

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE MICKEY
LELAND CHILDHOOD HUNGER
RELIEF ACT OF 1993

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of a very special piece of legislation, the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act. This bill responds to an ongoing national tragedy, the tragedy of hunger amidst our land of plenty. This bill has passed the House twice: In 1990 as part of the farm bill and last year in the children's initiative combining child antihunger and family preservation proposals. In August 1990, this body endorsed the Leland bill in a striking 336 to 83 vote.

The Leland bill's provisions have had strong bipartisan support. They reflect the ideas and hard work of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and of BILL EMERSON, whose advice, friendship, and dedication to ending hunger I valued and relied upon in the year he served with me as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition and on the Select Committee on Hunger's Domestic Task Force.

The bill is named for our colleague, the late Mickey Leland. As you know, Mickey had a very personal interest in the issue of hunger, both domestic and international hunger. Mickey was a special person. He had a rare combination of compassion and commitment. I would like to think of this bill as a sort of living memorial to Mickey and his work. By providing more food to millions of American children living in poverty and by preventing some of these children and their families from being thrown into the ranks of the homeless, we can help Mickey Leland's spirit to live on.

As Mickey understood, it would be irresponsible for us to sit by and ignore the mounting evidence of the prevalence of hunger and its consequences. For example, in 1991 a ground-breaking study of childhood hunger known as the Community Childhood Hunger Identification Project [CCHIP] found that about 5 million children under the age of 12 are hungry in this country, with even more on the brink of hunger. Hungry children are two to three times more likely to have suffered recent health problems than low-income children from non-hungry households. These health problems are associated with higher school absenteeism.

The consequences of hunger among children should give all of us pause. The U.S. Public Health Service has reported that the Surgeon General's goal of eliminating growth retardation of infants and children caused by inadequate diet cannot be met under present circumstances. Recent research shows that

hungry children have significantly impaired abilities to learn. It is unconscionable the children of America, who represent the future of our Nation, should have to endure these conditions.

I am proud to say that the legislation that we are introducing today, which is an updated version of the bill that the Committee on Agriculture reported out by voice vote in 1991, is an entirely fitting memorial to Mickey Leland. The bill makes a serious effort to attack the causes of hunger rather than just its symptoms.

The centerpiece of the bill is a pair of provisions designed to alleviate hunger among the homeless and near homeless. HUD and Census Bureau data show that 45 percent of all poor renters spend at least 70 percent of their incomes on shelter costs. Households that are forced to devote this much of their income to shelter costs will almost by definition be at severe risk of hunger. Moreover, the high cost of shelter for low-income Americans is forcing more and more of them to double-up in housing. Unfortunately, current food stamp rules do not properly recognize the needs of these households.

Our bill would allow households with children to deduct high shelter costs in the same way that elderly and disabled households do at present. Under current law, households may deduct shelter expenses that exceed 50 percent of their incomes, but only up to \$186 a month. The cap does not apply to elderly and disabled households.

The excess shelter deduction was enacted to avoid forcing households with high housing and utility costs to choose between eating and paying their shelter costs. But for households that are not elderly or disabled, this deduction is limited to \$186 a month—even if the household's excess shelter costs are greater than this. This means that the very families that face the most severe housing cost burdens—families that do not receive HUD housing aid and that pay extremely high proportions of their incomes for housing—are the families that are not permitted to deduct the full cost of their excess shelter costs. Under the current food stamp benefit structure, families with very high shelter costs are thus assumed that money is available for food that actually must go to pay the rent and utility bills—and as a direct result their food stamp benefits are set at unrealistically low levels. The cap most severely burdens families with children since it is a fixed limit with no allowance for household size.

Since the cap was enacted in 1977, the low-income housing market has changed radically. In 1978, the number of low-rent housing units, defined as units renting for no more than \$250 a month, as measured in 1985 dollars, exceeded the number of households with incomes below \$10,000 a year. In 1985, there were 3.7 million fewer low-rent units than there were households below \$10,000, a

sharp reversal of the conditions that prevailed only 7 years earlier. The result has been a stunning increase in the housing cost burdens on poor households.

Moreover, the rationale for the cap has disappeared since 1977. Congress imposed the cap to keep middle-income households from getting food stamps by claiming large shelter deductions. At the time, eligibility was based solely on income after deductions. Gross income limits have since been added to the program to exclude higher income households without regard to their deductible expenses. Lifting the cap therefore will not allow middle-income households to receive food stamps: It will only provide more realistic benefits to families with high shelter costs who are now eligible. Our bill also would simplify the current food stamp household definition. It would require that persons purchasing and preparing food together apply for food stamps as a single household. Adults who buy and cook food on their own could as separate households from their relatives. For example, when two brothers who had previously lived on their own move into the same apartment because they cannot afford separate housing, either or both could apply for food stamps independently if they bought and cooked food separately. The bill would still require parents and their minor children, and spouses, to be in the same household.

Current law requires, subject to several exceptions, that parents and their adult children, and adult siblings, be in the same household even if they buy and cook food separately. State food stamp administrators have complained that the current definition is far too complex and excessively error-prone.

The current household definition discourages low-income people from doubling-up in the homes of relatives. This is extremely counterproductive at a time of rising homelessness. These rules hurt migrant farm workers, who may live separately in their base States but double-up with relatives in labor camps during their travels to save money.

The AFDC, Medicaid, and SSI programs have no comparable rule requiring adult siblings, or parents and their adult children, to apply for and receive benefits together. This bill simplifies these rules and removes disincentives for families to live together while still preventing parents from artificially separating themselves from their own minor children or husbands and wives who live together from claiming to be separate households solely to manipulate the Food Stamp Program.

The bill seeks to promote self-sufficiency and personal responsibility in several ways. It would exclude the first \$50 a month paid as child support from being counted as income in determining food stamp allotments. AFDC already allows households to keep the first \$50 of child support paid each month.

The \$50 exclusion in AFDC recognizes the importance of having parents assume respon-

● 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.

sibility for their children: It gives custodial parents an incentive to seek out absent parents and absent parents an incentive to pay child support. The Food Stamp Program currently undercuts these incentives by counting the \$50 payments as income, which reduces food stamps.

Excluding the first \$50 of child support payments for food stamps as well as AFDC will simplify the administration of the two programs and ease burdens on case workers. This reform passed this body in 1987 as part of the welfare reform bill.

The bill also would seek to encourage low-income absent parents to make support payments and ensure that the ability of these parents to feed their current families is not unduly burdened by their performance of their child support obligations. The bill would exclude from the income of a low-income household any legally binding child support payments a household member makes to support a child outside of the household.

Under present law, no exclusion from income is provided for child support payments an absent parent makes. This means that if an absent parent remarries and has children in his second family—but still has low income—the payments he makes to support the children in his first family are counted as though they represented income still available to buy food for his current family.

In addition to being an unrealistic reflection of the resources available to the father's current family, the current law also raises serious equity issues. If two absent fathers have the same level of income before child support payments—but one responsibly pays child support while the other fails to—both receive the same amount of food stamps. Yet the father who has made the support payments has less money left for food purchases than the father who makes no payments.

Just as a key principle of welfare reform was that poor parents who work should be better off than those who do not, so, too, should the families of absent parents who pay child support be better off than parents who neglect their obligation to support their absent children.

Still another problem with current law is that money paid as child support from one poor household to another is now double-counted as income. It is counted first as income to the absent parent making the child support payment, that is, the parent's gross income is counted without deduction for the amount paid as child support, and then counted again as income to the household that receives the payment. This means the same dollars are simultaneously counted as income to two different households, even though the funds can only be used once to buy food and other necessities.

The proposal would strengthen food stamp employment and training [E&T] programs by increasing the limit for reimbursements to recipients for the costs incurred in E&T activities. The bill also would raise dependent care reimbursements to the level set in the Family Support Act, actual costs up to a maximum of \$200 a month for children under age 2, \$175 for older children, or the local market rate for child care, at State option. The limit on reimbursements for transportation, uniforms, and

other expenses, apart from child care, would rise to \$75 per month. Current law limits dependent care reimbursements to \$160 per dependent per month and other reimbursements to \$25 per month and requires States to exempt from the work requirement those households whose costs would be higher.

Raising the reimbursement limits will allow States to bring more households into E&T programs. In many areas, child care cannot be obtained for \$160 per month. In some rural areas, the cost of transportation to training sites or job contacts may well exceed \$25 for many recipients. Without this increase, States may be forced to leave whole communities out of their E&T programs. Also, many training programs require tools, uniforms, or protective clothing that cost significantly more than these programs can now reimburse. Similar provisions already have passed the House, as part of the 1987 welfare reform bill, and the Senate, in its version of the 1988 Hunger Prevention Act.

The bill includes a provision that both Mr. EMERSON and Mr. DE LA GARZA crafted to address the problems of low-income people trying to finish secondary school. Current law excludes the earnings of students from calculations of their families' income, but only up to the student's 18th birthday. For any number of reasons, many members of food stamp households may not finish high school by the time they turn 18. The bill would exclude students earnings without regard to age, but only for those enrolled in elementary or secondary schools.

The bill would raise the current \$4,500 limit on the fair market value of vehicles that food stamp recipients may own.

The current \$4,500 vehicle limit was written into the act in 1977 and has not changed since, despite rapid inflation. As inflation passes the \$4,500 vehicle resource limit by, more and more working families are made ineligible for food stamps because of cars they depend upon to get to work. The Consumer Price Index for cars has risen 120 percent since 1977. Working households may be forced to choose between going hungry for lack of food stamps and selling their cars, which can force them to leave their jobs.

The President's Task Force on Food Assistance in January 1984 recommended that this limit be increased to \$5,500 immediately. Increases in the limit passed the House, with the 1985 and 1990 farm bills, and the Senate, with the 1988 Hunger Prevention Act. We should do nothing that will compromise households' opportunities to retain and enhance their abilities to be self-sustaining.

