, and Cooperation.

I believe these three C's to be important and appropriate because much of what needs to be done cannot be accomplished in one year.

Our legislative effort has already been active. It goes without saying that the legislative committee and our affiliated PAC will continue to be active until we successfully meet the challenge of the 1993 sunset legislation. We are enthusiastic and anxious to start on membership and education pro-

grams that we are hopeful will add growth to our membership while at the same time increasing the number of members that are accredited in accounting.

Commitment, continuity, and cooperation. It cannot be done quickly; it cannot be done alone. Abraham Lincoln once said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well themselves, in their separate and individual capacities." If you substitute the word association for government into this quotation, you will understand how IAAI fits into attaining our individual and collective goals and objectives, as well as understanding the importance of the three C's—Commitment, Continuity, and Cooperation—in that overall effort.

ON YOUNG VOTERS' APATHY

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an article which appeared on the opinion page of New York Newsday shortly before last November's congressional elections. The article calls attention to the rapidly declining portion of Americans under the age of 30 who vote, and discusses the urgent need for a reversal of this trend. In addition to the inherent importance of the article's message, it is written by my nephew, John Beilenson, and I commend it to your attention.

[From New York Newsday, Nov. 1, 1990]

WHY YOUTH IS NOT SERVED

(By John Beilenson)

While many Americans go to the polls on Tuesday, many young Americans will do what we do most weekdays. Too much of the twentysomething crowd will go to our jobs, come home, maybe work out, eat a microwave dinner and pop down to watch the geezers in "thirtysomething."

In the last mid-term election four years ago, a scant 21.9 percent of registered 18- to 24-year-olds voted. This year, we have no reason to believe that number will rise. Voting rates among young people have been dropping steadily—faster even than the decline seen among all voters—since 18-year-olds won the right to vote in 1972. By contrast, more than 60 percent of people over 65 went to the polls in 1986.

It doesn't matter that young people distrust elected officials because they are repeatedly revealed—from Iran-Contra to HUD to the savings-and-loan imbroglio—to be corrupt. Or that our two most recent presidents made a virtual religion of getting government off our backs, of promoting the idea that government can't solve social problems.

Young Americans glibly denounce politicians as liars and incompetents, but we fail to understand that our country is run by a representative government, and these incompetent "liars" are the only representatives we have.

Young America's electoral apathy has ceded political influence to our mothers and fathers, and especially to our grandmothers and grandfathers, who vote in far greater numbers and have powerful and well-organized lobbies in Washington.

Faced with the disapproval of the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP),

politicians quake in their boots. "Touch Social Security and you die," senators and representatives say. Tamper with Medicare or propose a controversial health care bill, as Illinois Congressman Dan Rostenkowski did, and politicians risk receiving the treatment Rostenkowski got: confrontation by elderly citizens, who sprawled across his car's windshield as he tried to drive to work.

The result is that last year, according to the Congressional Budget Office, spending on people 65 and over made up about 47 percent of the national budget—if you don't count military appropriations and interest payments. As Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan said recently of the budget process, "For people with the franchise, this is a tremendously responsive system."

What happens when young Americans don't vote? Well, there's no budget debate about tax breaks for new homeowners or expanding college loan programs. Aid For Families with Dependent Children, Head Start and other social programs for the poor—generally young mothers and their children—have been cut back or sacrificed to preserve health care subsidies and other benefits for the elderly. Regressive taxes on gasoline, beer and cigarettes, which take a disproportionate chunk out of younger, poorer people's disposable income, are imposed rather than hikes in more progressive income taxes—all without fear of an electoral backlash.

Electoral participation is the lifeblood of our democracy. James Madison, in "The Federalist Papers," argued that one of our political system's strengths was its ability to prevent individual factions—special interests and particular sections of the citizenry—from predominating.

Our faction needs to be heard; we must vote.

If we don't, if young America continues to refuse our civic opportunity, the government of the older people for the older people will continue to ignore our interests.

**QUESTIONS ABOUT WAR IN THE
PERSIAN GULF**

HON. BERNIE SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns that I have with the entire discussion regarding the crisis in the Persian Gulf is that the President has refused to be straightforward with the American people and answer some of the hard questions that the people have been asking regarding a potential war in the gulf. Let me raise some of those questions now in the hope that the President and his administration will begin responding to these concerns.

