

dinner is being planned to honor Los Angeles School Board Member, Bobbi Fiedler. We wish to take this opportunity to extend special thanks to this very dedicated woman who has done so much to improve the quality of education in the Los Angeles School District. The following outlines some of Bobbi Fiedler's many accomplishments on behalf of the people of Los Angeles and especially the young people of that community.

Mr. Speaker, we, as Representatives from the Los Angeles area, would like to take this opportunity to bring to our colleagues' attention a dynamic woman whose quiet dedication and unfailing willingness to get involved have made a positive contribution to her community and the educational system in the Los Angeles area.

Bobbi Fiedler is currently a member of the Los Angeles Board of Education, and while she has often worked in the limelight, she has also willingly accepted the responsibility for countless hours of hard work at those volunteer jobs which are often thankless and unglamorous. Bobbi Fiedler typifies that grand and unique American institution, "the volunteer." Without the Bobbi Fiedler's of this country, there would be no community

spirit; no community activities; no cohesive society—there would be only people living in the same vicinity, but no "community." It is to this very issue that Bobbi has dedicated herself in the last several years.

Bobbi has managed a home and family and multiple careers. She has served as PTA Drug Abuse Chairman; PTA Parent Education Chairman and as a member of the Valley Interfaith Council—Drug Abuse Committee. She has been a leader for the Cub Scouts, Brownie Scouts and Girl Scouts, and has been active with the Mid-Valley Girls Softball League and the Encino Little League. Through all these activities, Bobbi learned and recognized the importance of the community as an extension of the home. She understands that adults working with children create a better environment for character development than children left to their own devices, and she understands that community involvement creates not only a feeling of belonging, but an acceptance of responsibility and concern for those around us.

In a society that has become more and more transient, Bobbi realizes how much more important those institutions which represent stability have become, and that the hub of a stable community is its

school system. It was for these reasons that Bobbi became a driving force in establishing BUSTOP, and later became the organization's executive director. While there has been much controversy surrounding the busing issue in Los Angeles, BUSTOP has been in the forefront in trying to find acceptable alternatives to massive busing and to fighting the court order which needlessly places children on buses for over 3 hours a day.

BUSTOP has worked within the system and on an issue in which feelings run high; it has led a nonviolent opposition to the court orders. In our judgment, this is, indeed, a high tribute to those who have organized and worked on this effort. BUSTOP has, and is, waging a hard fight against Los Angeles' court ordered busing, but it has resisted the temptation to drag the issue into the muck of violence which has plagued other cities in the same quandry. For this, we all owe Bobbi Fiedler a special thanks.

Bobbi's friends and neighbors are hosting a special dinner in her honor on March 2, and we would like to join her well-wishers in paying tribute to a lifetime of giving, helping, and involvement. ●

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 15, 1979

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend Tomas Ziuraitis, Dominican priest, Dominican Monastery, Lithuanian American Community of Metropolitan Washington, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

God bless America, this great country of human rights, and all who are commemorating the 728th anniversary of the formation of Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom and who are now commemorating the 61st anniversary of the reestablishment of the Republic of Lithuania in the year 1918.

Almighty God, eternal justice and love, Your Son came to bring freedom to all peoples, we now ask You to bestow freedom and independence upon Lithuania and all captive nations.

Graciously grant this hope and plea through Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

REV. TOMAS ZIURAITIS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to welcome to our Nation's Capitol Rev. Tomas Ziuraitis, who offered the opening prayer today. He was born in Lithuania and studied in France, Germany, Belgium, and Austria, and earned his doctor of philosophy degree at the Catholic university in Salzburg. During the postwar years he was chaplain of Lithuanian refugees in Austria and Germany.

Father Ziuraitis came to the United States in 1949, where he taught at various colleges and served as chaplain at two convents in New Jersey. In 1962, Father Ziuraitis was transferred to the Dominican Monastery in Washington, D.C., where he conducts missions and retreats and pursues scholarly studies.

Dr. Ziuraitis is a member of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Joint Baltic American Committee, and the National Advisory Board of the American Security Council.

SENATOR MUSKIE SPEAKS ON PROPOSALS TO BALANCE THE BUDGET BY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the wisest, most experienced and highly respected persons in American life is the distinguished senior Senator from

Maine, the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

Senator MUSKIE, who is chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, delivered an address this week at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on proposals to balance the budget through amending the Constitution of the United States.

Because I believe all Members of the House and Senate will want to read Senator MUSKIE's address on this occasion, I include the text of his address, delivered on February 13, 1979, at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

In 1930—Franklin Delano Roosevelt confided to a friend—"It's becoming harder and harder for an honest fellow with a wife and children and nineteen servants to make a decent living."

In 1979, for families and governments alike, it is still often difficult to make ends meet. And the rush is on for a quick-fix approach to the government's fiscal dilemma.

Mathematicians have a saying—solutions can't be found until problems are stated correctly.

This afternoon, I don't expect to find the solution to the difficulties we face in balancing the budget. I do hope to state the problem correctly. I hope to raise some serious questions. I hope to start some serious people thinking—particularly about the growing demand for a new constitutional convention.

That movement has attracted much attention—but little careful thought. It is considered too casually by proponent and foe alike.

To be sure, some legislatures have reviewed this proposal with appropriate deliberation. But in many statehouses, prudence has given

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

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

way to panic. Resolutions to change the Constitution of the United States are introduced at noon and adopted before dinner. Sometimes without a single hearing—without a review of alternatives—without as much debate as a new state song would engender—they endorse a substantial revision of the fundamental law of the land.

They have lost their grip on the enormity of what they are doing. And they have taken the wrong way out of a troublesome dilemma.

A VERY POOR SOLUTION

I am convinced that a constitutional amendment is a very poor solution to our current fiscal difficulties. It is unworkable, counterproductive, and even harmful. But it is not the caricature some critics suggest. It is a very serious proposal indeed. It deserves very serious review.

A mandated balance is not the only issue. There are many variations on the theme. Some propose a balanced budget statute. Others invent formulas to limit federal spending. Still others hope that Congress will produce an amendment for ratification by the states. All of these proposals are dangerous and poorly thought through. But the most alarming prospect of all is a new constitutional convention.

It's an uncharted course to an unknown destination. A balanced budget amendment is only one potential result. There are other popular crusades—to outlaw guns—to outlaw gun control—to make abortion a right—to make abortion a crime—to ban forced busing—to endow forced busing with a specific constitutional sanction.

Many passionate causes are deeply rooted in our nation. Many are well supported. Many are well financed. Many are eager to readjust the underpinnings of the United States of America.

A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION?

At a constitutional convention, could the readjustments be limited? No one really knows. The Attorney General thinks so. The American Bar Association agrees. But there is only one precedent. And it is not a comforting one.

The only convention we've ever had was called to revise the Articles of Confederation. But the delegates didn't stop at the revision. They scrapped the system. They built a new one. And what would prevent a wholesale recasting of the document they devised? Not the Constitution itself—it simply says that Congress "shall call a convention for proposing amendments." And depriving the states of Senate representation is the only amendment specifically ruled out. Hopefully, the agenda would be limited.

If a runaway convention exceeded the limits thought to be imposed by those who convene it and three-fourths of the legislatures, responding to the kinds of popular pressures now being generated, were to ratify the result, who could say no?

How many of us are willing to gamble that our national compass would not be disoriented? How many even perceive the risk?

There are too many questions here—and not enough answers.

We should not expose our Constitution to the prospect of substantial revision when there are other, less imposing alternatives. Neither should we trivialize it with money management schemes—particularly those which can do no good and a great deal of harm.

THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY

A mandated federal budget balance is just such an ill-considered contrivance. And it is largely the product of a basic misperception. The relationship between the deficit and the economy is a very close one indeed. But it is not a one-way affair. A bad budget can unbalance the economy. But a bad economy can also unbalance the budget. And no amendment could possibly cope with that.

When unemployment goes up only one percentage point—the deficit swells by some 20 billion dollars—20 billion dollars in lost tax revenues and increased social welfare costs—20 billion dollars drained from the federal purse without a single spending spree.

In times of severe recession, the impact on the budget can be devastating. We've had some recent experience.

In October, 1974, President Ford unwrapped his "Whip Inflation Now" Program. He pledged to hold the deficit to 9 billion dollars in fiscal 1975. But fate and recession intervened. Just 3 months later, the President revised that estimate to 35 billion dollars, and sent the Congress a fiscal 1976 recommendation for a 52 billion dollar deficit.

The men who made the WIN buttons lost their jobs—along with 2 million other Americans.

A year ago January, President Carter proposed a budget with a 60 billion dollar deficit. We worked hard to trim it—and by September, we had cut that deficit to 38 billion. But interest rates went up. Inflation pushed higher. And from September to January, the deficit increased by 5 billion dollars—when Congress wasn't even in session.

Constitutional amendments can't balance the economy. Resolutions passed in Richmond or Topeka can't dictate policy in Riyadh or Tehran. Decisions made in Washington's caucus rooms aren't always supported in the board rooms of New York.

PRUDENT FISCAL MANAGEMENT

Are we helpless then? Certainly not. Prudent fiscal management can work through the economy and lead us back to a steadier course. We are doing that job right now. But a suddenly imposed requirement for an immediate balance—or for one to be forged in the unknowable future—would have some very regrettable consequences.

Over the years, economists of nearly every persuasion have testified before our Committee. They have agreed on little more than this—you can't always catch a deficit with radical spending cuts and tax increases. That may only make it run faster.

For fiscal 1980, the President projects a 29 billion dollar deficit. But a 29 billion dollar spending cut would not bring the budget into balance. It would ripple through the economy with a tax revenue loss of many billions of dollars.

It would take a cut of at least 45 billion to put the books in balance. And that would cost more than a million American jobs. It might have an impact on inflation, but it would leave the economy far weaker than before. And where would we look for a cut of that magnitude?

Of course, a budget can be balanced by raising taxes as well as by cutting expenses. And some insist that closing loopholes would match our debits with credits.

In 1932, Herbert Hoover tried that. He rushed to balance the budget with a drastic hike in taxes. The rest is tragic history. Things got very much worse. Purchasing power had been drained from the economy exactly when it should have been injected.

1932 was not a good year for the economy. 1932 was not a good year for Herbert Hoover.

But there is a third option. When the economy is growing, taxes rise faster than spending. And unless you enact a tax cut, increased spending never catches up with revenues. So you juice up spending. You stimulate inflation. You push people into higher brackets. Your tax revenues go up. And you point with pride at a balanced budget.

That is the stuff of conservatives' nightmares. And that is yet another way to meet a balanced budget mandate.

All of these potential consequences are unattractive indeed. But perhaps the very worst result would be a failure of flexibility in times of economic downturn. Economists of

every respected school agree that increased federal spending or tax cuts producing a deficit may well be the only way to boost employment, generate investment, stimulate demand, accumulate capital, and prevent a downturn from deepening into a depression.

A mandated balance would blunt our sharpest fiscal tool. And that is why thoughtful advocates are quick to point to escape clauses.

But no escape clause could be framed quite cleverly enough. How would recession be defined? Who would announce its arrival? Who would be willing to lead the escape when the signs of a trend appeared. Would two-thirds of the Senate vote to abandon a constitutionally mandated balanced budget for a deficit unless the roof was caving in? Would we have time to pop the parachute before we hit the ground?

QUESTIONS WITHOUT ANSWERS

There are too many questions with no good answers—too many holes in the theory.

And so—some map a more sophisticated route to balance. They suggest that spending should be limited to a fixed percentage of GNP, or that growth in spending should be tied to GNP growth. But have they asked the right questions?

Our Constitution does only two things. It blueprints the structures by which we govern ourselves. And it defines the human rights we respect. Do we really want to devalue that currency with algebra and bar graphs?

We wouldn't even know where to begin the equation. Which magic number would we pick? To whose projections would we tie it? The President predicts a 3.2-percent GNP growth rate for 1980. But the Congressional Budget Office says 3.9 percent. This difference of seven-tenths percent in the growth of federal spending represents three and a half billion dollars.

Perhaps we should go to a prominent private sector forecaster. But Wharton Econometrics says 1.3 percent and Chase says 4.1.

It is sometimes proposed that the number be tied to last year's growth. But like generals preparing to fight the last war, politicians preparing to deal with last year's realities are poorly prepared indeed.

Should we be writing a guessing game into the Federal Constitution? Should we bind tomorrow's needs to yesterday's performance? How can we make good practical sense out of bad theoretical blueprints?

Too many questions with no good answers—too many holes in the theory.

THE CITIES AND STATES

Perhaps the most ironic twist is the role of the states in the budget balancing controversy. 25 of them are leading us into a serious mistake. And they will pay the biggest price. If Congress must suddenly chop the deficit, it will land in the laps of the states. That is not a threat. It's a matter of arithmetic.

Where would the cuts be made? Where would we find that 45 billion dollars this year? Let me refer you to the charts we've prepared.

Our cities and states are drawing on Washington for every conceivable need—from the health and education of their children to the wages of the men who trim the state-house lawn.

Over the last thirty years, federal grants-in-aid to state and local governments have grown five times faster than the gross national product.

In fiscal 1980, the average state expects to receive one billion, six hundred and fifty-nine million dollars from Washington. The legislatures seem to be unaware of the consequences an overnight balance would bring.

During its 1975-76 session, the Pennsylvania legislature passed its call for a balanced federal budget. That was Resolution 236. Resolution 235 demanded a renewal of revenue sharing.

When the Oregon legislature passed its amendment resolution, a "whereas" clause suggested that "a balanced budget would lessen the need for increased state and local taxes." That's an odd theory—particularly in view of the fact that Oregon got one billion, seventy-five million dollars from Washington in fiscal 1978.

We could save 31 billion—2 billion more than the President's projected deficit—merely by killing revenue sharing, education grants, EPA sewage construction, community development block grants, and the CETA program.

Is that what they want in the legislatures? Do they think the Congress would slash its own perception of national needs before it touched the states? And if we did exempt the states from surgery, what would be left to cut? Social security? National defense?

There is 82.9 billion dollars in the President's budget for grants to state and local governments. In 1978, the states ran a combined surplus of 29 billion—a figure that matches the President's deficit for fiscal 1980. An appealing solution to the balance dilemma leaps very quickly to mind.

It would be easy to ask, "Who's deficit is this?" and the states would not be pleased with the answer.

Of course, if we look to the states' example, we needn't make cuts at all. We can get into balance merely by following their long-standing and well accepted method of accounting. If we put capital investments in a separate accounting category, we'd have a much smaller deficit today. And it wouldn't make a lot of difference to our income, our outflow, or the state of the economy.

That is what the states do. That's what General Motors does. That is accepted practice.

It would also be easy to balance the budget by removing various programs from it. The federal government already spends some 12 billion dollars through agencies that are not counted in the budget totals. More programs could be moved into the dark. Or, more use could be made of federal guarantees and similar devices.

The Budget Committee is determined to bring such programs under the budget's umbrella. Only then will we have a full honest picture of real federal government activity. A balanced budget requirement would surely tempt the Congress to go the other way.

Creative accounting could provide us a meaningless paper balance, but is there any point in one? Is there any good reason for attaching a charade to the Constitution of our country?

The answers are clear. So are the holes in the theory.

THE NEW CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

We've been perfecting a different theory since 1975—a new Congressional budget process. It was forged in reaction to 37 years of deficit spending in the 54 years between 1920 and 1974. It was established because that record was flatly unacceptable. And for the first time in its history, Congress took explicit steps to reverse that record of deficits.

For the first time in its history, Congress established a standing committee with one exclusive mission—to set a fiscal plan—to hold the Congress to it—to pull us back from those irresponsible deficits.

Contrary to the popular rhetoric, we have made tremendous progress. And ours is no simple task.

In the popular imagination, the budget resembles an hourglass, with assets and liabilities neatly stacked at opposite ends. If an imbalance develops, what could be simpler than tilting the glass until the sands even out?

But the budget is better compared to a

watch. When it runs too fast or slow, a violent jolt may relieve frustration. But it will not repair a delicate mechanism. One has to determine which moving parts to lubricate—which gears to tighten—which counterweights to adjust.

We've been making those judgments. And the record is more impressive than rhetoric.

In our first year of 1975, recession prevailed—and George Meany demanded a hundred billion dollar deficit. We held it to 66 billion. And five years later, we are keeping the pressure on.

In 1975, the deficit was 3 percent of GNP. But in 1980, it is projected at 1.2 percent.

In 1980, the level of Federal spending will be 30 billion dollars lower than it would have been if Washington took the same percentage of GNP as it did in 1975.

And during the four years of the Congressional budget process, our spring budget resolutions have called for spending targets at an average of 28 billion dollars below the requests submitted by the authorizing committees.

WE CAN DO BETTER STILL

That's not good enough. We can do better still. We intend to. And we already have all the statutes, formulas and amendments we need to get the job done. We are asking the right questions. We are sealing the holes in a workable, flexible theory. Why scrap a proven system for one that defies a working diagram? Why graft an irresponsible scheme to the fundamental law of the land?

As one Supreme Court justice said, our Constitution is not a rubber ball to be tossed about and played with by each succeeding child. It embodies the essence of our system. There is no room in it for yesterday's whim or tomorrow's fancy.

In the long run, that is the centrally important concern. But in the near term, there is nothing attractive about the federal deficit. This is not a pro-deficit Congress. I am not a pro-deficit Budget Chairman. This is not a pro-deficit speech. But we don't need fiscal handcuffs to wipe the deficit out. We need fiscal discipline. We need to make informed, prudent judgments about hundreds of separate spending choices. We need the will to make those judgments stick. If we have that will, no formula is necessary. If we don't, no formula will work.

AN ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT CARTER'S FISCAL YEAR 1980 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert an appendix to Senator MUSKIE's address, an analysis of President Carter's proposed budget for fiscal year 1980:

An analysis of President Carter's fiscal year 1980 budget

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1980 outlays
Contributory insurance and retirement programs:	
Social security.....	115.2
Railroad retirement.....	4.5
Federal employee retirement and insurance.....	14.0
Unemployment assistance.....	11.4
Medicare.....	32.1
	177.2
Defense and veterans programs.....	146.2
Net interest payments.....	46.1
Grants to State and local governments:	
Sewage treatment plant construction.....	3.6
Federal-aid highways.....	6.8
Urban mass transit.....	2.4
Community development block grants.....	3.3
Elementary and secondary education.....	3.4
Other education programs.....	3.7

	Fiscal year 1980 outlays
Social services.....	3.0
Employment and training assistance.....	6.3
Temporary employment assistance.....	2.6
Youth, aging, and vocational rehabilitation programs.....	1.6
Medicaid.....	12.4
Other health programs.....	2.2
Unemployment assistance.....	1.8
Public assistance (primarily AFDC).....	6.7
Child nutrition and special milk programs.....	2.6
Subsidized housing programs.....	3.4
General revenue sharing.....	6.9
All other programs.....	10.4
	82.9

Welfare costs in the States assumed by the Federal Government:

Food stamps.....	6.5
Supplemental security income program.....	6.3
Earned income credits in excess of tax liability.....	1.7
Black lung benefits.....	1.5
Subsidized housing programs.....	1.7
All other programs.....	0.6
	18.3

Other Federal activities:

Foreign affairs.....	8.2
Space and scientific research.....	5.5
Energy.....	7.3
Environmental cleanup and development.....	6.9
Farm price supports and research.....	3.9
Transportation.....	7.3
Education and training.....	7.9
Health care, research, and training.....	6.8
Administration of justice.....	3.9
All other programs, net.....	3.3
	60.9

Total fiscal year 1980 outlays... 531.6

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL LIMITING PROPERTY AND CASUALTY AND LIFE INSURANCE ACTIVITIES OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

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

● Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was on the night of October 5 last year that this House had the opportunity to record its will on an issue in so overwhelming a way as to leave no one in doubt as to the desire and intent of its Members on the matter of restricting the activities of bank holding companies in certain insurance related pursuits. By a 252 to 72 vote, this House said "no" to expanded bank holding company insurance activities.

Unfortunately, a quirk of legislative necessity prevented this mandate from taking the form of law. At the last moment, title XIII of FIRA was cut from the compromise package of banking reforms which ultimately passed. However, the record shows and loudly echoes today the sentiments of those in the House who strongly supported the cause of bank separation from nonbank related commerce, particularly property and casualty insurance.

At that time and on that occasion late on the Saturday evening prior to adjournment, a bond was made, a promise was given that this issue was not to go unredressed. Today, Mr. Speaker, with the enthusiastic co-sponsorship of Mr. St GERMAIN, I am starting the process by which that pledge will be redeemed. The text of a bill follows—a bill seasoned by the passage of time, aged to its prime in the coolness of objective regard. It picks up where we left off last fall, only with a more refined and sharply honed precision, to get done the job which needs doing.

This effort bridges the time gap since last October and provides a continuity on this issue which should expedite its consideration by the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation, and Insurance and by the full Banking Committee. The forceful backing of a majority of those committees and the sense of purposeful commitment of their respective chairmen give me hope that we can have a bill such as I offer today back before the House in this session at an early date.

For many years in the courts and last year in Congress it has been argued persuasively that, because of a bank's ability to tie, directly or indirectly, the sale of insurance to an extension of credit, bank holding company insurance activities are not in the public's interest. Furthermore, the power of financial institutions which control enormous amounts of depositor's capital places special responsibilities on the banks' use of that capital, and places most competing small businesses at an immediate, usually non-compensable, disadvantage.

Congress, of course, has long recognized this problem, and the consequent need for a separation between banking and other forms of commerce. Most recently, primarily because of the insurance agents cases, Congress has also become more sensitive to the vulnerability of a variety of other businesses which face the possibility of unrestricted bank entry.

It should not go unsaid, Mr. Speaker, that some of these other enterprises have as good a case and as strong a need as do the insurance agencies for a legislated protection from the intrusive conduct of large bank holding company expansionism. I would not be at all surprised, therefore, to find that others would seek solace and find sympathy for a relief similar to the insurance prohibition contemplated by my bill.

It should come as no news that Congress already has deliberately and wisely constructed a restrictive regulatory framework within which banks must operate. That framework, enunciated in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and in the 1970 amendments to that act, explicitly contemplates restrictions on bank holding company nonbanking activities. Those restrictions have been steadily eroded, not by Congress' desire to see an expansion of bank holding company nonbanking activities, but because of the Federal Reserve Board's over-generous interpretation of existing law.

If Congress intended its legislated control over banks' unique financial power

to mean anything, they can begin to restore that meaning by supporting this bill. And if Congress believes, as I do, that the public interest would not be served by the elimination of large portions of a thriving and competitive insurance agency small business, they will act quickly to have this legislation signed into law.

Sensing the urgency of this cause would not be hard for any of our colleagues who have heard from the insurance companies, agents, and interested private parties already on this matter. To our other colleagues I want to communicate that same enthusiasm for deliberate but expeditious consideration and adoption of this needed legislation. A relief provided too late would be an injustice, a victory awarded posthumously would be a mockery.

In the months since the 95th Congress adjourned, circumstances have conspired to increase the danger to insurance agents of bank entry into the business. In addition to a Supreme Court decision in 1978 not to hear the insurance agents cases, and since the short-circuited effort to obtain legislative relief in the 95th Congress, the Federal Reserve Board announced in December the scheduled expiration next year of a limited grandfather clause. This will require bank holding companies to submit applications to continue in, or to divest nonbanking activities, including insurance, already engaged in when current law took effect 10 years ago. Moreover, the Federal Reserve Board rejected a House and Senate Banking Committee request in October to impose a moratorium on processing bank applications to engage in insurance activities.

These events make the swift, unhampered consideration of this bill crucial to the survival of many thousands of small business men and women who make their living as insurance agents. Furthermore, decisive action on this bill will lay the groundwork for more comprehensive, also urgently needed, bank holding company reform legislation.

I urge my colleagues to waste no time in completing legislation most supported by record vote only 4 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of my bill and the accompanying explanation be included in the RECORD:

H.R. 2255

A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to limit the property and casualty and life insurance activities of bank holding companies and their subsidiaries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 4(c) (8) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(c) (8)) is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and adding the following: ", but for purposes of this subsection it is not closely related to banking or managing or controlling banks for a bank holding company to provide insurance as a principal, agent or broker except (i) where the insurance is limited to assuring repayment of the outstanding balance due on a specific extension of credit by a bank holding company or its subsidiary in the event of the death or disability of the debtor; or (ii) any insurance agency activity in a place that (A) has a population not exceeding 5,000 (as shown

by the last preceding decennial census), or (B) the bank holding company, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, demonstrates has inadequate insurance agency facilities; or (iii) any insurance activity engaged in by a bank holding company or any of its subsidiaries pursuant to an application which was approved prior to June 6, 1978; or (iv) any insurance agency activity engaged in by a bank holding company, or any of its subsidiaries which bank holding company has total assets of \$50 million or less, provided, however, such bank holding company and its subsidiaries may not engage in the sale of life insurance or annuities except as provided in (i) or (ii) above."

EXPLANATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANY INSURANCE PROHIBITION

During the 95th Congress, both the House of Representatives and the Senate voted overwhelmingly to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 ("BHC Act") specifically to prohibit bank holding companies from engaging in certain insurance activities. The House vote came in connection with the Financial Institutions Regulatory Act of 1978 (H.R. 13471); the Senate vote came in connection with H.R. 8389.

The accompanying bill is almost identical to that which was overwhelmingly approved just a few months ago. It contains a technical amendment in the grandfather clause which states more clearly the intent of the legislation.

The legislation would amend Section 4(c) (8) of the BHC Act to prohibit bank holding companies from engaging as principal, agent, or broker in insurance activities with certain exceptions.

Exception (i) would permit bank holding companies to continue to underwrite and sell credit life and credit accident and health insurance, lines of insurance which have historically been offered by lenders. This exception (i) is identical to that previously adopted by the 95th Congress.

Exception (ii) would permit bank holding companies and their subsidiaries to sell insurance in communities having a population not exceeding 5,000. The purpose of this exception is to confer upon bank holding companies the same authority currently available to national banking associations under the National Bank Act. See U.S.C.A. § 92 (1970). In addition, exception (ii) would permit bank holding companies to sell insurance in other communities upon demonstration, after notice and opportunity for a hearing on the record, that the community has no adequate insurance agency facilities. This exception (ii) also is identical to that adopted by the 95th Congress.

Exception (iii) is the bill's grandfather provision. It would permit bank holding companies to continue to engage in those insurance activities for which they received Federal Reserve Board approval prior to June 6, 1978.¹ The provision does not, however, contemplate any expansion of insurance authority received prior to June 6, 1978 after that date. Exception (iii) contains minor technical changes from the language adopted by the 95th Congress making it clear that insurance activities engaged in by bank holding companies after the 1970 Amendments pursuant to the limited grandfather provision contained in Section 4(a) (2) of the BHC Act are not covered by the exception. As such, such activities are subject to the general prohibition of the bill, unless Federal Reserve Board approval to retain the activities was obtained prior to the grandfather date.

¹ June 6, 1978 is the date on which the Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the House first voted favorably upon a bank holding company insurance prohibition, thereby placing bank holding companies on notice of possible prohibitive legislation.

Exception (iv) would exempt from the insurance prohibition bank holding companies with total assets of \$50 million or less. This exception, however, would not permit such holding companies to sell or underwrite life insurance or annuities except as provided in exceptions (i) or (ii). Exception (iv) is identical to that adopted by the 95th Congress except for addition of the word "total" for absolute clarity. ●

□ 1105

VOLUNTARY JOB PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY STABILIZATION ACT

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

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today with my colleagues STANLEY LUNDINE and MATTHEW McHUGH of New York I am introducing the Voluntary Job Preservation and Community Stabilization Act of 1979. This bill is identical to legislation we introduced March 1, 1978, and which received the support of some 70 Members of the House.

The bill was the subject of a field hearing under the auspices of the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee in Jamestown, N.Y., last November. The subcommittee has scheduled a second hearing on employee-owned firms for February 27 in Washington.

We authored this legislation in response to the problems of plant shutdowns which in the past decade have hurt increasing numbers of Americans and threatened the economic stability of their communities. When a firm closes, employees often lose more than their jobs. The economic hardship and uncertainty can wreck families, affect mental health, and cause extended personal suffering. Idleness may last for months and many workers require substantial retraining before they are again employable. The costs to society are staggering.

We see examples of this phenomenon time and time again. In my own State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia has lost at least 40,000 manufacturing jobs in the last 10 years, and Pittsburgh and other cities in Pennsylvania have suffered similar losses. New England's manufacturing employment has declined 9 percent in the last 10 years and that of the Midwest declined 14 percent between 1960 and 1975. New Jersey has lost 115,000 factory jobs since 1969 and heavily industrialized regions like Michigan and Ohio lost nearly 200,000 each in plant shutdowns in relatively the same period.

Plant shutdowns affect smaller towns and rural areas just as much as cities, and contrary to popular opinion, the so-called Sunbelt States are not the major beneficiaries of the new jobs by attracting runaway plants with generally lower wages and nonunionized workforces. Our research shows, for example, that between 1971 and 1976 only about 9 percent of plant relocations were to the Sunbelt. Many jobs go overseas. The South is also losing jobs overseas, and it is clear that net gains in total employment in the South are masking the effects of many plant shutdowns taking

place there. Plant shutdowns are truly a national problem and job preservation should be a common concern to all regions.

Plant closings take place with painful abruptness. Generally, the law does not require a firm to give notice to its employees or the community and very often there is insufficient time to consider alternatives or plan for the consequences. The Federal and State government response is limited. The Government can spend money on unemployment compensation, welfare or expensive job training programs, but these are only short-term solutions, however, and do not combat the basic problem—preserving jobs. When a plant closes, a ripple effect goes through the business community, the tax base disappears, and an area's economy can be devastated for years.

We believe one alternative to plant closings is ownership by the employees or the residents of the affected community. Where plants would otherwise be abandoned, our bill would help interested groups of employees and community residents purchase the firms and try to run them profitably. Recognizing that such ownership arrangements will not always be feasible, we believe the approach can help blunt the impact of plant shutdowns in many areas.

The bill has four purposes:

First. To preserve jobs.

Second. To encourage employee and community participation in ownership of firms that would otherwise have closed.

Third. To support and strengthen the local economy that would be seriously damaged by the plant shutdown.

Fourth. To develop and test the value of a new strategy for the preservation of jobs.

The act builds on successful experiences with employee and employee-community ownership concepts. In a number of areas, these arrangements have saved jobs, maintained viable economic enterprises, and strengthened local economic conditions.

The legislation would facilitate this process by making loans to organizations of employees and community residents that plan to purchase plants in danger of closing down or moving elsewhere. The loans would be used to arrange the purchase, to cover start-up and initial operating costs, and to allow the employees to acquire stock in the new firm.

The act authorizes the expenditure of \$100 million in the first year with appropriations rising gradually to \$177 for the seventh year. Toward the end of this period, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to make a study and to report to Congress on the cost effectiveness of this program in comparison with other measures designed to deal with the problems of unemployment.

The act establishes no new bureaucracy. Implementation of the program is assigned to the Economic Development Administration, the Federal agency which has had the greatest experience in preserving jobs through assisting transfers to employee ownership, but which now lacks sufficient loan author-

ity and legislative direction to undertake the type of program we are proposing.

This is not a giveaway program. It is just one example of an alternative legislative solution which recognizes that the big government approach is no longer feasible or realistic for handling every complex economic and social problem. The threat of long-term inflation, deficit budgets, and burdensome taxation requires that we enable and encourage the most efficient and sensible nongovernmental solutions. We must begin to phase in as much as is possible citizen, cooperative, and local solutions involving minimal Government resources. In utilizing this approach, the bill authorizes two kinds of loans; to the newly constituted firm and to individual employees for the purpose of enabling them to buy stock in their own enterprise. The company itself would be responsible to the Federal Government for collecting principal and interest payments on the loans granted employees. In order to qualify for such loans, employees are required to agree to payroll deductions under terms and conditions to be established by the Secretary of Commerce.

The Economic Development Administration is to be responsible for furnishing technical assistance to the group forming the new company on financial, legal, engineering, and organizational problems. No loans are to be authorized except when a feasibility study indicates that there is a reasonable chance that the company can become a viable economic enterprise.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I might note that this legislation counters the major problem facing our country today—inflation. Economists seem to agree that inflation has been fueled by a disturbing nationwide downward trend in productivity. The United States now trails other Western industrial democracies and its trading partners in productivity. In the past decade, productivity—generally defined as output per hour worked—has advanced at a snail's pace: about 1.6 percent annually against 3.2 percent between 1947 and 1967. Experience shows that employee ownership can increase productivity.

This point was acknowledged by the President's former anti-inflation adviser Robert Strauss in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee last year. Mr. Strauss correctly pointed out that:

Employee ownership can be a meaningful long-term measure to dampen inflation since "people perform better if they have a piece of the action."

VOLUNTARY JOB PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY STABILIZATION ACT

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

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, at our subcommittee hearing in Jamestown last November, we learned about the experiences of several employee-owned firms. We heard new evidence of how this approach, by increasing worker participa-

tion and changing the structure of decisionmaking, can dramatically improve industrial performance.

One panel of witnesses described the purchase of a specialty steel plant in Dunkirk, N.Y., by a group of management employee investors in 1976. After 15 years of heavy losses, the previous owner—Allegheny Ludlum—was ready to close down the operation. Nearly 2,000 workers would have lost their jobs.

In this case, employee ownership was really the only alternative to liquidation. The group negotiated with Allegheny Ludlum for a year, eventually agreeing on a purchase price of \$26 million. While the new owners obtained sufficient credit from local sources to finance initial operating expenses, they could not get a longer term loan to cover the purchase. A company witness testified:

With no past history of our own and an extremely poor past history under the prior owners, it was absolutely impossible to obtain any long-term financing.

Ultimately, the Dunkirk group was able to meet its financing requirements with the help of a \$10 million loan from the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration. The new company, Al Tech Specialty Steel Corp., significantly increased its operating capacity and hired several hundred additional workers. Productivity increased by 9 percent a year. Despite considerable pressure from imports and other difficulties, Al Tech made profits in each of its first 2 years in business.

What was different about employee ownership, that enabled Al Tech to revitalize an enterprise that Allegheny Ludlum was about to abandon? A major factor, apparently, was the ability to make decisions quickly and "call the shots" for the benefit of Al Tech alone. Extensive capital improvements undertaken by the new firm would never have occurred under Allegheny Ludlum, the Al Tech witnesses testified. Even relatively simple changes—such as installing a national Watts line for the sales office to replace a cumbersome teletype system—would never have been made.

In Al Tech's case, EDA's investment in employee ownership will have substantial payoffs. Over the life of its \$10 million loan, the company is expected to pay principal and interest totaling \$18 million. Al Tech employees have already paid more than \$10 million in Federal income taxes in the last 2 years, and the company estimates it will pay over \$1 billion in wages during the 25-year term of the loan.

Another panel discussed the case of the Mohawk Valley Community Corp., an employee-community-owned manufacturer of library furniture in Herkimer, N.Y. Recounting their efforts to purchase the company from Sperry Rand in 1976, the Herkimer witnesses stressed the need for technical as well as financial assistance.

The key hurdles in this case involved stock registration requirements. After failing to obtain a clearance from the Securities and Exchange Commission, the group turned to registration under New York State laws and was eventu-

ally able to raise the \$1.8 million in equity it needed through a State approved stock offering. The State also enabled the purchasers to meet their downpayment by permitting the issuance of promissory notes to employees that could later be redeemed in stock.

Despite the difficulties of arranging the purchase, the new firm is encouraged by its prospects. In 1977, the Mohawk Valley Community Corp. made a profit of \$340,000 on sales of \$11.8 million. While sales slumped somewhat last year, the company is actively developing new markets and considers the setback a temporary one.

We also heard from the Jamestown Metal Products Co., which became an employee-owned firm in 1973. The former owner—a conglomerate called AVM—was about to close the plant, forcing employees to mobilize resources fast. Within a month, however, the purchase plan was drawn up, and nearly three quarters of the company's 120 employees participated in the acquisition.

Company officials recalled their initial struggles to stay in business. Right away, the new firm was faced with a steel shortage and unrealistic pricing arrangements inherited from AVM. About \$3 million of its orders, for example, had been contracted before the severe inflation of 1973. But the company weathered the unprofitable years without layoffs and began developing new product lines. Gradually business revived: sales have expanded by 55 percent since 1973 and the book value of Jamestown Metal Products stock has more than tripled.

Nationally, one of the most stunning success stories involved the South Bend Lathe Co. in South Bend, Ind. After 5 years of losing money on the plant, the conglomerate owner—Amsted Industries—was prepared to shut down. Four hundred and twenty jobs were at stake.

With the help of a low interest loan from the Commerce Department and credit from private lending institutions, the shutdown was prevented and a new 100 percent employee-owned corporation took control of South Bend Lathe in 1975. Business rebounded quickly: waste was cut, absenteeism and turnover rates declined, morale was higher than ever. In its first year, the company showed pre-tax profits of 9 percent on sales of \$18 to \$20 million. And profits have stayed high ever since.

In each of these cases, transition to a form of employee or employee-community ownership proved a constructive way to cope with impending plant shutdowns and save jobs. But the approach need not be limited to cases of economic emergency, and can be viewed as one aspect of a broader effort to encourage worker investment and participation in decisionmaking.

Recent research on employee-owned firms offers additional evidence of their potential to improve business performance. In a major study completed last year for the Economic Development Administration, researchers at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center concluded that employee ownership enhances profitability by strengthening workers' motivation to do a good job.

With a new financial stake in their enterprise, both workers and managers are encouraged to explore ways to increase productivity and make the business run better. In many of the cases I am familiar with, cooperative labor-management efforts to restructure the workplace, develop skills, and generally improve the quality of working life contributed heavily to success.

Significant obstacles to employee ownership remain, despite the promise of the concept. Among our witnesses at the Jamestown hearing was a panel from North Tonawanda, N.Y., which described an unsuccessful attempt by employees to purchase the International Paper Company in 1976. A key factor in this case was the willingness of the seller to negotiate seriously with the prospective employee purchasers. More often, however, the buyers simply cannot make the necessary financial arrangements in time. Technical and legal requirements may pose further complications, which employee groups cannot handle without professional assistance.

The Federal Government can clearly play a more active role. Our bill would begin on a small scale, with \$100 million in loan authority. But it should establish a Federal commitment to help interested groups pursue this alternative, and provide new evidence that these ownership arrangements are good practical investments for employees and their communities.

VOLUNTARY JOB PRESERVATION AND COMMUNITY STABILIZATION ACT

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

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, as Congressmen KOSTMAYER and LUNDINE have pointed out, employee and employee-community ownership of firms that would otherwise close down is becoming increasingly popular. In many cases it is a practical alternative for coping with a very real problem that many communities face in these times of economic stress, and for that reason I am pleased to join with them in reintroducing our bill.

Some may ask why this legislation is necessary. If employee and employee-community ownership has been emerging as a response to corporate divestitures in recent years, why do we need new legislation?

The answer is that employee and employee-community groups often face numerous obstacles when they seek to purchase firms that corporate managers are planning to close down or transfer. At the same time, there is no single agency within the Federal Government to which they can turn to obtain the help necessary to overcome these obstacles.

This legislation is designed to provide employees and residents of a community with the assistance they need, and to provide that assistance in a timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, transfers of ownership to

an employee or employee community group are not easily managed. As we have examined those cases where such a transfer has occurred, we have found that it took extraordinary efforts and exceptional leadership to keep the firm in operation and thus save jobs.

Moreover, for every successful case, we have found many others where employees and residents of a community have tried and failed, not because the firm could not be operated profitably but because there was no technical assistance available at the critical time or because the prospective purchasers lacked sufficient capital to purchase it.

In 1977, for example, the New York based owners of Kasanof's bakery in Boston decided to close the firm down. Although the employees were interested in purchasing the bakery and keeping it in operation, the efforts failed for a variety of reasons, including their inability to raise funds quickly enough to keep their buying option open. As a result, one of the largest employers in Boston's Roxbury section was forced to close down. Both the community and the workers were the losers.

To be sure, the Economic Development Administration has done some work in this field. However, even in those cases in which EDA loans were extended, this help was provided only as a last resort and only under special circumstances.

The fact is that EDA cannot now provide very much help to employee and employee-community groups. While it is authorized in certain cases to help the existing owners of a firm who are seeking to avoid shutting their firm down, it lacks both the mandate and the funds to help workers and community residents purchase a firm if the current owners have decided to give up. And, as my colleagues have pointed out, corporate managers often base their decisions on factors other than whether the firm could continue to operate profitably.

Our bill would offer employees and residents of a community assistance similar to that which is now provided to the existing owners in certain circumstances. As I have already suggested, that assistance is desperately needed.

For example, EDA officials have told us that they have received hundreds of inquiries regarding the possibility of its providing financial and technical support for transfers to employee and employee community groups. However, these same officials have been very frank to say that most of these inquiries have never moved beyond this initial stage because the agency lacks the mandate and the funds.

That is likely to remain the case without the enactment of this legislation. Because it has no formal mandate to do so, and lacks sufficient funds even if the mandate did exist, EDA has no plans to provide the help which employee-community groups need. This bill would enable that agency to provide basis.

By establishing a pilot program designed to provide loans and technical assistance to employee and employee-community groups, we would be helping to solve the two most serious obstacles

these groups now face, namely, the need for technical assistance on how to manage such a transfer and the need for capital to purchase the plant. If not a complete answer to all of the problems these groups face, our bill provides a good starting point.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that our bill is in the best tradition of American free enterprise. It would not impose decisions from Washington upon local communities. Rather, it is designed to encourage and support voluntary local initiatives.

Our bill would not require a local community to pursue this alternative when a firm closes down. It would provide employees and residents with necessary assistance if they would like to pursue this alternative.

Our bill would not require employees and residents of a community to adopt a particular form of ownership and control. It would only aid them in making an informed choice among all of the options available to them under the laws of their State.

Finally, this bill would not require the Secretary of Commerce to provide help in cases where a transfer of ownership is not likely to be successful. It would merely give the Secretary the tools to provide such help in situations with reasonable prospects of success.

Mr. Speaker, there is increasing evidence that we cannot look to our largest corporations to provide significant numbers of new jobs for our economy. As the House Small Business Subcommittee on Antitrust, Consumers, and Employment reported last year, less than 1 percent of the new jobs created between 1969 and 1976 were generated by the 1,000 largest U.S. corporations. That is why this bill is so important. As Prof. William F. Whyte of Cornell has suggested: "It is just as important to preserve existing jobs as to create new jobs."

Given the economic impact a plant closing can have on a community and on the lives of the employees directly affected, we believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to actively search for new approaches to preserving jobs that already exist. The achievements which my colleagues have documented suggest that this is one promising new strategy.

That is why I am so pleased that the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee of the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee has agreed to hold hearings on our bill. Its interest, and the support of the members who have co-sponsored our bill in the past, is very encouraging.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of our bill.

The section-by-section analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

Short title: "Voluntary Job Preservation and Community Stabilization Act."

SECTION 2

Declaration

(1) Unemployment is a serious problem that causes grave economic loss and social suffering to individuals, their families, communities, and the nation.

(2) Federal initiatives to reduce unemployment should be multi-faceted, not limited to temporary compensation nor to expensive job training programs.

(3) Experience and research have shown that in some cases employee or employee-community purchase of industrial, manufacturing, business, and agricultural concerns that would otherwise close down can save jobs, maintain viable economic enterprises, and strengthen the local economy.

(4) However, these groups face numerous obstacles in purchasing such concerns at the present time.

SECTION 3

Purposes

(1) To save jobs and stabilize communities by facilitating employee or employee-community purchase of concerns that would otherwise close down or relocate.

(2) To support the local tax base by maintaining viable concerns through federal loans and technical assistance.

(3) To test an alternative to unemployment insurance (and other methods of dealing with unemployment).

SECTION 4

Definitions

(Self-explanatory for the most part.)

SECTION 5

Federal assistance

(a) Existing EDA regional offices, working in cooperation with appropriate state and local agencies, will identify firms in danger of closing down or relocating.

(b) In those cases where firms may be able to be kept in operation profitably, EDA will furnish information about this program to employees and the local community.

(c) (1) Loans for technical assistance, start-up and operating costs will be provided to employee or employee-community organizations that have had an application for funds approved (as provided for under Section 6).

(c) (2) An organization made up of employees and community residents who wish to apply for a loan to purchase a plant that is about to shut down must meet the following requirements:

(A) Incorporate under the laws of the State in which the plant is located.

(B) Certify that a form of ownership has been adopted by the members of the organization after full consideration of their alternatives under state law.

(C) Certify that the organization allows for the inclusion of new employees in ownership and participation, and provides a method of disposing of stock if there is no longer an association with the concern, guaranteeing the organization the right of first refusal.

(D) Agree to serve as the administrative agent of the federal government for collecting loans and interest payments from employee members of the organization through a system of wage deductions acceptable to the Secretary.

(d) EDA will make loans to the employees of the organization that has an application approved so that they can acquire stock in the concern. First, employees must make a good-faith effort to secure the loan from financial institutions in the community and must agree in writing to allow the organization to serve as administrative agent of the federal government for collecting the loans through a system of wage deductions. No loan to an employee shall be for longer than ten years or for more than \$15,000, and no loan will be forgiven.

SECTION 6

Applications

(1) An employee or employee-community organization that wishes to purchase a concern that would otherwise close down may

apply to the Secretary of Commerce for loans and technical assistance provided for under this Act.

(2) The Secretary, acting through EDA, will conduct a feasibility study within 60 days after receiving an application to determine whether reasonable grounds exist to expect that the proposed transfer would be successful.

(3) If the feasibility study is positive, the Secretary may make loans for technical assistance, start-up and operating costs to the organization. The rate of interest to be charged on such loans shall be no greater than the prevailing rate within the community, and there shall be no forgiveness on such loans.

(4) Loans to employee members of employee or employee-community organizations to allow them to purchase stock in the new concern (as provided for under Section 5) shall also be made at this time.

SECTION 7

Waiver of Securities Act of 1933

This section allows the Secretary of Commerce to exempt employee or employee-community organizations from select provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 to facilitate the purchase of the plant.

SECTION 8

Coordination of Federal programs

This section provides that the Economic Development Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall give priority in making loans to organizations receiving assistance under the Act.

SECTION 9

Report

EDA will evaluate the success or failure of the program and report to Congress at the end of three years and again after seven years.

SECTION 10

Authorization for appropriations

Appropriations are authorized for seven years. For the first year the authorization level will be approximately \$100 million. Each succeeding year the amount may be increased by ten percent over the previous year.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday I mentioned and brought out to the House the problem facing our senior citizens and our disabled people in this country under the food stamp program. This program on March 1 is going to be radically altered to a point that is going to make it nearly impossible for many of our seniors to survive in this year ahead.

I am going to give another example today of a senior citizen who happens to be a diabetic 79 years old. Her total income is \$250 a month. Out of that income, she pays \$156 rent, \$34 for utilities and \$10 for phone bills. She has been receiving \$34 a month in food stamps, which is certainly not a tremendous amount. Starting on March 1 her food stamps will be reduced to \$10 a month.

Mr. