

entire farming community in the Klamath Basin of Northern California. Families are being told simply that there is zero water for farming this year. It is an unspeakable tragedy and an appalling example of the power of the Endangered Species Act.

This is a poster child for the need to reform this misguided law and for all that is wrong, unjust and unbalanced with extreme environmental policies. It is a heartbreaking example of how people, families and, indeed, entire communities, can be sacrificed at the stroke of a biologist's pen, and based on nothing more than incomplete data, speculation and guesswork.

There is little consideration given to the human species under the Endangered Species Act. Once an animal or fish species is listed, its needs must come first, before the rights and livelihoods of the American people. This is not reasonable, it is not balanced, it is not prudent.

Farmers should be irrigating right now, but the normally bustling towns of the Klamath Basin in Northern California and Southern Oregon are quiet. Without water for the crops that drive this economy, farmers cannot work in their fields; the fertilizer companies, the maintenance shops, all agricultural-related businesses are closing. Delivery trucks and processing plants sit idle. Unemployment will rise.

More than 12 years ago the government decided that a species of fish was in decline and had to be protected under the Endangered Species Act, despite the fact that nobody really knows how many fish there are, how many there have been historically, and how many there should be. But because the ESA requires protection at any cost and all costs, the water has been shut off completely and there will be no farming this year. The Federal Government has reneged on its promise and has left these farmers wondering how this could happen.

But, Mr. Speaker, this need not happen. Three decades ago this country put men on the moon. With technology and know-how, the impossible became possible, and I know that we can do this in the Klamath Basin and throughout the country.

Protecting the environment and maintaining our local economies need not be mutually exclusive. In fact, we have studies that tell us, as surprising as this may seem, that more water does not necessarily equal more fish.

□ 1630

The issue is one of water quality, and we can do some things to improve that for the fish without simply taking water from our farmers. But the extreme environmentalists want this to be an either/or proposition.

Many of us have been working for years to fundamentally change the ESA, knowing that it allows for just this kind of tragic result. We have simply asked for reasonableness, for common sense, for balance between the needs of people and the needs of fish.

We have seen lives lost because of the Endangered Species Act, preventing us from fixing levees. We have seen the rights of property owners trampled. Now we are seeing people lose all they have or worked for. The loss of life, the loss of livelihoods, the trouncing of fundamental rights to freedom and the pursuit of the American dream, all of this is occurring under the extremes of the Endangered Species Act.

I would venture to guess that this is not what the American people truly want, and that this is not what Congress envisioned when it crafted this legislation more than 30 years ago.

I am committed to making sure the entire Nation knows that this is happening, and to working with this Congress and with the administration in making sure that it does not happen ever again. We need a fundamental change in this law so that we can prevent our local economies and the environment from being pitted against one another. If we put a man on the moon, I know that we can do this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PLATTS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SANCHEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION RELIEF FOR THE SUPPORT STAFF OF FERDINAND MARCOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to re-introduce a bill that provides immigration relief for the support staff of Ferdinand Marcos. This bill is similar to H.R. 4370, which I introduced in the 106th Congress.

In 1986, President Marcos of the Philippines was granted political asylum in the United

States to avert civil conflagration because of a popular uprising against his regime. The civil unrest arose following a controversial election in which President Marcos claimed to have defeated Corazon Aquino but was widely accused of election fraud. Growing street demonstrations in support of Mrs. Aquino raised fears of violence against what many viewed as a fraudulent election result. President Marcos left the Philippines on February 25, 1986 at U.S. urging and went into exile in Hawaii.

President Marcos, his wife Imelda and 88 members of his staff and their families were advised that they were being allowed into the United States with "parole" status for the convenience of the U.S. Government. This status is a legal fiction in which the individual is physically present in the United States but had never been "admitted" to the United States. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) can terminate parole status at any time. The individual can be treated as if he or she had entered the United States illegally and had no right to be here. In this case, it is extremely unfair.

INS has instituted proceedings to expel some of these individuals and their families but not all of them. The only pattern which seems to exist is that only individuals living in Hawaii are targeted for removal or exclusion proceedings. Based on reports I have received, no member of the Marcos entourage who moved to the mainland had been the target of any exclusion, deportation or removal proceeding.

These immigrants were invited to the United States to help care for President Marcos who was already ailing and died in 1989. They were told that they could bring their families with them. They have been in the United States for fourteen years and are fully integrated into our society. These people should not be deported. They came to the U.S. for an important reason. Because that reason is now past should not cause us to turn against them.

To rectify this unfair treatment, the bill grants the individuals and their families the right to remain in the United States. These honest, hardworking people came to the United States at the invitation of our government. Their presence was known and they have done nothing to violate our immigration laws. To uproot them would be an injustice to them and their families that we should not allow.

The exile Marcos government in Hawaii was instigated by the U.S. to save the Philippines from political turmoil and rebellion. Those who came to implement this policy to end civil unrest in the Philippines should have the protection of this government.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IN SUPPORT OF A MISSILE DEFENSE SHIELD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has stated to the world that he is going to embark on a program to defend the American people from incoming ballistic missiles.

This position, this statement, has started the machinery of dissent

throughout the United States, and indeed, in some of the forums of government in adversarial states and in some of our allied states, with some of our friends around the world.

Mr. Speaker, today it is against the law for the United States of America to defend itself from incoming ballistic missiles. It is against the treaty known as the ABM treaty. That treaty has the force of law in this country.