Up to this point, we have not heard any estimate from the President of the expected casualties in such a war. While we fully recognize that it is impossible to predict such figures exactly, we do know, for example, that thousands of body bags have been sent to Saudi Arabia. We know that in the first stages of the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, the casualties were enormous. Can the President tell us how many Americans would die if we launch a war against Iraq?

As we all know, the United States has a \$3 trillion debt, with the cost of the S&L bailout

expected to reach up to another trillion. The Washington Post recently reported that the fiscal 1991 deficit will be \$50 billion more than previously estimated. As a result of last fall's deficit reduction plan, Medicare, veterans' benefits, student loans, farm support and other domestic programs will be cut by billions of dollars, and the gas tax will rise by 5 cents per gallon.

The estimated cost of maintaining our troops in Saudi Arabia this year, without war, is over \$30 billion. If war breaks out, these costs could reach several hundred billion. Can the President tell us how much he would cut in Social Security, how much more will be cut from Medicare, how much from farm supports, student loans and veterans programs, and how much more in taxes the middle class and the poor will have to pay, if we go to war?

The President has suggested repeatedly that war in the Persian Gulf has to do with freedom and American values. Our constituents would like to know the relationship between freedom and the feudal, undemocratic governments of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Saudi Arabia is a kingdom without free elections, freedom of religion or freedom of speech and has a very poor human rights record. Specifically, we need to know why young Americans should die on the sands of Saudi Arabia when that government does not allow our Christian soldiers to celebrate Christmas or our Jewish soldiers to celebrate Hannukah. Women in our country need to know what freedom means when women in Saudi Arabia can't vote, speak out, participate in politics or even drive a car. Please, Mr. President, explain to our confused constituents what war in the Persian Gulf has to do with human freedom.

Lastly, Mr. President, we would appreciate your best estimate of how many years it would be necessary for American troops to stay in the region after an American victory and the taking of Baghdad. And what would be the cost to the taxpayers?

These are some of the questions that our constituents are asking us. We need to have them answered.

ALBERT E. BLUMBERG

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, 1990, the New York State Council of Senior Citizens, at its fourth annual luncheon, presented one of its three Intergenerational Service Awards to Dr. Albert E. Blumberg. The award is given in recognition of continuing advocacy on behalf of senior citizens, those still in the work force, and our children, the future of our society.

Dr. Blumberg's leadership extends far beyond his local community. He serves as president of the Congress of Senior Citizens of Greater New York, vice president of the New York State Council of Senior Citizens, chair of the Presbyterian Hospital Community Health Council, and president of the J. Hood Wright Senior Center. In each of these roles, Dr.

Blumberg has been an articulate advocate for the needs of people, translating his ideals into effective action aimed at achieving social justice.

Many of those who have worked with Dr. Albert Blumberg view him as a role model, a person who represents citizen participation at its best. He combines the ability to conceptualize the issues with a readiness to take on the less than glamorous tasks crucial to any organizing effort.

The recognition given to Dr. Blumberg by the New York State Council of Senior Citizens is well deserved. The occasion allows us to rediscover the meaning of community leadership and service. It would be difficult to find a better example than Dr. Albert Blumberg.

THE HAYWARD-CASTRO VALLEY
BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY
WOMEN CELEBRATES ITS 50TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Hayward-Castro Valley branch of the American Association of University Women, in California's Ninth Congressional District, which celebrates its 50th anniversary this month.

The American Association of University Women [AAUW] is a nationwide organization dedicated to the education of and the advancement of women. Nationwide, the organization has over 193,000 members. In June, the AAUW National Association will be celebrating its 110th anniversary which makes it the oldest women's organization in the United States.

The Hayward-Castro Valley branch of the AAUW began in 1941 with a membership of 35 and in its 50 years has grown to over 215 active members.

The Hayward-Castro Valley branch has worked tirelessly to promote educational reform by providing scholarships for both California State University Hayward and Chabot College; fellowships for women pursuing advanced degrees; grants for research and community service projects, and it has participated in the study of and the search for solutions to current social and educational problems.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Hayward-Castro Valley chapter of the AAUW on its 50th anniversary. I can only hope that the chapter will be able to continue in its efforts to promote equity and educational opportunities for women for the next 50 years.

