

"a lousy, rotten way to legislate." Mr. Broder was referring to the recent practice in Congress of rolling up nearly all of the appropriation actions for the fiscal year plus germane and nongermane authorization legislation in a usurpation of the authority of such committees. Right he is, it's a lousy and rotten way to legislate and the leadership of the two Houses who really should end this continuing, undemocratic, fiscally irresponsible travesty are again giving the membership of this Congress that sorry choice again! In the process we have an aggrandizement of the power of senior members of the Appropriation, Budget, and Revenue Committees and effectively thwart the ability of the President, realistically, to veto the fiscally irresponsible actions of the Congress.

Members are faced on the eve of adjournment with the choice of rejecting the flawed product of this outrageous appropriation process and seeing the offices and activities of Government closed and stopped and faced with millions of citizens' lives being badly disrupted. Or, we are faced with accepting the bad with the good and avoiding those disruptions and faced with international and domestic ramifications of great consequences. Indeed, what a choice; what a lousy, rotten way to legislate!

As a result of a continued frustration with this corruptive appropriation process, earlier this day this Member signed a letter to the President of the United States, with many of my colleagues. It asks the President in his State of the Union message next year to vow that he will absolutely veto any continuing resolution coming to his desk in his last year in office. The majority leadership of the House and Senate and of their relevant Appropriation and Budget Committees would thus be served with the earliest notice that they must perform their tasks at the earliest possible time in 1988, so that the Members of the two Houses can work their will on the 13 appropriation bills and the President can fulfill his constitutional role with the bills reaching his desk. They would be served the earliest notice, in short, that in 1988 it will not be business as usual under the corruptive dilatory process Congress has adopted during the past two decades.

The relevant column of Mr. David Broder follows, and I urge my colleagues to read it carefully before we begin the second session of the 100th Congress.

A LOUSY, ROTTEN WAY TO LEGISLATE"

(By David Broder)

WASHINGTON.—The next summit here will not be about the arms race but the spending race. The Senate has just taken each spending decision it has made so far this year, linked it to every other decision, and summed it all up—\$606 billion worth—in a single massive piece of legislation called a continuing resolution or CR.

The House passed its version of the CR on Dec. 4—a modest, little \$576 billion compendium, including 13 separate appropriations bills and a spate of unrelated legislation on broadcasting rules, environmental-cleanup deadlines and a few other stray cats and dogs.

When a conference committee of House members and senators has worked out the differences between the two versions of the CR, the final compromise will be dumped on President Reagan's desk for him to sign or veto as Congress flees town for the Christmas holidays.

Reagan says that the way the package is shaping up, he will veto it—and he should.

This is, as House Minority Leader Robert H. Michel, R-Ill., said, "absolutely a lousy, rotten way to legislate." And that view is not confined to Republicans. Sen. David Pryor, D-Ark., said that CR really stands for "combined retreat," or "our admission of failure . . . at the end of each fiscal year, when we get ready to go home."

Bundling everything together in one monstrous bill sharply reduces the ability of Congress to make effective judgments on the nation's spending priorities. It also, and not accidentally, subverts the president's constitutional authority to veto legislation and have that veto count.

When everything from the Army's kitchen sinks to the National Institutes of Health's experimental drugs is wrapped into a single bill, passed in Congress' final hours of session, the president must either swallow it whole or accept responsibility for shutting down the government. Reagan says he will not shrink from the latter course—but no president should have to face that choice.

This is a new and ugly feature of government, a phenomenon of the 1980s. Through most of its history, Congress has passed individual appropriations bills for individual departments or functions and sent them on to the president for his signature or veto. The CR was used only when a particular appropriation was briefly delayed and authority was needed for a department to go on spending for a short time.

But in recent years, Congress has fallen into the habit of wrapping all its spending authority into one CR—and then loading it up with other measures to make them "veto-proof."

Some blame the development on the new congressional budget process when began in the mid-1970s, claiming it has slowed the work of the appropriations committees. But in the last couple of years, Congress has chosen to repackage even largely completed appropriations bills into the CR, rather than send them individually to the president for his approval or veto.

Increasingly, the CR has become a vehicle for shoving extraneous legislation down a reluctant president's throat. Earlier this year, President Reagan vetoed a bill to reinstate the "fairness doctrine," a regulation requiring broadcasters to present alternative policy views. The Senate failed by 13 votes to override the veto, so now congressional sponsors of the legislation have stitched it onto the House CR—figuring Reagan would not veto money for military pay or school lunches just to win the "fairness doctrine" fight.

Whether you agree with Reagan or not on that issue, you have to recognize the Democratic architects of this strategy are attempting an end run, not just around Reagan, but around the Constitution.

What is to be done? Sen. Daniel J. Evans, R-Wash., has offered a proposal requiring that any future continuing resolution must be split into its component parts when it comes out of the House-Senate conference committee, so that Congress can vote on each separate appropriation and the president can sign or veto each of them.

Evans has lined up 42 co-sponsors. Among them are five Democrats, three of them major committee chairmen.

The House will be a tougher nut to crack. Similar legislation offered by Rep. Mickey Edwards, R-Okla., was killed in the House Rules Committee, which denied Edwards the chance for a floor vote.

Edwards' sponsorship is significant. Unlike other conservatives, he has consistently opposed Reagan's call for presidential

authority to veto individual items in an appropriations bill. The "line-item veto" authority, Edwards has argued, would tilt the constitutional balance too heavily in the executive's direction.

But denying the president his right to receive and act on individual appropriations bills is a serious infringement on his constitutional authority, Edwards rightly says.

Whatever advantage Democrats may temporarily gain by using the CR device to thwart Reagan's veto, short-circuiting the Constitution ultimately endangers everyone. The Evans proposal is a start on the path back to the right way of doing business.

NO WAY TO RUN A BUSINESS, NO WAY TO RUN A COUNTRY

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1987

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, we have looming before us two legislative vehicles—an omnibus continuing resolution and a reconciliation package—which ought to have their distributors taken out, or at least given an EPA citation for fouling the air.

A CR, procedurally, is no way to legislate. There is no accountability, it is subterfuge of the worst kind, it makes a mockery of our legislative system, and it is for all practical purposes a way to lie and cheat.

We should not approve the CR and voice our disapproval by forcing the leadership to divide this monstrosity into 13 separate appropriations bills—as it should be—so that we can correctly and honestly consider each one on its merits.

Reconciliation is the most ludicrously misnamed piece of political finagling ever devised by man or beast. We are reconciled to nothing save higher taxes and higher spending. It would be more appropriate to label it a congressional conveyor belt—of taxpayer money coming in and pork barrel going out. It would be far better to allow sequestration under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings to occur, barring a more preferable freeze on all spending. At least Gramm-Rudman-Hollings makes solid reductions in projected spending increases.

This reconciliation package, on the other hand, doesn't include substantial savings in spending; it makes some cosmetic changes and then increases taxes. Worse yet, it authorize higher spending levels. As a conferee on the Medicare, part B provisions, I have seen how \$800 million in new spending was authorized. Coupled with a matching \$800 million which the States must come up with, that amounts to \$1.6 billion in new authorization. We should be reducing spending, not adding to it. We are cheating, Mr. Speaker. It is not fair and it is not right.

RELIGIOUS HATE VIOLENCE TARGETS ISLAMIC MOSQUES

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1987

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, on October 5 of this year the House passed, by voice vote,

H.R. 3258, a bill to impose criminal penalties for damage to religious property and for obstruction of persons in the free exercise of religious beliefs.

While I would like to commend the House for its swift deliberation and adoption of this bill which is now in the Senate Judiciary Committee as S. 794, I would like to bring up the point that this bill is inadequate in addressing the problem in Los Angeles County, and other parts of the United States.

According to the 1985 annual report of the county of Los Angeles, County Commission on Human Relations, about 17 percent of religiously motivated violence in Los Angeles County was directed against Islamic mosques, centers or individuals of the Islamic faith. The commission documented attacks against Americans of Arab ethnic background which ranged from anti-Muslim and anti-Arab graffiti painted on mosques and businesses, to arson at a South Pasadena school owned by an Islamic center. Bombings which occurred within a 4-day period in October of that year included a bomb placed at a Los Angeles mosque, and discovered by early morning worshippers. In another incident, a fake explosive device was placed on the steps of a Muslim family in Venice, Los Angeles.

The report is by no means all inclusive of violence against Islamic mosques and individuals. The report for instance did not count two consecutive nights of violence which occurred in late January at a mosque and an Islamic center in downtown Los Angeles, and another Islamic center in the South Bay area.

While the commission's 1987 annual report shows a decline of religiously motivated violence against Islamic centers, mosques, and individuals to 8.3 percent of the incidents that year, nonetheless, this type of violence ranked second, with violence against Jews ranking first. Interestingly enough, violence against Islamic institutions was greater than violence against Catholic, Presbyterian, and Methodist churches all put together. Yet, Islamic centers, and mosques were inadvertently omitted from H.R. 3258, or its companion bill S. 794.

This trend of violence against Americans of Arab ethnic background or Muslims and their places of worship is by no means limited to Los Angeles County. Unfortunately, it is a national phenomena which made it necessary to hold a July 16, 1986 hearing on this precise topic by the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the House Committee on the Judiciary, at which I testified.

Following is a short compilation of such violence on a national scale:

In Houston, TX, on June 22, 1985, the Eid al-Fitr celebration had to be canceled because of repeated death threats from anonymous callers against the Muslim community at the South-West Mosque. At 11:30 p.m., on the same day, two homemade pipe bombs were thrown from a truck through the window of the mosque causing \$50,000 in damages. Other mosques received threats: "One down, three to go."

In June and July 1985 mosques and Islamic centers in San Francisco; Orange County, CA; Denver; Quincy, MA; and Dearborn, MI, were vandalized or threatened. In Dearborn, mosque windows were broken. Threatening phone calls in Orange County stated: "You people are dead."

Mr. Speaker, in the United States there are now at least 3 million Muslims and over 600

mosques, and Islamic centers, including many in the black community. Islam has become the third largest religious community in the United States. Islam, as you may know, is one of the world's three monotheistic religions believing together with Judaism and Christianity in one God. In fact, 20 percent of the world's population is Muslim, constituting over 1 billion individuals. In light of the current anti-Muslim violence and our heritage of religious tolerance as guaranteed by our Constitution, I urge the Senate Judiciary Committee, and later on the conferees on this bill, to ensure the inclusion of the following under the term "religious real property" "any church, synagogue, mosque, Islamic center, Hindu, Buddhist, and Sikh temple, religious cemetery, or other religious real property."

I trust the Senate would amend the bill accordingly.

SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1987

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the superconducting super collider [SSC]. This accelerator will be one of the most far-reaching scientific programs this country has ever undertaken.

With each new generation particle accelerator, science has advanced further into the realm of high energy physics where particle physics and cosmology become unified. Experiments performed with the SSC will reveal aspects of the underlying structure of matter, but the SSC will also provide insight into theories of the origin of the universe.

As a member of the California delegation, I am especially enthusiastic about the level of support for the SSC within the California State government and among State business and civic associations. California has submitted two site proposals, one near Davis and the other near Stockton.

There are many reasons why California would be an excellent home for the SSC, but my point today is not so much to promote California specifically as to encourage my colleagues to consider what is at stake for this country—regardless of where the accelerator is eventually located.

The Department of Energy will complete its review of site proposals in January. Each site selected for the "Best Qualified List" will have met the Department's stringent standards on a wide range of criteria. The final site recommendation will be delivered by the National Academy of Sciences/National Academy of Engineering in July 1988.

As the site selection process proceeds, I urge my colleagues to remember the importance the SSC will have to our Nation as a whole. Next year will be crucial as far as this project is concerned, because it will require the first major commitment on funding. The SSC will cost about \$4.5 billion over a 10 year period, of which the international community could contribute \$1 billion. The payoffs are impossible to quantify. The SSC will be invaluable as an educational facility, training generations of students who will invigorate our high

technology industry. The technical challenges in constructing the accelerator, and in developing a whole new generation of diagnostic equipment, will produce substantial high tech spinoffs. The SSC is an investment well worth supporting. In fact, our country cannot afford not to invest in the sort of pathbreaking scientific research exemplified by the SSC.

If we as a Nation want to be leaders in high technology, we must commit the resources necessary to construct and operate the SSC. I encourage my colleagues to work with me to give this accelerator full support.

CONTINUED AID TO THE CONTRAS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 21, 1987

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to vote on the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1988, which contains nonlethal aid to the Nicaragua insurgents called various "Nicaraguan freedom fighters" or "Contras," this Member calls to the attention of colleagues in this body editorials from three distinguished national newspapers in this country. The editorials from the December 18, 1987, edition of the New York Times and the December 20, 1987, edition of the Washington Post analyze the current situation in Nicaragua and in the peace process now unfolding in Central America under the Guatemala City accord and support the short-term continuation of nonlethal aid for the Contras and the funding for the delivery of all varieties of material funded in this and previous congressional actions. The December 18, 1987, signed opinions editorial by John Hughes from the Christian Science Monitor describes the recent revelation about either a plan or proposal for a very major buildup of military manpower and weaponry that far exceeds those of all of the other Central American nations combined. It quite logically questions whether these revelations cast further doubt on the Sandinista protestation of their desire for peace in the region and democracy at home. The three items follow:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1987]

NASTY CHOICES ON NICARAGUA

These are not easy times for those conscientiously seeking a responsible policy on Nicaragua. How can Congress send more guns to the contra rebels? That would flagrantly violate the new Central American peace plan, which forbids all foreign aid to insurgents. Then why not cut off all contra aid? To do that, before the Sandinistas have complied with the plan, would remove the one pressure point that seems to burden President Daniel Ortega and the other commandantes.

What makes the choices harder is the confirmation by Nicaragua's Defense Minister, Humberto Ortega, of startling information from a defector. It seems that the Sandinistas are secretly planning to build a 600,000-man army, including reserves. Daniel Ortega tried to limit the damage created by that news by asserting that his younger brother was speaking of a proposal, not a definite plan. Plan or proposal, the effect is to bolster the defector's claims that Managua is already violating the pact by arming insurgents elsewhere.