That means that if Russia, for example, should launch a ballistic missile to the United States, we have agreed, we have promised in a treaty, not to try to destroy that missile but to let it land in the United States and destroy millions of Americans, presumably, if it hits in a major city, or if it hits in a military installation, destroy thousands of American uniformed service personnel.

Now, we made this agreement with Russia, which seems like a stupid agreement, I think, to most people looking at it intuitively for the first time, we made this agreement with Russia when they had an extremely large nuclear arsenal and we had an extremely large nuclear arsenal. We thought that the best way to prevent a war from starting was to say that neither one of us would protect ourselves. So if they threw the first the first rock, we could not stop that rock, but we could respond with an overwhelming fusillade of rocks ourselves, that is, nuclear weapons, and both nations would be totally destroyed by these nuclear explosions.

This doctrine was called the doctrine of MAD, mutually assured destruction. Because of that, we adhered to our treaty not to ever build a defense against an incoming nuclear weapon.

Now, President Reagan did not like that. He said the best way to defend this country is to truly defend it, not simply to wreak vengeance on someone who throws that first nuclear weapon. The way to be most humane and not to destroy cities and not to kill millions of people is to have a shield, to have a shield or a protection against that incoming ballistic missile.

That was some 17 years ago, Mr. Speaker. Today President Bush renewed that idea and that philosophy, and said it will soon be manifested in an American missile defense program.

Now, even for those people who thought that MAD, mutually assured destruction, was a good treaty to have between the United States and Russia, then the Soviet Union, it does not apply anymore. The reason it does not apply anymore is because there are now lots of countries that never signed any treaty with the United States who now are developing missiles with the capability of carrying nuclear, biological, or chemical warheads into the United States.

For example, China never signed that treaty. They are building ballistic missiles right now and aiming them at American cities and telling us, it is your obligation not to defend your-

selves. North Korea now has recently tested a missile which, if we extrapolated its flight, would have enough stretch, enough distance to get to the United States, or at least parts of the United States.

Iraq and Iran are now testing missiles with increasing capabilities. They never signed any ABM treaty or agreement not to defend themselves, or for the United States not to defend itself against incoming missiles. They never signed the ABM treaty. North Korea did not sign the treaty. China did not sign the treaty.

As time goes on, we are going to see that this is the age of missiles. More and more nations are building those missiles. To some degree, we are like this country was in the 1920s when General Billy Mitchell came back to the Coolidge administration and said, "You know something, we live in an age of air power. We had better start building airplanes, because lots of other people, including potential adversaries, are building airplanes. If we do not build airplanes, if we do not get into the aerospace age, we are going to lose a lot of Americans dead on the battlefield of the next war."

We did not pay too much attention to Billy Mitchell. In fact, we court-martialed him for saying the Nation was unready for war. In fact, we were moving into the aerospace age. Although we lagged with our industrial base, we were able to catch up. It was because of American aerospace dominance in World War II that we were able to prevail in that war. Ever since then, our country has dominated the skies with respect to aircraft.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, we live today in an age of missiles. In fact, it was in the Desert Storm operation that we saw for the first time Americans killed by ballistic missiles; slow missiles, but ballistic missiles.

For that reason, President Bush, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely right on to launch this program that will defend uniformed American servicemen and our citizens against incoming ballistic missiles. The American people should get behind it.

THE MILITARY SURVIVORS EQUITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I would bring my colleagues down to Earth after the last speaker.

I rise today to speak about a bill to restore equity, equity, Mr. Speaker, to the survivors of our Nation's veterans. I call that bill the Military Survivors Equity Act, H.R. 1232.

It is hard to believe that we continue to condone a system that penalizes the aging survivors, mostly widows, of the veterans of our Nation. But that is exactly what the Military Survivors Benefit Plan does. When a member of the

military retires, he or she may join the Survivors Benefit Plan, known as SBP. After paying a premium for many, many years, the retiree expects that his or her spouse will receive, as is claimed in the literature, 55 percent of the retired military pay when that veteran dies.

But it turns out, in a very painful realization, that this is not the case. Most of the survivors who receive SBP benefits are military widows. We may not realize it, but when these widows who are receiving SBP benefits turn 62, what is called a Social Security offset causes their benefits to be reduced from the 55 percent they thought they were getting to 35 percent of their husband's military retired pay. That is quite a shock for widows.

This occurs even when the Social Security comes from the wife's employment. That is, they were entitled to the Social Security, the premium was paid for for their retirement, and yet, they offset one another.

Let me tell Members what this means to a military widow. I have received a lot of letters on this topic from my constituents and from around the country. Here is what one of them says:

My husband, who served in the Army for 20 years, was on Social Security disability because of heart problems and could no longer work. He died when I was 61. I received Social Security income plus my SBP. With those two incomes I was doing fine, paying my monthly bills and having enough left for groceries. But when I turned 62, I was notified that my SBP was reduced from \$476 to \$302. What a shock. That was my grocery money that they took away from me.

Another letter said:

While my husband was alive, we worked out a budget for me in case he died. I felt secure in the knowledge that he had provided for me by joining the Survivors Benefit Plan. I could not believe it when I learned I was not going to get the amount we were promised. I cannot believe that our government would do this to the widow of a veteran.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time to change this misleading and unfair law. We must provide some equity to the survivor spouses of our military retirees. My bill would fix this problem by eliminating the callous and absurd reduction of benefits and give what is expected and what is deserved, 55 percent of the military retired pay. To put it simply: no offset; a simple solution to a difficult problem, but an equitable solution to a mean-spirited practice.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1232, the Military Survivors Equity Act. Let us do this for our veterans and for their widows, their surviving spouses. We are causing them great pain and anguish.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.