HONORING JOEL A. MIELE, SR.,
"THE PRIDE OF QUEENS AWARD"

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years the Pride of Judea has been a human service

agency that revolves totally around people—those receiving services, those providing them, and those who support them. The Pride is a friend to those who have no friends.

This year's community awards dinner is a time when the Pride of Judea honors outstanding individuals for their humanitarian efforts in serving the Queens and Nassau communities.

This year's recipient of "the Pride of Queens Award" is Joel A. Miele, Sr., a true example of a humanitarian citizen. Mr. Miele is the Queens representative to the new city planning commission, the latest in a long list of his distinguished accomplishments.

Early in his career, while in the Navy, Mr. Miele led his construction battalion in building playgrounds and roofs for orphanages. He is now a retired captain of the Civil Engineer Corps.

Mr. Miele, a resident of Howard Beach, is a professional engineer with his own practice in Queens with his brother and son. His business reputation has earned him several officer positions in professional organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Joel Miele's community dedication spreads throughout city life. He is involved in the membership or board of directors in neighborhood associations, libraries, civic groups, hospitals, economic development agencies, and the local community board. In fact, he was chair of Queens Community Board No. 109 for 12 years. He was a delegate to the New York State Bicentennial Constitutional Convention, and has been awarded "Man of the Year," "Engineer of the Year," "Outstanding Community Leader" and other such awards by his friends, neighbors, and business associates.

Joel Miele has been heard to say, "If there is a need that I am aware of—a vacuum—in the areas of civic, community, and not-for-profit life, I am motivated to fill that need." Indeed he does, every day of his life. All of us in Queens are very proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere pleasure to join Pride of Judea in acclaiming Joel Miele with the "Pride of Queens" award. I am honored to join his wife, Josephine, his family and friends in recognizing a lifetime of contribution. Because we have people like Joel Miele today, our children and grandchildren will have a better tomorrow.

SUCCESS OF HELP US GROW
STRAIGHT [HUGS] PROGRAM

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an innovative and effective drug prevention program in my home State of Rhode Island. I believe this program can serve as a model for us as we begin to consider legislation dealing with the national problem of drug abuse among our children.

Began as a dream, "Help Us Grow Straight" [HUGS] became a reality in 1987. HUGS is based on the idea of giving our young people natural, rather than chemical, highs through

the physical challenges of hiking, camping, mountain climbing and biking. By understanding superior alternatives to drug use, our children are dissuaded from experimenting with the dangerous substances which are so tempting to high school and junior high school students. The program, offered to North Cumberland Rhode Island middle school's eighth graders, encourages hard work and dedication to a worthwhile goal in order to achieve greater satisfaction and enhanced self-concepts.

In recent times, participants in HUGS have traveled far and wide, experienced a variety of natural highs. They have climbed mountains in New Hampshire, biked throughout the Island of Martha's Vinyard, and spent a week in Arizona, much of it hiking in the Grand Canyon. Last April, I was fortunate enough to welcome these upbeat travelers home at Rhode Island's Greene Airport after their trip to Arizona.

The response from the students to this experience in Arizona has convinced me that HUGS is a program that produces real results. This HUGS experience and others like it has allowed its participants to realize that pride in one's accomplishments can offer a lifetime high. I received over a dozen letters from these students, who gave me a clear message that HUGS taught them the superiority of a natural high over a chemical high. One such student, Sarah Pelletier, wrote me about her experience with HUGS:

The whole purpose of HUGS is to teach teens that natural highs are so much better than drug highs. I think that the HUGS program does a wonderful job doing just that. You may feel high while taking the drugs, but afterwards you are overcome by depression. When I hiked the Grand Canyon, I felt high, but I also felt high afterwards because I was proud of myself—I actually made it out of the Grand Canyon alive. I just think that it's too bad that there aren't more programs such as HUGS around.

As a U.S. legislator, I have always argued that we must teach our children of the perils of drug abuse before they are given a chance to find out the hard way. HUGS is an ideal program which seeks this important goal. As such, I hope my colleagues here in the House of Representatives will recognize the value of the HUGS Program, and support this kind of approach to the problem of drug abuse among our young people.

**NATIONAL WEATHER ASSOCIATION
MAKES FIRST ANNUAL PUBLIC
SERVICE AWARD**

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on October 17 the National Weather Association made its First Annual Public Service Award to Mark Lange of Vincennes, IN, at a banquet here in the suburbs of Washington. In the presentation Andrew Horwitz, chairman of the Awards Committee said:

You were selected based on your decision to cancel all regular programming to provide non-stop broadcasts for over three hours of tornado warnings, including exact locations

of the funnels, in the station's listening area. You gave proper warnings to people, advising them to accepted sheltered areas, and special advice to individuals in mobile homes, saying all the right words in a calm, non-flustered manner. Nearly every local and state agency contacted you to voice their thanks. You used local radio to do what it does best, because of your commitment to the community and an interest in weather. Your efforts are a prime example of what radio stations should be doing.

I had hoped to be there for this occasion but the House was in session at the time so I could not. I have a special reason for my keen interest in this award because the National Weather Association has named this annual award for my father, Walter J. Bennett, who was a weather bureau forecaster for nearly 50 years and was himself a very effective leader in a long life of public service. My family and I are deeply grateful that this was done.

**UPON INTRODUCTION OF THE
DESERT SHIELD TAX RELIEF
ACT OF 1991**

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to assist the American servicemen and servicewomen participating in Operation Desert Shield. A recent article in the Washington Post explained that the Internal Revenue Service planned to require our soldiers to file their tax returns on time or face financial penalties.

Fortunately, the IRS has extended the income tax filing deadline for our troops in the Persian Gulf until June 15. While I commend this decision, I am outraged that the IRS has not waived the interest penalties that our soldiers would incur should they not be able to meet the June 15 deadline. To say the least, these brave men and women have more pressing matters on their mind and we should not burden them with the cumbersome task of meeting income tax filing deadlines.

My bill will provide automatic extensions of time for filing Federal income tax returns and other tax-related acts for members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in Operation Desert Shield. The extensions and waivers will allow our soldiers to defer the filing of their Federal income tax returns without penalty for up to 180 days after they return from the gulf.

We all hope and pray that the Persian Gulf crisis is resolved in a peaceful fashion. Regardless of the outcome, however, American military personnel are experiencing tremendous emotional and psychological stress due to the current situation. This legislation will provide our service persons relief from the worry of legal action due to failure to file Federal income taxes. For the sacrifices they are making, it is the very least we can do.

My bill already enjoys the strong bipartisan support of 30 House Members. I urge all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in cosponsoring this important measure.

**FACTORS LIMITING THE EFFEC-
TIVENESS OF ECONOMIC SAN-
CTIONS AGAINST IRAQ**

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, much of the debate in recent weeks and months concerning the Persian Gulf crisis has focused on the effectiveness of economic sanctions against Iraq. The desirability of relying solely on the embargo to resolve this crisis is understandable. It would obviously be in the best interests of the United States and the world if the sanctions by themselves bring Iraq to its economic knees and force Saddam Hussein to remove all Iraqi troops from Kuwait. However, this Member believes it is important to recognize some of the factors limiting the effectiveness of these sanctions.

Although almost all governments are enforcing the United Nations trade sanctions against Iraq, there are many foreign companies and individuals interested in filling the economic vacuum created by the embargo. Since the sanctions were enacted, private firms have been seeking ways to supply Iraq with the goods it demands. In addition to industrial and agricultural products, these foreign firms are offering military, chemical, transport, electrical, and oil-related items for sale to Iraq.

Individual smugglers are also actively involved in transporting goods to Iraq and the country's borders have proven to be very porous. A recent Associated Press article states that thousands of smugglers in the area are "making a mockery of the sanctions." It is realistic to expect further holes to develop in the embargo if Iraq's neighbors and former trading partners continue to suffer economically as a result of the sanctions.

EARNING BY LEARNING

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, last summer, the early childhood department at West Georgia College in Carrollton carried out a pilot program designed to motivate youngsters to read by giving them a monetary incentive. The program, called "Earning by Learning," had very positive results in the Sixth District of Georgia.

Conducted in five Sixth District counties—Carroll, Spalding, Clayton, Coweta, and Douglas—Earning by Learning was designed to encourage poorly motivated third and fourth graders to read. Over the course of 5 weeks in the summer of 1990, 282 students earned \$2 for every book they read and reported on to an adult volunteer. In total, the group earned \$7,602 by reading 3,801 books.

Because of our success, I decided to introduce a bill to allow public elementary and secondary schools throughout the country to duplicate such innovative projects. By amending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

of 1965, H.R. 95 would make programs like Earning by Learning an allowable expense for any public elementary or secondary school in the United States. Thus, the benefits of the Sixth District's Earning by Learning Program could be extended to youngsters across America.

During our Earning by Learning project in Georgia, many students both improved their reading skills and gained a greater enjoyment of reading. I am proud to share with my colleagues today the following article written by Stephanie Wynn, who read the most books during those 5 weeks in 1990. Her story is a case in point of why we should allow Earning by Learning type programs in all public elementary and secondary schools.

ONCE UPON A TIME, A LITTLE GIRL WAS PAID TO READ

(By Stephanie Wynn)

(Stephanie, age 10, is a fourth-grader at Villa Rica Primary in Villa Rica, Ga. This summer she took part in a pilot project conceived by GOP Rep. Newt Gingrich and carried out by West Georgia College's early childhood education department. The more than 200 third- and fourth-graders who participated were "at risk" readers. They had potential but were not motivated to read for pleasure. By the end of the summer, Stephanie had read more books than any other participant. We invited her to send us her story, which we have not altered in any way.)

Last summer I read 83 books. I earned \$166.00, \$2 for every book.

Mrs. Hamilton, my school's assistant principal, told me about the Earning by Learning Reading Program which was going to be during the summer at my school. I went to the school library and found different books. The books were fun. I told about the books I had read to Mrs. Hamilton, and Mrs. Rothbart, and Mrs. Marchman. I picked the books out all by myself. My mom helped a little bit by saying, "Would you like these books?"

I read all of my books in my bedroom and the living room. I like to read on my bed or on the couch. I read some of the easier books to myself. Some of the harder ones, I read them out loud to my mom or my dad. My friends said that's OK if you read books. My grandmother was surprised that I was reading a bunch of books. She thought I was only reading one or two. My brother thought I was weird for reading so many books, but, I told him that he was crazy. My mom, dad, my sister, Sonya, my brother, Stephen, Mrs. Hamilton, Mrs. Brooks, Mrs. Rothbart, Mrs. Marchman, and everyone was proud of me for reading the most books.

"My favorite books were "The Care Bears" books and I like the Strawberry Shortcake book, too. These books were about helping people and about trying to keep a man from taking all the fruit from the Strawberry People. I like them because they were neat to read. They made me feel like they were really real. One of the Care Bear books was about a little girl who was scared of the dark. That's me!! I used to be afraid of the dark. One of the books made me want to go where the Care Bears are. When I grow up, I want to be a movie star. The Care Bears are on television and that reminds me of being a movie star.

I recommended a book to my friend Jeremiah. I let him take it home and read it. He said it was really good. He brought it back to me.

The hardest book I read was one about horses. This book was very boring to me.

There were a lot of words on the pages and not very many pictures. I like books that have lots of pictures.

I read a few books that were short. One was Jack and the Beanstalk. It was fun to read and also short.

I spent a lot of time this summer reading. If I hadn't read the books, I would have been bored. I do like to swim and watch TV sometimes. But the reading time was fun.

The awards ceremony was in the gym at my school. All the kids families were there. The awards ceremony, my mother, my father, and my sister and brother were there. All the kids were very happy to get their money. I was the last person to get mine. The reason I was last was because I was the highest reader. I felt weird. Mrs. Hamilton was kidding me. She told everybody that one night I wanted my mom to help me tell about the books. Mrs. Hamilton told me that she would give the money to my mom. I didn't like that. Everybody laughed when she said that.

With the money I earned I bought some new clothes and a lot of Barbie stuff.

The summer reading program is over. I am still reading. I am still reading because it is fun.

I think it is a good idea to give kids money for reading books. It showed me that reading was fun. It also helped bring my mom and I closer together. We had fun reading together.

I am reading Cinderella now. It is a story about a girl named Cinderella. She had two step-sisters and a mean step mother. She had to work and work and work hard every day. One day a letter came in. Her step mother read it. It was an invitation to a ball and she didn't have anything to wear to the ball. But her fairy godmother gave her a dress. It was ice-blue. It was pretty. She went to the ball. She lost her shoe and she ran out to the coachmen. The crown duke came to Cinderella's house. She was locked in her room. Then the mice brought the key up to her room. She got free and she was going downstairs to meet the crown duke. First her sisters tried on the slipper. After her sisters tried it on, it was too small. Then Cinderella tried it on. It broke. But, she had the other slipper. That showed the crown duke who she was. He took her to the ball. She married the prince. They lived happily every after. The end.

BUENA PARK CITY COUNCIL
HONORS KENNETH B. JONES

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today it is rare to encounter an American who unselfishly devotes his life to serving his community and fellow citizens, in many cases without any monetary recompense. Few of us are willing to sacrifice the advantages of private life for the many burdens of public service. However, I would like to take this opportunity to alert my colleagues to one of my constituents who has devoted his life to public service and has made countless personal sacrifices to serve his fellow citizens.

Mr. Kenneth B. Jones served as the mayor pro tem of Buena Park, CA, in 1989 and 1990 and as a member of the Buena Park City Council from 1980 to 1990. The city council of

Buena Park recently adopted a resolution commending Jones for dedicating his life to the community and demonstrating in many ways his "deep and genuine love for this city and its citizens" and for always placing his concern for the public good ahead of his personal interests. I would like to join the Buena Park City Council in honoring this exceptional citizen.

Before joining the city council, Jones served his community for nearly 30 years in the Buena Park Police Department as a police officer, police sergeant, and chief of police. Jones received the Police Officer of the Year award in 1970, 1971, and 1979. Furthermore, Jones served as a fireman from 1949 to 1952 and has held a number of other official positions in his many years of service in Buena Park. In addition, Ken Jones has held leadership positions in scores of community service organizations including the Kiwanis Club, the Buena Park PTA, the Lions Club, the Orange County Sheriff's Association, and many other organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Ken Jones stands as a fine example to those throughout the Nation who seek to serve the public. I strongly commend his efforts and honor his accomplishments. I encourage all citizens to look to Ken Jones as a fine example of the positive influence one citizen can have on his community.

ARNOLD I. BURNS' ELLIS ISLAND
MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, President George Bush has reminded us that we are a nation of communities. Nowhere is the fact of our ethnic, religious, and racial diversity more honored than at Ellis Island, where so many Americans, from so many backgrounds, have come to these shores.

On December 6, 1990, Arnold I. Burns, former Deputy Attorney General for the United States, was awarded the 1990 Ellis Island Medal of Honor at ceremonies conducted on the island itself. The medal honors distinguished representatives of various ethnic backgrounds. Mr. Burns was honored along with a number of Americans, including President Bush, former Presidents Reagan, Ford, Carter, and Nixon, and many others.

Mr. Burns, who is of Russian descent, is an alumnus of Union College in Schenectady, NY, and Cornell University Law School. He serves as vice chairman of the board of trustees of the Boys and Girls Clubs of America and is active in many civic and charitable organizations.

The nomination of recipients of the medal came through member organizations of the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations [NECO] and through thousands of forms submitted by the public. NECO, an umbrella group for 66 of the Nation's largest heritage groups, participated in the first presentation of the medals in 1986 during the 100th anniversary celebration of the Statue of Liberty.

I want to bring this event and Mr. Burns' award to the attention of our colleagues, be-

cause they serve to remind us that this country is, indeed, "E Pluribus Unum," one out of many. This medal is a great tribute not only to Mr. Burns and the other recipients, but to the unsung millions who came to Ellis Island to begin a new life and a better America.

TRIBUTE TO CUB SCOUT PACK 332

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Cub Scout Pack 332 of St. Bartholomew R.C. Church for their 35 years of service.

On October 1, 1990, Cub Scout Pack 332 was officially rechartered and dedicated to serving the youth of the Philadelphia community.

Throughout their 35 years, the pack has worked to enhance and serve the Philadelphia neighborhood. They deserve great recognition for their success in providing the city with an outstanding example of commitment to achievement.

St. Bartholomew R.C. Church has assisted Cub Scout Pack 332 by providing meeting places and holding activities. I am sure they will continue to provide many more years of dedicated sponsorship.

Mr. Speaker, I join the citizens of Philadelphia in expressing my gratitude to St. Bartholomew R.C. Church for sponsoring this Scouting organization. In addition, I also join them in commending and thanking Cub Scout Pack No. 332 for 35 years of service to its community.

TRIBUTE TO DWAYNE E. HOFUS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dwayne E. Hofus of my 17th Congressional District of Ohio, who received the Carnegie Medal from the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission.

The Carnegie Medal is awarded to people who risk their lives to save or attempt to save the lives of others. Only 105 other persons were recognized by the commission in 1990.

Dwayne E. Hofus saved Jessica Maxwell, 2, and Heather McGee, 3, from their burning home in Youngstown, OH, June 10, 1989. The two girls were asleep on the second floor of their family's two-story house when, just before dawn, fire erupted in the first-floor kitchen. An alert neighbor, Mr. Hofus, spotted the flames through the window and immediately ran to the house to alert its occupants. He forced open the front door and headed for the second floor, where he discovered one of the

girls. After carrying her outside to safety, Mr. Hofus, unaware that another girl remained in the house, left to call the fire department.

Only upon returning to the scene did he learn that another girl was still inside the home. Despite the dense smoke, heat, and rapidly spreading flames, Mr. Hofus reentered the house and was able to locate the second child in an upstairs bedroom. Mr. Hofus entered the bedroom, above the burning kitchen, and began to carry the child downstairs to safety. In the process, Mr. Hofus tripped and fell part way down the stairs. Luckily, he managed to regain his footing and safety deposit his precious cargo outside. Jessica and Heather were subsequently taken to the hospital for treatment, as was Mr. Hofus. All are now fully recovered.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Dwayne E. Hofus as a truly exceptional neighbor and citizen. May his tremendous courage and selflessness serve as a shining example for us all. Mr. Hofus is a great credit to both himself and the community. I am honored to represent this outstanding individual.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ENERGY CONSERVATION

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 9, 1991

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Washington Post reported that the White House is opposed to the inclusion of energy conservation measures by Energy Secretary James Watkins in his recommendations for a national energy policy. This is, indeed, troubling news that does not bode well for the development of a sound national energy strategy.

The energy crises of the 1970's should have taught us that energy conservation works. From a 1977 peak of about 8.8 million barrels per day, we reduced oil imports to a 1985 low of about 5.1 million barrels. As we see imports rising again to a level exceeding 8 million barrels in 1989—of which 2.2 million are from Arab OPEC nations—it is imperative that the role of conservation be enhanced, not reduced.

The administration also cannot afford to ignore the fact that declining U.S. competitiveness in world markets is due, in some measure, to our gluttonous energy appetite. The U.S. economy consumes about \$440 billion annually for energy, an amount equal to about 11 percent of our GNP. Japan's percentages is only half this amount. Higher energy consumption by American manufacturers raises prices and makes it difficult for us to compete with foreign producers.

Although the administration may not recognize the value and importance of energy conservation, the American public does. In public opinion polls, the American people, by wide

margins, prefer conservation to increased production as an energy strategy. They are also quite willing to make the lifestyle changes necessary to achieve energy savings.

If the White House insists on an energy policy that seeks to build more nuclear powerplants and promote oil and gas drilling in environmentally sensitive areas, while excluding energy conservation as a critical component, it will be making a serious mistake. The Congress will not accept this and neither will the American people.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 10, 1991, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 15

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings to examine services available to children and youth from impoverished families, focusing on ways to ensure that they graduate from high school, preparing them for the workforce, and/or helping them get into college.

SD-428

JANUARY 30

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico.

SD-366

Rules and Administration

Organizational meeting, to consider committee rules of procedure and committee budget for the 102nd Congress, membership for the Joint Committees on Printing and the Library, and pending legislative and administrative business.

SR-301