The bill would make one addition in the vehicle rules to assist a small group of households that need vehicles that may be especially durable—and hence expensive. The bill would exempt vehicles that are used to transport water or fuel where the household lacks piped-in water or fuel.

In places that still are not served by water mains, households may have to haul drums of water for long distances, and often over difficult terrain. Other rural households may have to haul firewood or coal to their homes for heat. Even the poorest of these households cannot afford to be without a dependable vehicle that can hold up under this kind of use.

Yet the trucks that many of these households have for this purpose, though far from luxurious, tend to have fair market values well in excess of the current \$4,500 limit or the new limits proposed by this legislation.

The bill seeks to avoid hunger and hardship caused by inadequate benefits in the Food Stamp Program. Almost two-thirds of those getting food stamps are elderly, disabled, or children. Almost 83 percent of all food stamp benefits go to families with children.

The bill would raise basic food stamp benefit levels in stages to 105 percent of the Thrifty Food Plan. This needs to be done to allow households to purchase the Thrifty Food Plan for most or all of the year. Under the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988, basic food stamp benefits are set at 103 percent of the previous June's Thrifty Food Plan. Food stamp benefit levels increase every October to reflect food costs the previous June.

Over the first 13 years of the thrifty food plan's history, the average cost of the plan in the last half of the fiscal year has exceeded the cost in the previous June by an average of 5.4 percent. The adjustment to 105 percent of the previous June's cost is needed to make it much more likely that food stamp allotments will be sufficient to allow food stamp households to purchase the Thrifty Food Plan for most or all of the year.

The experience of fiscal year 1989 is illustrative: In the latter half of fiscal year 1989, the average monthly cost of the Thrifty Food Plan exceeded the cost in the previous June by 8.9 percent.

It should be noted that even this increase is relatively modest. Food stamps provide an average of less than \$0.70 per person per meal. The maximum food stamp benefit for a family of four provides only about one dollar per person per meal. FNS has reported that fewer than 1 in 10 families spending an amount of money equivalent to the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan received 100 percent of the recommended daily allowances. Less than half received even two thirds of the recommended daily allowances.

The bill would increase funding for the Nutrition Assistance Program [NAP] in Puerto Rico over baseline in each of the four remaining years of the farm bill. The increments would rise to \$25 million in the final year of its authorization.

In 1981, the Food Stamp Program in Puerto Rico was replaced by the NAP, which is funded on a block grant basis. Funding was cut well below the level required to provide nutritional assistance comparable with that of the Food Stamp Program. In subsequent years, funding was frozen or increased by less than baseline. As a result, poor children in Puerto Rico have far less of a nutritional safety net to rely upon than do comparably poor children in the 50 States, Guam, or the U.S. Virgin Islands. These modest increments would make a small step toward redressing this imbalance.

The bill would return to the rule contained in OBRA 1981 and eliminate the prorating of food stamps for households reapplying within 30 days of going off of the program. OBRA 1981 required that new applicants for food stamps have their initial month's benefit prorated based upon the day of the month that they applied. OBRA 1982 extended prorating

to recipients whose participation in the program is briefly interrupted because the household, for whatever reason, do not reapply by the first day of the month. GAO has recommended this change back to the OBRA 1981 rule.

GAO found that the vast majority of the households suffering short gaps in benefits remain eligible throughout the period. Gaps frequently result from State errors, forms lost or delayed in the mails, or honest misunderstandings by household members. These gaps in benefits can force households to divert some of their rent, mortgage, or utility money to pay for food, leaving them in danger of an eviction or a utility shut-off. The situation of recipients who suffer a brief gap in benefits is different from that of new applicants, who may have been living off of income from a job in the early part of the month before they applied for food stamps.

The Drought Relief Act of 1988 enacted this provision for migrant farm workers, and the Senate's version of the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988 would have applied this rule to all households.

The bill would exclude all vendor payments for housing that meets definition of transitional housing for the homeless. None of these vendor payments should be counted against homeless households since they are not in fact available to households and cannot be used for food. Current rules count part of vendor payments for transitional housing for the homeless in States that use certain methods to calculate AFDC benefits. This makes no sense. Homeless households' ability to receive food stamps should not depend on how a State happens to label its AFDC benefits. Homeless households are among the poorest of the poor, and we should not accept arbitrary policies that deny them food stamps.

The bill would exclude general assistance [GA] vendor payments provided for expenses other than housing from consideration as income in the Food Stamp Program.

In all but a handful of States, general assistance programs are primarily local, often quite informal efforts. A township supervisor or a county justice may receive a request from a family for help with a particular need—a utility shutoff notice, a medical procedure that is needed, a car that needs to be repaired so that a household member can get to work, and so forth—and authorize payment from local governmental funds to meet that need. Because these payments are sought and approved for specific purposes, the supervisors or court clerks will often make their checks out to the vendor or creditor involved. Although these payments are never in the household's hands, and are not available to meet the household's food needs, they are nonetheless counted as available income to reduce the household's food stamps.

The Food Stamp Program's current rules on vendor payments were written primarily to prevent the wholesale diversion of regular AFDC benefits into vendor payments to keep them from being counted as income to food stamp households. Unfortunately, it was written to cover GA vendor payments as well, even though the same problem does not apply with regard to GA. Few GA programs operate on anything like a statewide entitlement basis,

and if GA vendor payments are made on behalf of the household it will generally be because of the custom of the official making the payment.

The 1990 farm bill excluded from consideration as income those GA vendor payments made under State laws that prohibit making direct payments to households. In some jurisdictions that routinely provide any GA relief in the form of vendor payments, however, the program is so informal that there may be no explicit State law requiring them to be issued in that form. This amendment will allow these jurisdictions to respond to households' legitimate emergencies, other than those requiring housing assistance, without causing the household to suffer a new emergency with the reduction of their food stamps.

The bill recognizes the importance of the Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP] by calling for an increase in funding for the purchase of commodities to \$220 million, the authorization for next year. Although the bill does not change TEFAP's long-term status as a discretionary program, we hope this initiative will send a clear message of the importance that we attached to making sure that low-income people in need are not forced to go hungry.

Finally, the bill would eliminate anachronistic procedures requiring USDA to submit monthly reports to Congress concerning the Food Stamp Program's rate of spending and the sections that authorize the reduction or cessation of benefits to households if funding is insufficient.

This approach was proposed in 1990 by the administration as part of its recommendations for the farm bill. As the administration correctly pointed out, the cap was imposed more than a decade ago, at a time when the program's growth and utilization were much harder to predict. Allotment reductions have never taken place, but the continued presence of these provisions in the act has caused unnecessary uncertainties on the part of both State administrators and recipient households.

The farm bill removed the formal authorization caps that had been in the law but retained the reporting requirements and, due to a technical drafting error, could be read to require cessation of benefits to households if a supplemental appropriations bill is delayed. The administration's provision would put the Food Stamp Program in the same position that AFDC, Medicaid, and other Federal programs intended to function as entitlements have long enjoyed.

I believe that this legislation will go a long way to address the great need for nutrition assistance in this country. Clearly assistance of this type does not come without some cost. Neglecting the problem of childhood hunger, however, also has a cost, in human suffering, in wasted potential, and ultimately in damage to America's ability potential to compete internationally in the next century. This bill should be fully paid for under the pay as you go rules, and it includes a provision that was agreed upon in the Committee on Agriculture to signify the importance of making sure that it proceeds in total compliance with the budget resolution.

I urge my colleagues to review this legislation and support its passage. It not only hon-

ors Mickey Leland but also addresses real problems faced by real families every day. Imagine having to make the choice between heating your home or eating 7 nights a week. I believe that no family should have to make that choice. This bill makes important changes to food assistance programs serving our Nation's children to ensure that families do not have to make these choices.

In conclusion, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in this critical and long overdue effort to ensure that all of the children in America have the opportunity to enjoy what should be some of the happiest and most carefree years of their lives and to reach their full potential. I can think of no more important, no more noble, no more worthy effort for this body to dedicate itself to than protecting the children of this country against the ravages of hunger.

The text of legislation follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. References to Act.

TITLE I—ENSURING ADEQUATE FOOD ASSISTANCE

- Sec. 101. Families with high shelter expenses.
- Sec. 102. Basic benefit level.
- Sec. 103. Continuing benefits to eligible households.
- Sec. 104. Homeless families in transitional housing.
- Sec. 105. Improving the nutritional status of children in Puerto Rico.
- Sec. 106. Households benefiting from general assistance vendor payments.
- Sec. 107. Helping low-income high school students.

TITLE II—PROMOTING SELF-SUFFICIENCY

- Sec. 201. Child support disregard.
- Sec. 202. Child support payments to non-household members.
- Sec. 203. Vehicles needed to seek and continue employment and for household transportation.
- Sec. 204. Vehicles necessary to carry fuel or water.
- Sec. 205. Improving access to employment and training activities.

TITLE III—SIMPLIFYING THE PROVISION OF FOOD ASSISTANCE

- Sec. 301. Simplifying the household definition for households with children and others.
- Sec. 302. Resources of households with disabled members.
- Sec. 303. Assuring adequate funding for the food stamp program.

TITLE IV—COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION TO NEEDY FAMILIES

- Sec. 401. Commodity purchases.

TITLE V—IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVE DATES

- Sec. 501. Effective dates.
- Sec. 502. Budget neutrality requirement.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO ACTS.

Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, references to "the Act" and sections

thereof shall be deemed to be references to the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) and the sections thereof.

TITLE I—ENSURING ADEQUATE FOOD ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. FAMILIES WITH HIGH SHELTER EXPENSES.

(a) REMOVAL OF CAP.—(1) The fourth sentence of section 5(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)) is amended by striking "Provided, That the amount" and all that follows through "June 30".

(2) The fifth sentence of section 5(e) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)) is amended by striking "under clause (2) of the preceding sentence".

(b) TRANSITIONAL CAP.—(1) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 5(e) of the Act is amended by inserting after the fourth sentence the following: "In the 12-month period ending September 30, 1994, such excess shelter expense deduction shall not exceed \$230 a month in the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia, and shall not exceed, in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, \$400, \$328, \$279, and \$170 a month, respectively; in the 12-month period ending September 30, 1995, shall not exceed \$260 a month in the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia, and shall not exceed, in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, \$452, \$371, \$315, and \$192 a month, respectively; in the 12-month period ending September 30, 1996, shall not exceed \$300 a month in the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia, and shall not exceed, in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, \$521, \$420, \$364, and \$221 a month, respectively; and in the 12-month period ending September 30, 1997, shall not exceed \$360 a month in the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia, and shall not exceed, in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, \$626, \$514, \$437, and \$266 a month, respectively."

(2) Effective October 1, 1997, section 5(e) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)) is amended by striking the fifth sentence.

SEC. 102. BASIC BENEFIT LEVEL.

Section 3(o) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2012(o)) is amended by striking "(4) through" and all that follows through the end of the subsection, and inserting the following: "(4) on October 1, 1993, adjust the cost of such diet to reflect 103½ percent of the cost of thrifty food plan in the preceding June (without regard to adjustments made under such clauses (9), (10), and (11) of this subsection as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act), as determined by the Secretary, and round the result to the nearest lower dollar increment for each household size, (5) on October 1, 1994, adjust the cost of such diet to reflect 103½ percent of the cost of the thrifty food plan in the preceding June (without regard to adjustments made under such clauses (9), (10), and (11) of this subsection as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act), as determined by the Secretary, and round the result to the nearest lower dollar increment for each household size, (6) on October 1, 1995, adjust the cost of such diet to reflect 104 percent of the cost of the thrifty food plan in the preceding June (without regard to adjustments made under such clauses (9), (10), and (11) and under clauses (4) and (5)), as determined by the Secretary, and round the result to the lowest dollar increment for each household size, (7) on October 1, 1996, adjust the cost of such diet to reflect 104½ percent of the cost of the thrifty food plan in

the preceding June (without regard to adjustments made under such clauses (9), (10), and (11) and under clauses (4), (5), and (6)), as determined by the Secretary, and round the result to the nearest lower dollar increment for each household size, (8) on October 1, 1997, adjust the cost of such diet to reflect 104½ percent of the cost of the thrifty food plan in the preceding June (without regard to adjustments made under such clauses (9), (10), and (11) and under clauses (4), (5), (6), and (7)), as determined by the Secretary, and round the result to the nearest lower dollar increment for each household size, and (9) on October 1, 1998, and on every October 1 thereafter, adjust the cost of such diet to reflect 105 percent of the cost of the thrifty food plan in the preceding June (without regard to previous adjustments made under such clauses (9), (10), and (11), under clauses (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8), and under this clause), as determined by the Secretary, and round the result to the nearest lower dollar increment for each household size."

SEC. 103. CONTINUING BENEFITS TO ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS.

Section 8(c)(2)(B) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2017(c)(2)(B)) is amended by inserting "of more than one month in" after "following any period".

SEC. 104. HOMELESS FAMILIES IN TRANSITIONAL HOUSING.

Section 5(k)(2)(F) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(k)(2)(F)) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) housing assistance payments made to a third party on behalf of a household residing in transitional housing for the homeless;"

SEC. 105. IMPROVING THE NUTRITIONAL STATUS OF CHILDREN IN PUERTO RICO.

Section 19(a)(1)(A) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2028(a)(1)(A)) is amended:

(1) by striking "\$1,091,000,000" and inserting "\$1,111,000,000"; and

(2) by striking "\$1,133,000,000" and inserting "\$1,158,000,000".

SEC. 106. HOUSEHOLDS BENEFITING FROM GENERAL ASSISTANCE VENDOR PAYMENTS.

Section 5(k)(1)(B) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(k)(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) a benefit payable to the household for housing expenses, not including energy or utility-cost assistance, under—

"(i) a State or local general assistance program; or

"(ii) another basic assistance program comparable to general assistance (as determined by the Secretary)."

SEC. 107. HELPING LOW-INCOME HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

Section 5(d)(7) is amended by striking "who is a student, and who has not attained his eighteenth birthday" and inserting "and who is an elementary or secondary student".

TITLE II—PROMOTING SELF-SUFFICIENCY

SEC. 201. CHILD SUPPORT DISREGARD.

Section 5 of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in clause (13) of subsection (d)—

(A) by striking "at the option" and all that follows through "subsection (m)," and inserting "(A)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: "and (B) the first \$50 of any child support payments for each month received in that month, and the first \$50 of child support of each month received in that month if such payments were made by the absent parent in the month when due,"; and

(2) by striking subsection (m).

SEC. 202. CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO NON-HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS.

Section 5(d)(6) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(d)(6)) is amended by striking the comma

at the end and inserting the following: "Provided, That child support payments made by a household member to or for a person who is not a member of the household shall be excluded from the income of the household of the person making such payments if such household member was legally obligated to make such payments."

SEC. 203. VEHICLES NEEDED TO SEEK AND CONTINUE EMPLOYMENT AND FOR HOUSEHOLD TRANSPORTATION.

Section 5(g)(2) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(g)(2)) is amended by striking "\$4,500" and inserting the following: "a level set by the Secretary, which shall be \$4,500 through September 30, 1993, and which shall be adjusted from \$4,500 on October 1, 1993, and on each October 1 thereafter, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for new cars, for the 12-month period ending the preceding June 30, and rounded to the nearest \$50".

SEC. 204. VEHICLES NECESSARY TO CARRY FUEL OR WATER.

Section 5(g)(2) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(g)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Secretary shall exclude from financial resources the value of a vehicle that a household depends upon to carry fuel for heating or water for home use when such transported fuel or water is the primary source of fuel or water for the household."

SEC. 205. IMPROVING ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.

(a) DEPENDENT CARE DEDUCTION.—Section 5(e) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)) is amended in clause (1) of the fourth sentence—

(1) by striking "\$160 a month for each dependent" and inserting "\$200 a month for a dependent child under age 2 and \$175 a month for any other dependent"; and

(2) by striking "regardless of the dependent's age,".

(b) REIMBURSEMENTS TO PARTICIPANTS.—(1) Section 6(d)(4)(I)(i) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)(I)(i)) is amended by striking "\$25" and inserting "\$75".

(2) Subclause (II) of section 6(d)(4)(I)(i) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)(I)(i)) is amended by striking "reimbursements exceed \$160" and all that follows through the end of such subclause, and inserting "reimbursements exceed the applicable local market rate as determined by procedures consistent with any such determination under the Social Security Act. Individuals subject to the program under this paragraph may not be required to participate if dependent care costs exceed the limit established by the State agency under this paragraph (which limit shall not be less than the limit for the dependent care deduction under section 5(e))."

(c) REIMBURSEMENTS TO STATE AGENCIES.—Section 16(h)(3) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking "\$25" and all that follows through "dependent care costs" and inserting "the payment made under section 6(d)(4)(I)(i) but not more than \$75 per participant per month"; and

(2) by striking "representing \$160 per month per dependent" and inserting "equal to the payment made under section 6(d)(4)(I)(i) but not more than the applicable local market rate".

TITLE III—SIMPLIFYING THE PROVISION OF FOOD ASSISTANCE

SEC. 301. SIMPLIFYING THE HOUSEHOLD DEFINITION FOR HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AND OTHERS.

The first sentence of section 3(1) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2012(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(2)" and inserting "or (2)";

(2) by striking " , or (3) a parent of minor children and that parent's children" and all that follows through "parents and children, or siblings," and inserting " . Parents and their minor children who live together and spouses"; and

(3) by striking " , unless one of" and all that follows through "disabled member".

SEC. 302. RESOURCES OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH DISABLED MEMBERS.

Section 5(g)(1) of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(g)(1)) is amended by striking "a member who is 60 years of age or older," and inserting "an elderly or disabled member,".

SEC. 303. ASSURING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM.

Section 18 of the Act (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

TITLE IV—COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION TO NEEDY FAMILIES.

SEC. 401. COMMODITY PURCHASES.

Section 214(e) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended—

(1) by striking "\$175,000,000" and all that follows through "1992, and";

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following:

"During fiscal year 1994, the Secretary shall spend \$220,000,000 to purchase, process, and distribute additional commodities under this section."; and

(3) in the last sentence by striking "1991 through" and inserting "1993 and".

TITLE V—IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 501. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the provisions of this Act shall become effective and be implemented on October 1, 1993.

(b) SPECIAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Sections 103, 106, 201, 202, 204, 205, 301, and 302 of this Act shall become effective and be implemented on July 1, 1994.

SEC. 502. BUDGET NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT.

None of the provisions of this Act shall become effective unless the costs are fully offset in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998. No agriculture price or income support program administered through the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Agricultural Act of 1949 may be reduced to achieve such offset.

ART ACROSS AMERICA

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment on the floor of the House of Representatives to bring to the attention of my colleagues and constituents a truly remarkable art exhibition being displayed this week here in our Nation's capital. Art Across America: An American Reunion, displayed in the Very Special Arts Gallery at 1331 F Street in northwest Washington, DC, is a moving exhibition comprised of pieces created by artists from across the country.

A featured artist of Art Across America: An American Reunion, I am pleased to note, is Michigander William Pardee from Fremont. His natural drawing is among the 51 works of

art which make up the exhibition. Ranging from paintings to pieces of jewelry to works of folk art, Very Special Arts has assembled a unique exhibition, representative of the vast beauty of our diverse Nation including artists from each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Founded in 1972 by Jean Kennedy Smith, Very Special Arts is an educational affiliate of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which coordinates and promotes the education and empowerment of persons with disabilities through the arts. The Washington-based gallery is one of their recent projects, which provides a fully mainstreamed setting in which to exhibit the works of emerging and recognized professional artists with disabilities. Proceeds from gallery sales benefit other projects of the Very Special Arts organization, including intergenerational visual and performing arts programs, arts curriculum development and distribution for our Nation's school children, international conferences to enhance the promotional opportunities for artists with disabilities, and others.

I am pleased to commend Very Special Arts and its fine work on behalf of artists with disabilities—indeed—all artists. I urge my colleagues to take time to visit this extraordinary exhibition, and foster relationships with the Very Special Arts organization in the future.

TRIBUTE TO DICK ICHORD

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the congressional service of our late friend and colleague, Dick Ichord, who served for many years in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Dick was able, conscientious and effective, and certainly the Congress and the Nation are better for his service.

Dick was chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee for years and also was a member of the Armed Services Committee. He did a fine job in both areas.

I join with his many friends in expressing my sorrow and regrets at his untimely passing. Truly he has left a mark, the benefits of which will be felt for many years.

LEGISLATION TO AID THE SUCCESSFUL REUSE OF FORT ORD

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to direct the Department of Defense to convey to the University of California and the California State University real property at Fort Ord for the purpose of facilitating the universities' plans to establish a new California State University campus and a research and development center of the University of California on the sites.

This measure is critical to the successful reuse of Fort Ord, and it has the full support of the entire Fort Ord community task force. The two universities' proposals to establish their new facilities at Fort Ord constitute the centerpiece of our Fort Ord reuse strategy. Without the transfer of the property, the base's successful reuse will be greatly delayed. Moreover, the conveyance of the property to the universities must not carry the standard restrictions on public benefit conveyances in order to allow the universities to fund their activities through royalties from private firms reliant upon the results of their research and development.

Without this legislation, our community's highest hopes for a model of base conversion will be endangered. With the enactment of this measure, Fort Ord's conversion to an area of higher education and research and development in a number of marine, environmental and atmospheric studies, and technologies will be brought to fruition within 2 years. I urge my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee to approve this bill expeditiously, and I commend it to the full House's attention.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY AT FORT ORD, CALIFORNIA

(a) CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall convey, without reimbursement, to the University of California and the California State University all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of real property described in subsection (b), including improvements thereon, which is located at Fort Ord, California. The Secretary shall not impose as part of the conveyance under this subsection any condition or restriction on the use of the conveyed real property by the recipients.

(d) DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense on the basis of the Educational Public Benefit Transfer Applications submitted by the University of California and the California State University before March 8, 1993, with regard to Fort Ord.

ETHNIC CLEANSING IN KHALISTAN

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the deep concerns of 300,000 Sikh-Americans to India's appointment of S.S. Ray as Ambassador to the United States. Mr. Ray previously served as the Governor of the Sikh state of Punjab from 1986 to 1989. During his tenure, it is alleged that thousands of Sikhs died in fake encounters where police murdered their Sikh victims and later claimed to have acted in self-defense.

I do not have to remind Congress that India has maintained a ban on Amnesty International since 1978. What exactly is India trying to hide? Indeed there is much India would like to hide from the eyes of the international

community. It refers to itself as the world's largest democracy, but minorities under Indian rule know it to be anything but.

Take the recent violence surrounding the destruction of an ancient Moslem mosque in Adyodhya by Hindu fundamentalists. What did the Indian Government do to protect Moslems in Adyodhya? What did the Indian Government do to prevent the destruction of the mosque? Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao had 10,000 troops stationed 5 miles from the mosque while it was being destroyed, yet he did not deploy them. Hindus killed Moslems and burnt their homes throughout Ayodhya, yet no police or security forces were sent for protection.

In Bombay, however, India did not hesitate to use force against Moslems who protested against the injustice of the mosque destruction. At least 159 Moslems were shot and killed by police. Indeed, of all the rioting that enveloped India last month, 80 percent of those killed were Moslem, most of them shot by Indian police.

It is important to emphasize that the Adyodhya episode is not an aberration, but a manifestation of the intolerance India holds for those it demands stay under its power. In November 1984, the Indian Government exposed its character when Congress party politicians instigated angry Hindu mobs to massacre 40,000 Sikhs throughout India. Far from facing justice, the politicians responsible for the crimes are free in India. Many of them hold seats in the Parliament.

Recently, I received word that the Indian police are making movies to send to foreign countries in order to malign the Sikh character. In these movies, supposedly captured Sikh terrorists are interviewed, explain their operations, and confess to the brutal, heinous crimes they have committed. According to Dr. Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, they are entirely fabricated. Those Sikhs interviewed are agents of the Indian Government, willing to produce works of pure fiction to further the propaganda goals of the Indian Government in return for money and special treatment.

Already Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh has been cautioned regarding attempts on his life. Other prominent Sikh and Kashmiri leaders in the United States and Europe have been cautioned about the growing possibility of assassination as well. I know Dr. Aulakh personally and can testify that he is a peaceful man working for the freedom of his people here within the boundaries of the United States. India has a history of spreading disinformation about those persons who stand up for freedom, often slandering them as terrorists and criminals.

For the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit a January 5th press release from the Council of Khalistan. I also want to submit a letter I sent to Lawrence Eagleburger regarding the upcoming village councils elections in Punjab. I commend both to those Members of Congress interested in promoting and protecting human rights in India.

[Press Release]

Council of Khalistan,
Washington, DC.

ETHNIC CLEANSING IN KHALISTAN—INDIAN GOVERNMENT ESCALATES OPPRESSION OF SIKHS NEW TARGETS: LEADERS, WOMEN AND CHILDREN

WASHINGTON, DC, January 5.—The bloody process of ethnic cleansing in former Yugoslavia has deservedly caught the attention and outrage of the international community. Equally outrageous, however, is the process of ethnic cleansing occurring in Khalistan. Since 1984, at least 110,000 Sikhs have been killed by police and other security forces of the Indian government. In recent months India has noticeably increased its brutal offensive against Sikhs in an effort to deal a final blow to the movement of Sikh freedom.

Sikh youth, once the primary target of India's state sponsored terrorism, are now seeing their elder leaders, women and children falling victim as well. Indian police and paramilitary forces have been given an open license to kill by government leadership, and all evidence indicates an absolute willingness to use it. While anarchy reigns in former Yugoslavia, Khalistan has been transformed into a police state where the human rights of its inhabitants are daily violated as a matter of government policy.

On December 20, Gurdev Singh Kaunke, former Jathedar, or high priest, of the Akal Takht (the seat of the Sikh faith) was arrested by Indian police in his home village near Jagraon. Mr. Kaunke was released on December 22 so that he could attend the funeral of his nephew. Re-arrested on December 25, Mr. Kaunke was then tortured and killed. Police did not return his remains to the family claiming that the former high priest had escaped during custody. Amnesty International and other international human rights organizations have reported such "escapes" to be a common *modus operandi* of the Indian police. Tomorrow, Sikhs plan a massive gathering in Mr. Kaunke's home village to protest his murder and the general repression of the Sikh nation.

Early in November, Kulwinder Kaur, wife of Chamkaur Singh Dala, an active figure in the Sikh freedom struggle, was arrested along with her 2 year old daughter, Jagwinder Kaur. Indian police held Mrs. Kaur and her daughter in illegal custody, raped and tortured them. Police continue to refuse to divulge their whereabouts. It is feared that the mother and her two year old daughter may have been murdered. Such has become the fate of an increasing number of women in the Sikh homeland.

Take the case of Majit Kaur Sekhon. Her husband was tortured by police repeatedly for speaking out for Sikh independence. Eventually he had to flee to the United States in fear of his life. In his absence Mrs. Sekhon and her family have become the surrogate target of police rage. In one particularly heinous instance, the police took the family's 7 month old daughter, poured molasses over her body, placed her on top of an ant colony, and watched as she was eaten away at by the ants. Mrs. Kaur was forced to watch this sadistic scene. When she protested in indignant outrage, the police responded by torturing her. Today she remains bedridden. It is difficult to tell if she will ever fully recover.

Or take the case of Baba Manochahal, head of the Panthic Committee. His son, father, uncle and two of his brothers have all been recently killed by Indian police. The women in his family have been arrested as well and remain in police custody. It is reported that

his mother has suffered permanent psychological damage as a result of the trauma.

All the emphasis on the killing of Sikh leaders and family members of Sikh freedom fighters is not to say that India is easing up on Sikh youth. On Dec. 2, Indian police killed 19 Sikh youth in cold blood in a Khalistan sugar cane field. Taken from police custody, they were brought to the field and shot in a fake encounter. The killing, torture and rape of Sikhs continues unabated.

To augment its offensive against the Sikh nation, India has endeavored to slander the character of the Sikh freedom movement through a relentless campaign of disinformation. The new blitz was launched late last year with the appointment of S.S. Ray as Indian ambassador to the United States. According to Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, "S.S. Ray is a murderer and should not be allowed to set foot on American soil."

As Governor of Punjab from 1986 to 1989, Mr. Ray is responsible for thousands of Sikh deaths, most of them committed as "fake encounters" where police murder their Sikh victims and later claim to have acted in self-defense. As former Chief Minister of Bengal, Mr. Ray is also responsible for the killings of thousands of Bengalis and the burning of Bengali villages. "Clearly, Mr. Ray is not fit to associate within diplomatic circles," said Dr. Aulakh, "and the 300,000 Khalistani-Americans adamantly oppose his appointment."

"The Indian government cannot deter the Khalsa Panth," continued Dr. Aulakh. "The Sikh nation declared independence on October 7, 1987 forming the separate country of Khalistan and we fully intend to obtain that freedom. We have acted in full accordance with the principle of self-determination as enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Sikhs constitute a separate nation unto themselves and India has no right to hold us in bondage. The Punjab is our homeland, no Sikh has ever signed the Indian constitution, and we simply want our freedom. We will not be deterred.

"I warn the Indian government to stop killing Sikhs. It is already being exposed as the one of the worst violators of human rights in the world. It cannot hide behind its facade of democracy forever. The U.S. Congress already approved the termination of aid to India due to its oppression of Sikhs. India cannot hold the Sikhs and hold its head in the international community at the same time. I suggest that the Indian government settle this issue peacefully by removing its occupying forces from Sikh soil, sitting down with the Sikh leadership, and demarcating the boundaries between India and Khalistan today. The Sikh nation will not submit. India has no other choice.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 1993.

HON. LAWRENCE EAGLEBURGER,
Secretary of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY EAGLEBURGER: We wish to draw your attention to the upcoming elections of Village Councils in Punjab, India which are scheduled for January 15 to January 22, 1993. We urge the State Department to pay close attention to this process.

Unlike other elections, several Sikh political parties are participating in these elections. We urge that independent and impartial observers from the U.S., the United Nations, and International Human Rights organizations be sent to watch these elections.

Such actions will help prevent the intimidation of voters as occurred in the February, 1992 elections for the state assembly in Punjab.

Intimidation of voters in the February election was widely reported by the Indian newspapers and international human rights organizations. Between March and April of 1992, most village councils and village mayors resigned to protest the continuing unrelenting human rights violations in Punjab under the new regime. The Indian government is now attempting to fill the resulting vacancies with their own people. We believe that observers should be sent to Punjab to ensure that Sikhs can freely exercise their right to vote.

We have received many reports that pro-Sikh movement candidates are being intimidated and coerced into withdrawing as candidates. Some candidates have been arrested by the police and detained at undisclosed locations. This has happened in previous elections. In 1991, one of the candidates for state assembly, Avtar Singh, was tortured to death by the Punjab police.

Once again, we urge that outside observers be sent to prevent human and civil rights violations and to ensure honest and free elections.

DAN BURTON.

LEGISLATION TO REFORM MILITARY HEALTH CARE

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to reform the way in which our Federal Government, and the Defense Department [DOD] in particular, makes decisions on the number and size of health care facilities for Government beneficiaries, particularly our retired military personnel and their families.

For years, the DOD has insisted on making its decisions whether to open, close, reduce, or enlarge military health care facilities solely on the basis of the local active duty military population. But that analysis is simplistic, given the multitude of DOD and other Government beneficiaries who exist in every region of the Nation. In my view, the Federal Government ought to use a broader and more inclusive analysis of each region's Federal beneficiaries when it makes decisions on the provision of health care to those individuals. Often, for example, the closure of a military health care facility necessitates the placement of military retirees and their dependents under the Medicare Insurance Program or CHAMPUS [Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services] insurance, forcing them to go to private health care facilities. This phenomenon results in higher costs to the U.S. Government. DOD is satisfied with the results insofar as its own costs are lower, but the Government as a whole pays more for DOD's myopic cost-cutting.

My legislation is intended to force the entire Government, and the DOD in particular, to pay special attention to these facts, and to refrain from such hospital closures when the cost to the entire Government will rise rather than fall with those closures.

The bill was promoted by the case of the Silas B. Hays Hospital at Fort Ord. The DOD

has not yet made its final decision on the status of the hospital, but I have not waited for its fiat. Instead, I authored a provision in the fiscal year 1993 defense appropriations bill to retain 50 beds at the hospital in fiscal year 1993 to guard against the DOD's inclination to close the facility.

I am hopeful and confident that this legislation, if adopted by the Congress and signed by the President, will improve the provision of health care to Government beneficiaries, increase savings to the American taxpayer, and preserve critical health care facilities for our Nation's retired military personnel and their families. I would strongly encourage my friends on the Armed Services committee to act on this measure expeditiously, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. CONDITIONS ON CLOSURE OF, OR REDUCTION IN CARE AT, MILITARY MEDICAL FACILITIES.

(a) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of a military department may not take any action to close, or reduce the level of care provided at, a military medical facility in the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary until 90 days after the date on which the Secretary determines that the closure or reduction will be cost effective, as calculated under subsection (b). If the closure of a military medical facility or a reduction in the level of care provided at a military medical facility is proposed as part of the closure or realignment of a military installation selected for closure or realignment under a base closure law, the Secretary of Defense shall make the determination required by the subsection.

(b) CALCULATION OF COST EFFECTIVENESS.—To determine whether the closure of a military medical facility or a reduction in the level of care provided at a military medical facility is cost effective, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned, as the case may be, shall calculate whether—

(1) the cost to the Federal government of continuing to provide care at the military medical facility to persons who are eligible to receive care at the facility pursuant to section 1074(b), 1074a, 1074b, 1076, or 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, and receive or are likely to seek treatment at the facility; exceeds

(2) the cost to the Federal Government of providing alternate equivalent care to such persons at other Federal or private health care facilities as a consequence of the closure or reduction.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department shall notify Congress of each determination made by the Secretary concerned under subsection (a), and the basis for making the determination, not later than 10 days after the Secretary makes the determination.

(d) NOTIFICATION OF AND CONSULTATION WITH COMMUNITY REUSE ENTITIES.—In the case of a military medical facility located on a military installation in the United States selected for closure or realignment under a base closure law, the Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify all community reuse entities formed with respect to the installation if the Secretary is considering the closure of the military medical facility or a reduction in the level of care provided at the

military medical facility as part of the closure or realignment of the installation. The Secretary shall consult with such community reuse entities in making the determination under subsection (a) with regard to that military medical facility.

(e) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—This section shall apply with respect to any closure of a military medical facility in the United States or any reduction in the level of care provided at a military medical facility in the United States, even if the military medical facility is located on a military installation selected for closure or realignment under a base closure law.

(f) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "base closure law" means the following:

(1) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 104 Stat. 1808; U.S.C. 2687 note).

(2) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 102 Stat. 26271 19 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(3) Section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) Any other similar law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TRIBUTE TO DICK ICHORD, JR.

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I join my colleagues in remembering our former colleague and friend, Congressman Richard H. Ichord, Jr.

Dick Ichord gave 20 years of his life in service to his country as a Member of the House of Representatives. His work as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development helped keep this Nation strong both militarily and economically. His legacy is the peace and stability which we now enjoy with the end of the cold war. His dedication earned him the honor and respect of all his colleagues.

Dick didn't confine his service to his public life. He also worked in private, through organizations such as the Jhoon Rhee Foundation to improve the quality of life for children by developing their self-respect, self-discipline, physical and mental health, and motivation.

My deepest sympathy and sincere condolences go to Dick's family and friends. We will all miss him.

LEGISLATION TO PRESERVE THE FORT ORD COASTAL CORRIDOR

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to transfer the ownership of the shoreline and dunes located on Fort Ord property to the California Department of Parks and Recreation to be used for public

recreational purposes, once the property is declared excess by the Army.

Anyone who is familiar with the central coastline of California knows what a truly unique and fragile area these sand dunes represent. The shoreline owned by Fort Ord helps to comprise the southern Monterey Bay dunes system, one of the most extensive dune systems on the west coast. The Monterey Bay dunes are some of the tallest dunes in California, rising several stories high.

While tremendous in stature, these castles of sand, and the plants and animals which reside in them, are terribly fragile. There is great concern in the local community over the deterioration of the dunes and comprehensive plans to restore the dunes complex are underway.

Fort Ord owns a large portion of the Monterey Bay dunes system. The Army has left the dunes relatively intact and, to its credit, has wisely allowed little development of the area. This legislation would ensure the preservation and proper management of this important area when the base begins closure later this year.

To aid the economic transition caused by the base closure, I am heading a local Fort Ord community task force that is developing a reuse strategy for Fort Ord. I have made clear to the surrounding communities that no action will be taken on this legislation until the Fort Ord community task force has developed its consensus strategy for the reuse of Fort Ord.

The Fort Ord community task force released its strategy report for the reuse of Fort Ord last June. The report makes an initial recommendation for the coastal area west of Highway 1 be retained as open space for public recreation. The task force's reuse group is now in the process of reviewing the area and mapping out the area which should be protected. Once the FORG base reuse plan has been completed and a recommendation made in the base reuse plan, I would hope that my successor in the Congress would work for the enactment of this legislation and other legislation necessary to codify the recommendation of the reuse group.

At that time, I hope my colleagues will add their support to this legislation which will protect these unique dunes and the quality of life we enjoy in the Monterey Bay area.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. TRANSFER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that the parcel described in subsection (b) is excess to the needs of the Department of the Army, and after making the certification under section 2, all right, title, and interest in and to the parcel shall be transferred, without consideration, to the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation for use solely for public recreational and open space purposes in a manner consistent with the preservation of the sand dunes located on the parcel.

(b) AREA.—The parcel referred to in subsection (a) is that area which consists of the lands and interests in lands within the area of Fort Ord, California, which is bounded by the Pacific Ocean on the west and State Highway Route 1 on the east.

(c) REVERSION.—If the parcel transferred to the State of California under subsection (a)

ceases to be used for public recreational and open space purposes, all right, title, and interest in and to that parcel shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. SAFETY OF PARCEL FOR PUBLIC USE.

Not later than the 18-month period beginning on the date the parcel described in section 1 is determined to be excess, the Secretary of the Army shall—

(1) take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that the parcel is not contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous materials; and

(2) certify to the State of California that the parcel is not contaminated with explosive, toxic, or other hazardous materials.

OPERATION RESTORE HOPE TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1993

HON. MEL REYNOLDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation designed to address a very real need facing the brave men and women of our Armed Forces serving in Operation Restore Hope. I am joined in this effort by Congressmen MCHUGH, WHEAT, BAKER of Louisiana, OWENS, and MONTGOMERY.

The legislation I am introducing today would provide to those soldiers serving in Operation Restore Hope the exact same tax relief as provided soldiers who served in Operation Desert Storm. The need for this legislation is simple.

Under the provisions of our Tax Code, soldiers serving in a Presidentially declared combat zone, receive certain tax benefits, such as exclusion from payment of Federal taxes on their combat-related pay. Operation Desert Storm was declared a combat zone. Operation Restore Hope, by contrast, has not been declared such a zone, and therefore, the benefits associated with such a declaration have not been accorded to our soldiers in Somalia.

There are two ways to correct this inequity. One way is for the President to declare the area of operation a combat zone. The other way is to provide the same benefits legislatively, in the absence of a declaration of the area of operation a combat zone. At the present time, it is unlikely that the men and women of our Armed Forces will receive the benefits they deserve.

There can be no question as to the danger and risk associated with the mission of mercy to the people of Somalia. While it may not technically be called a combat zone, there can be no doubt that our service personnel face the same risks faced by our personnel in Operation Desert Storm.

My legislation seeks to offer nothing more and nothing less than what was provided to our forces in Operation Desert Storm. It has been crafted to mirror exactly what was provided to our men and women in the gulf. What I seek to do is provide fair and equitable treatment for our forces in Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation recognizes the tremendous contribution our men and women in uniform are providing to the people in Somalia. They deserve our praise, our thanks, and our assistance whenever necessary. This

legislation will do just that. I urge my colleagues' support of this legislation.

KRIEBLE INSTITUTE SPONSORS SEMINARS

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to participate in a series of seminars in Tallinn, Estonia, Prague in the Czech Republic, and Ljubljana in Slovenia, sponsored by the Kriebie Institute of the Free Congress Foundation.

It was exciting to take part in nongovernment, privately sponsored instruction of those who until so recently were deprived of their freedom.

The Kriebie Institute has worked to assist democracy movements in the East since 1987, and began seminars on campaigns, democratic governing, and principles of free enterprise and business development in 1989—before the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Since that time the Kriebie Institute has sponsored some 65 such training conferences throughout the former Soviet empire, covering every country in Eastern and Central Europe, and half of the Republics of the former Soviet Union. Sixty percent of the institute's activity has been concentrated in Russia and Ukraine taking the institute to the far reaches of Siberia and the Russian far east.

The institute has recruited and trained more than 30 field persons who after 2 months of intensive training at the Free Congress Foundation headquarters in Washington and in the field in U.S. campaigns are home in their native lands assisting democracy efforts and furthering small business development. They have helped thousands in the former Soviet empire.

The genius behind this effort and the man who has funded most of it personally is Dr. Robert H. Kriebie.

At 77 years of age he travels with the teaching teams and spends full-time in institute activities. As he tells everyone, "The Kriebie Institute is my life."

He began this activity after a remarkable career in business. Following a successful career at the General Electric Co., he and his father founded the Loctite Corp.—which first made what we now call super glue for industrial and later domestic purposes.

He built Loctite from a company with three employees to a Fortune 500 enterprise. With the financial rewards reaped, he could have retired to a life of leisure. Instead he is as busy as ever.

He tells his audiences that the Soviet empire was the greatest threat to world peace and stability in his lifetime and he wanted to do what he could to bring about its demise. Dr. Kriebie was nearly alone in predicting the end of the Soviet Union in 1988. More recently, the remaining Communist press in Russia honored Dr. Kriebie with scathing attacks on the Kriebie Institute for its role in the Soviet empire's demise. One glaring headline read, "Kriebie cracks the Kremlin."

All of this Dr. Kriebel has done—spending several million dollars of his own money and devoting all his personal time—without asking anything in return. In that sense he is typical of the generosity of American entrepreneurs.

It was an honor for me to share in Dr. Kriebel's work. I might add that in this most recent work I was joined by several other Wisconsinites. My administrative assistant, Todd Schultz, also served as one of the instructors on the government side of the parallel conferences which take place. Also joining us was the president of the Kriebel Institute, Paul M. Weyrich, a Racine native and former TV and newspaper reporter in Milwaukee. Louis Andrew, a businessman from Fond du Lac, taught on the business side.

I might add, two other Wisconsinites, J. Fritz Rench of Racine and Terry Kohler of Sheboygan are on the Kriebel Institute board of directors and participate actively in the work of the institute.

America—indeed the world—needs more selfless men of principle like Bob Kriebel. The world would be a better place if the sort of dedication to principle he exemplifies was more commonplace. I am honored to have played a part in his noble effort.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENHANCED RESCISSION/RECEIPTS ACT OF 1993

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which builds on the legislative line-item veto proposal that has already been introduced by Congressman SOLOMON. My proposal would broaden the focus of the legislative line-item veto to encompass both pork-barrel spending items in appropriations and special tax provisions in revenue bills.

Under this bill the President could rescind all or any part of any discretionary budget authority in appropriations bills or veto any targeted tax benefit within a revenue bill. Congress would then have 20 days after the submission of a rescission or veto proposal in which to enact a rescission/receipts disapproval bill by majority vote of both Houses.

I believe that it is important that the President be able to single out both pork-barrel spending and special tax provisions for an individual vote. Often such provisions are buried in large bills and Members may not even be aware of all of these individual provisions tucked away in an omnibus bill.

As an example, H.R. 11, the Revenue Act of 1992, contained over 50 special tax provisions that totaled \$2.5 billion in cost over a 5-year period. H.R. 11 was Congress' response to the Los Angeles riots last spring. The supposed cornerstone of that legislation was the enterprise zone provisions. I was surprised to learn that the 5-year, \$2.4 billion cost of the enterprise zone provisions was less than the total for the special tax provisions within that bill. There should be a way for the President to get at such targeted tax benefits providing special treatment to a particular taxpayer or limited class of taxpayers which are buried in massive revenue bills.

I urge my colleagues to review this legislation, a copy of which is printed below, and join me in the effort to provide the President with a legislative line-item veto.

H.R. 493

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as "The Enhanced Rescission/Receipts Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions of part B of title X of The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, and subject to the provisions of this section, the President may rescind all or part of any discretionary budget authority or veto any targeted tax benefit within any revenue bill which is subject to the terms of this Act if the President—

- (1) determines that—
 - (A) such rescission or veto would help reduce the Federal budget deficit;
 - (B) such rescission or veto will not impair any essential Government functions; and
 - (C) such rescission or veto will not harm the national interest; and
- (2) notifies the Congress of such rescission or veto by a special message not later than twenty calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays) after the date of enactment of a regular or supplemental appropriation act or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations providing such budget authority or a revenue bill containing a targeted tax benefit.

The President shall submit a separate rescission message for each appropriation bill and for each revenue bill under this paragraph.

SEC. 3 RESCISSION EFFECTIVE UNLESS DISAPPROVED.

(a)(1) Any amount of budget authority rescinded under this Act as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed canceled unless, during the period described in subsection (b), a rescission/receipts disapproval bill making available all of the amount rescinded is enacted into law.

(2) Any provision of law vetoed under this Act as set forth in a special message by the President shall be deemed repealed unless, during the period described in subsection (b), a rescission/receipts disapproval bill restoring that provision is enacted into law.

(b) The period referred to in subsection (a) is—

(1) a congressional review period of twenty calendar days of session during which Congress must complete action on the rescission/receipts disapproval bill and present such bill to the President for approval or disapproval;

(2) after the period provided in paragraph (1), an additional ten days (not including Sundays) during which the President may exercise his authority to sign or veto the rescission/receipts disapproval bill; and

(3) if the President vetoes the rescission/receipts disapproval bill during the period in paragraph (2), an additional five calendar days of session after the date of the veto.

(c) If a special message transmitted by the President under this Act and the last session of the Congress adjourns sine die before the expiration of the period described in subsection (b), the rescission or veto, as the case may be, shall not take effect. The message shall be deemed to have been retransmitted on the first day of the succeeding Congress and the review period referred to in subsection (b) (with respect to such message) shall run beginning after such first day.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "rescission/receipts disapproval bill" means a bill or joint resolution which—

(A) only disapproves a rescission of budget authority, in whole, rescinded, or

(B) only disapproves a veto of any provision of law that would decrease receipts,

in a special message transmitted by the President under this Act.

(2) The term "calendar days of session" shall mean only those days on which both Houses of Congress are in session.

(3) The term "targeted tax benefit" means any provision which has the practical effect of providing a benefit in the form of a differential treatment to particular taxpayer or a limited class of taxpayers, whether or not such provision is limited by its terms to a particular taxpayer or a class of taxpayers. Such term does not include any benefit provided to a class of taxpayers distinguished on the basis of general demographic conditions such as income, number of dependents, or marital status.

SEC. 5. CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO RESCISSIONS.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Whenever the President rescinds any budget authority as provided in this Act or vetoes any provision of law as provided in this Act, the President shall transmit to both Houses of Congress a special message specifying—

- (1) the amount of budget authority rescinded or the provision vetoed;
- (2) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;
- (3) the reasons and justifications for the determination to rescind budget authority or veto any provision pursuant to this Act;
- (4) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the rescission or veto; and
- (5) all factions, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the rescission or veto and the decision to effect the rescission or veto, and to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated effect of the rescission upon the objects, purposes, and programs for which the budget authority is provided.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF MESSAGES TO HOUSE AND SENATE.—

(1) Each special message transmitted under this Act shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each special message so transmitted shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Each such message shall be printed as a document of each House.

(2) Any special message transmitted under this Act shall be printed in the first issue of the Federal Register published after such transmittal.

(c) REFERRAL OF RESCISSION/RECEIPTS DISAPPROVAL BILLS.—Any rescission/receipts disapproval bill introduced with respect to a special message shall be referred to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as the case may be.

(d) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(1) Any rescission/receipts disapproval bill received in the Senate from the House shall

be considered in the Senate pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(2) Debate in the Senate on any rescission/receipts disapproval bill and debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than ten hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(3) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motions or appeal in connection with such bill shall be limited to one hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by the mover and the manager of the bill, except that in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(4) A motion to further limit debate is not debatable. A motion to recommit (except a motion to recommit with instructions to report back within a specified number of days not to exceed one, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session) is not in order.

(e) POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any rescission/receipts disapproval bill that relates to any matter other than the rescission of budget authority or veto of the provision of law transmitted by the President under this Act.

(2) It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any amendment to a rescission/receipts disapproval bill.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by a vote of three-fifths of the members duly chosen and sworn.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR FORMER REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman Richard H. (Dick) Ichord of Missouri died on Christmas Day. On January 7, a memorial service was held in the House Armed Services Committee hearing room for our friend and former colleague, who served in the House from 1961–81.

I want to share with the House the program and the statements of those who participated in this service to remember our good friend. I also am including statements from other Members who wanted to pay tribute to Dick Ichord:

REMARKS OF HON. G.V. MONTGOMERY

As Dick looks down on us today, I think he would say, "Thanks for coming, but make it brief so we can go to the gym."

We are pleased to have some members of Dick's family with us. I especially want to recognize Penny Ichord and Kyle White.

I heard from Fred Gage this week. He and Dick wrote a book together years ago. He wanted me to read this portion of the letter he sent from California: "Dick was my friend, and there's a miracle called friend-

ship. It dwells within the heart, and you don't know how it happens or when it gets its start * * * but the happiness it brings you always gives a special lift * * * and you realize that friendship then is God's special gift. Thanks Dick, for giving me and others the special gift of friendship."

REMARKS OF DR. JAMES DAVID FORD, CHAPLAIN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

We are gathered today in loving memory of Dick Ichord and to hear God's words of hope and peace. The Psalms have provided a source of strength for all the years and I will read Psalms 139 and Psalms 23 for they give us the peace of God.

O Lord, thou has searched me, and known me. Thou knowest my down sitting and mine uprising, thou understandest my thought afar off. Thou compassed my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways. For there is not a word in my tongue, but, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether. Thou has beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it. Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee. Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me, and know my thoughts: And see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.—Psalms 139.

The Lord is my shepherd: I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his Name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over. Surely, goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.—Psalms 23.

Let us pray: O God, before whose face the generations rise and pass away, the strength of those who labor, and the repose of the blessed dead, we rejoice in the communion of thy saint. We remember all who have faithfully lived and died and especially those most dear to us who rest in thee. Give us at length our portion with those who have trusted in thee and striven in all things to do thy holy will and unto thy name, with the faithful on earth and the faithful in heaven, we ascribe all honor and glory, world without end. Amen.

O, God, who healest the broken in heart and bindest up their wounds, look in tender pity and compassion upon thy servants whose joy has been turned into mourning. Leave them not comfortless, but grant that they may be drawn closer to thee and to one another by their common sorrow. Fill their souls with the light and comfort of thy presence. Grant unto them such a vision of that life wherein all mysteries shall be revealed, and all tears be wiped away, that they may be able to endure as seeing thee who art invisible. So dwell with them and be their God,

until the day break and the shadows flee away. Amen.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN IKE SKELTON

We are all here today because Richard Ichord touched our lives in one way or another. I had the privilege of knowing him as a fellow Missourian and patriot, colleague, and friend.

A native of Licking, Missouri, Dick Ichord was a Navy veteran of World War II, and earned bachelor's and law degrees from the University of Missouri. After serving four terms in the Missouri House of Representatives, including one as speaker, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1960.

A conservative Democrat from southern Missouri, he served 10 terms in Congress, from 1961–1981. He worked tirelessly for the rural Missouri district he represented. His successful efforts to designate Ozark National Scenic Rivers in his district will have a lasting impact on the environment and people of central Missouri. He was a true patriot, and was known as a supporter of efforts to maintain our national security and a strong military.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, Dick was a champion of Fort Leonard Wood, a key Army base in the district I now represent. His chairmanship of the Research and Design Subcommittee, and promotion of new technologies, helped assure our powerful military arsenal. As he prepared to leave Congress in 1980, he said, "diplomatic power doesn't mean anything without the military power to back it up."

But he was perhaps best known for his six-year tenure as chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the subsequent Internal Security Committee. While fighting the elimination of the committee in 1975, he warned against America letting its guard down on intelligence and security matters. Upon retiring from the Congress, the Army honored him with the Distinguished Civilian Service Award for his outstanding contributions to our national security policy.

He was very active in the American Freedom Coalition, and Dr. Grant, who heads up this coalition, is with us here today. The Honorable Bob Wilson, a close friend of Dick Ichord and also active with the coalition, said he wanted to be here today for this special memorial service.

Dick will be missed by his former colleagues and his many friends throughout our country. He is survived by his widow, Penny; a son, Richard H. Ichord III, of Houston, Missouri; a daughter, Mrs. Pam Ehlers, of Nevada, Missouri; and three grandchildren.

Dick Ichord left his footprints on his south central Missouri district. He left footprints on Fort Leonard Wood Army Base. He left footprints on our national security policy. And he left his footprints in the lives he touched throughout his distinguished career in public service.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow wrote:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime.
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

Dick Ichord left this world a better place than he found it, and I was proud to call him my friend.

REMARKS OF HON. SUSAN LIVINGSTONE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR INSTALLATIONS, LOGISTICS AND ENVIRONMENT

Penny, Pam, Kyle and friends and colleagues of Dick Ichord.

Your presence here today honors Dick Ichord. And on behalf of his family, I thank you for your personal tribute to him. For some, Dick Ichord was our boss—a man who earned our loyalty and dedication. For some, Dick Ichord was a father and husband—much beloved. For some, he was our friend and colleague—a man known as a work horse, not a show horse—a man who always did what he felt was right—a man loyal to his friends, loyal to his constituents and loyal to his Nation. For some he was our mentor—a man who was at heart an academic and philosopher—who gave us opportunity and helped us grow as individuals. And for all of us, we will miss him.

Dick Ichord was born in the rural farming community of Licking, Missouri, on June 27, 1926. And he never lost sight of his roots. He rode a horse to school. And in that school, he excelled, possessed of an almost photographic memory and ethic of hard work, Ozark pride and strong faith. In those depression years, the times in Licking were hard, but not desperate. Once when Dick was 8, a "federal relief man" came to his Licking school with coffee, sugar, potatoes and fruit. The children all brought a sack home but, the next day, Dick Ichord brought his sack back. In fact, 80% of the children in his school brought their sacks back, an experience which embedded in him the strong belief that if you were physically and mentally able, you should work for what you got. He graduated valedictorian at Licking High and gave a speech which the basketball coach said was "better by far than the guy we paid to speak." Already, he was reaching out to the career of public service which lay in front of him.

In 1944 Dick entered the U.S. Naval Air Corps, flying submarine patrol in the Pacific. Discharged in 1946, he went to the University of Missouri in Columbia on the GI Bill, received a bachelor's degree in accounting, and, taking advantage of the 4th year allowed under the GI Bill, he entered law school. At law school, he got the fever for public service from his friend Warren Hearnes. At 26 he became a Missouri state representative and at 32 was elected the Speaker of the Missouri House, the youngest person to have ever held that position. In just the first three decades of his life, Dick Ichord achieved and contributed more than many do in a lifetime.

Two years later, in 1961, he was elected Congressman from the 8th Congressional District in Missouri, and for the next 20 years served his Nation, his State and his constituents with dedication and vigor, leaving a record of contribution and legacy, such as the creation of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which endures today.

The issues he fought for these 20 years remain issues today:

Federal red tape and overregulation;
Deficit spending and the mortgaging of America's future;

The need to preserve a strong defense structure;

The need to make Congress a more effective, productive organizational entity; (in fact, Dick once said, "I think you should measure the value of a legislator by the legislation that he helps to defeat, rather than pass.")

The need to rationalize foreign aid.

He called himself a "Jeffersonian Democrat." Most would say he was a staunch conservative. Indeed, he strongly believed in getting government as close to the people as you could. But he also voted as he saw the issues. He supported the "war on poverty," he

supported the 1964 Civil Rights Act, he voted for the Equal Rights Amendment. He voted in favor of public financing of presidential elections. In a statement made in 1977 which rings a clear note today, he said "My friends, you cannot assume the posture of a dove when it comes to defense spending, and then fight like a ferocious tiger when they are going to take a base out of your district."

I could go on. But perhaps two phases sum up Dick Ichord's 20 years in Congress. He had common sense. And he had courage—two personal characteristics that he daily brought to bear to do what was right for this Nation, his State of Missouri and his beloved constituents. Since 1981, he continued that devoted service as a private citizen. When he told his constituents in 1979 that he had decided not to seek reelection, he said that no person is indispensable. He quoted his favorite scriptural passage: "To every thing there is a season and a time", and as he said, for him, it was time "to step forward to new paths of service" to this country he loved so well.

And he did step forward until last month, when a heart attack took him from his family and from us.

Today he has stepped forward to be with God. And while that leaves us with great sadness, Dick Ichord would not want us to grieve. So we do not come grieving. We come hoping and believing, as Dick Ichord did, that today and tomorrow will always be grand days in America and days that can be made even better if all of us as citizens of this great Nation do, as Dick Ichord did, and work hard to serve it.

As Theodore Roosevelt said, "The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena—whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood . . . a leader who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions and spends himself in a worthy cause—who, at best if he wins, knows the thrills of high achievement—and if he fails, fails while daring greatly." Dick Ichord was a man in the arena—who always dared greatly. And when the bell tolls for us, we can only hope the same can be said.

So Dick, go with God. This world, this Nation, and all of us are better because of you. And we will miss you greatly.

REMARKS OF RONALD C. WILLIS

Congressional staff members are called upon to do many things for and on behalf of the members they serve. Some things are done as a routine part of fulfilling the role of congressional employee. Other things take on a deeper significance because they involve a personal friend or concern.

Two or three years ago, Ron Dellums asked me to meet with a friend of his regarding a youth program for the District of Columbia. The request was not unusual for Ron as Chair of the D.C. Committee. What was unusual was the caveat he added. He said "Keep in mind, politically you and I could not agree with Dick Ichord on anything and we never will.

However, his heart is in the right place, and for that reason. I want you to do whatever it is you can to assist him." Ron added this note, "I'm not sure what he wants, but I trust him because he has always been a straight shooter."

With that as an introduction, I met with Dick Ichord and became a part of his team to make a difference in the lives of inner city children.

Richard Ichord was president of the Jhoon Rhee Foundation, which developed the "Black Belts Against Drugs" through the

"Joy of Discipline" program. This was a true labor of love and one which has impacted the lives of hundreds of grade school children in the District of Columbia and other cities.

Dick believed in this program, and if you look at the list of directors and advisors, he made some others believe in it also.

Let me read to you just a portion of the list:

Hon. Stanley Kimmitt;
Hon. Donald K. Anderson;
Hon. Robert A. Borski, Jr.;
Hon. Mike Espy;
Hon. Duncan L. Hunter;
Hon. Robert L. Livingston;
Hon. James T. Molloy;
Hon. Howard Pollock;
Hon. Thomas J. Ridge;
Hon. Toby Roth;
Hon. Gerry Sikorski;
Hon. Ike Skelton;
Hon. Gene Taylor; and
Hon. Paul Trible.

A wide range of individuals representing a cross section of the American political system.

What Dick Ichord got us involved in was a program that goes directly to the heart of the problem, facing today's school children. That is, a program of personal discipline and training that brings the child a deep sense of self-worth and begins when the child is in the first and second grades.

Under the firm and loving hand of Master Rhee, the children learn basic rules for living in harmony with themselves and others.

On May 26th of last year, I was privileged to attend the "Joy of Discipline" graduation ceremony for children from seven D.C. public elementary schools. I watched with amazement as 300 children sat in an orderly fashion, eyes forward, and heads straight for nearly an hour.

By the end of the ceremony, all of the adults in attendance were moved nearly to tears at the precision and order these children displayed as they went through the routines that are a major part of the "Joy of Discipline" program.

In the Old Testament, living and dying are considered a part of the great scheme of things. If a man lived a full and generous life, when he died, he was remembered for his integrity, his stewardship and his generosity, and he was buried with his name, that is, with honor, and his name was forever held in the highest esteem.

I believe with all my heart that it can be said of Dick Ichord that, like the great men of the Old Testament, he was buried with his name and shall be remembered for his integrity, his stewardship and his generosity, and as he stands before almighty God, he is judged worthy of a job well done.

THE FEDERAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTITUTE CONSOLIDATION ACT

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1993

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, we are embarked upon a new era. It is an era as yet undefined and unnamed. It will not be characterized by a "new world order," but rather, as we have seen, by regional economic and military competition and ethnic disputes within and among neighboring States. It is an era in

which military power will diminish as a tool of larger powers, and it is an era in which economic contests will define nations' power and progress.

At the same time, the interdependence of nations grows inexorably. Our international commerce, monetary flows, trade ties, and multilateral activities with other nations are building layer upon layer of interconnecting relationships among nations. Yet, as citizens of a historically and geographically isolated giant, Americans remain far behind nearly every other nation's populace in their foreign language abilities and in their knowledge of the world around them.

Our competitive edge among nations will hinge upon our productivity, the quality of our work force, our educational systems, and our ability to compete in every economic arena. And our competitiveness will depend in no small degree upon Americans' ability to communicate in foreign languages.

The new era demands innovative thinking about our Federal institutions and our national intelligence resources in particular. It behooves us to focus our attention on outdated national intelligence resources with a view to modernizing and streamlining our education and training resources. I believe that we must also strengthen the human resources of the intelligence community and other agencies, and our foreign language instruction and translation capabilities in preparation for the fast-paced changes occurring in this, the first decade of the rapidly forming new era. Since World War II, the national security apparatus has maintained a well-funded program of instruction in languages for each of its component agencies. The logic of the preceding review leads us to the following conclusion: the Federal Government ought now to devote the same attention and resources to our language and area studies programs tailored not only to national security but also to our economic security.

Accordingly, my purpose today is to call for the transformation of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center [DLI] into the Federal Language Institute. I envision this institution serving as the single organization at which Federal personnel would learn foreign languages and related area issues, at which the Federal Government would translate unclassified documents, and at which a wide variety of foreign language services would be performed for all Federal agencies.

In fiscal year 1991, the Defense Language Institute trained 4,025 students, of which the majority were in the Department of the Army. DLI offers courses covering the entire range of language proficiency and tailored to specialized subject areas. DLI has done an outstanding job of providing expertise in languages not commonly taught in American schools and colleges. Its intensive methods have served to augment existing programs at schools around the country in more common languages, and it has reacted quickly to changes in international relations as demands for language proficiency in different languages have fluctuated.

DLI conducts important research on techniques for language instruction with the use of computer technology and administers other DOD language resources as well as foreign

language training under contract with the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute in Washington, DC.

The Institute anticipates receiving advanced translation and communication equipment within the year, enabling it to offer translation and communications services to any Federal agency requiring them around the world and around the clock. The Institute already possesses 6 transmission and receiving devices capable of teleconferencing DLI personnel with other Federal personnel throughout the United States at 60 different sites. DLI features 650 classrooms and 36 language labs, and its library offers more than 80,000 volumes in over 40 languages.

Without exaggeration, DLI can be said to possess the finest instruction facilities in the world, using the most advanced heuristic methods. Rounding out its students' linguistic skills, the Institute also offers courses in area studies, including the history, culture, and politics of the nations in which each language is spoken.

I would add that any needs DLI might have for greater space in the future would be easily remedied through the acquisition of available space at Fort Ord, located just a few miles away. Fort Ord, comprising 28,000 acres, is scheduled to close in the fall of 1995.

After careful study of DLI's capabilities and potential, and consultation with the DLI administration and faculty and other public and private foreign language institutions, I have concluded that DLI's expansion and transformation into an institute serving the entire Federal Government would yield cost savings, streamline our Federal foreign language instruction programs, and provide powerful new incentives and capabilities to our national foreign language instruction and translation apparatus.

This is the kind of bold and innovative approach required in the new era of competition. If we are to adopt fresh approaches and reforms to boost our competitiveness in all aspects of international commerce, we ought to begin by renovating and consolidating our foreign language instruction apparatus.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is long past the time to bring our Federal language instruction programs into the 1990's and into accordance with the demands of our budgetary constraints. I do not make this proposal lightly. Any innovative plan requires bold leadership, but I hold that we can accomplish greater efficiencies in these programs even as we boost their resources and their applicability. The transformation of the Defense Language Institute into a Federal Language Institute handling language and area studies instruction for the Federal Government would achieve a valuable synergy from which not only governmental but private sector organizations would benefit. A Federal Language Institute will fortify our national economic security and our intelligence community's preparedness for the new age. I urge my colleagues to reflect on the wisdom of this proposal and to join with me to support making the Federal Language Institute a reality.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Foreign Language Institute Consolidation Act".

SEC. 2. CONSOLIDATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each program to learn a foreign language of each agency and department of the executive branch shall be consolidated in accordance with this section into the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California.

(b) SUPERVISION AND TIME.—The consolidation required by subsection (a) shall be carried out—

(1) under the supervision of the Secretary of Defense, and

(2) within 5 years of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Center for Advancement of Language Learning shall coordinate in the consolidation required by subsection (a).

(d) NEW INSTITUTE.—The consolidation required by subsection (a) shall be placed in a new Federal Language Institute. Upon completion of the consolidation under subsection (a), the Federal Language Institute shall incorporate the Defense Language Institute.

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 21, 1993, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 22

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism
Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to grant employees family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the prospective nomination of Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

SH-216

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on the prospective nomination of Hershel W. Gober, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on the prospective nomination of Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

SH-216

JANUARY 25

2:00 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on the prospective nomination of Bruce Babbitt, of Arizona, to be Secretary of the Interior.

SH-216

JANUARY 26

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold an organizational meeting to consider pending committee business.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings on the nation's economic and budget outlook.

SD-608

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider the prospective nominations of Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State, and Madeleine K. Albright, of the District of Columbia, to be the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and the U.S. Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations; and to hold an organization meeting, to consider committee's funding resolution, committee's rules of procedure for the 103rd Congress, and its subcommittee assignments.

S-116, Capitol

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold an organizational meeting, to consider proposed legislation requesting certain funds in operating expenses, and other pending committee business.

SR-485

JANUARY 27

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Organizational meeting, to consider proposed legislation requesting funds for the committee's operating expenses.

SD-366

JANUARY 28

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to redesignate the Environmental Protection Agency as the Department of Environmental Protection, an executive agency.

SD-342

Rules and Administration

Organizational meeting to consider committee's rules of procedures for the 103rd Congress, membership for the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress, and pending legislative and administrative business, including the committee's budget for the 103rd Congress.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings on the nation's economic outlook.

SD-608

FEBRUARY 3

9:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1993 and 1994.

SR-301

FEBRUARY 4

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the General Accounting Office analysis of TRIAD cost effectiveness.

SD-342

Rules and Administration

To continue hearings on proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1993 and 1994.

SR-301

FEBRUARY 23

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Disabled American Veterans.

345 Cannon Building

FEBRUARY 25

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Blinded Veterans of America, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Retired Officers Association.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 2

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, the Veterans of World War I, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, and the Non-Commissioned Officers Association.

345 Cannon Building

POSTPONEMENTS

FEBRUARY 2

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine performance measurement in Federal programs.

SD-342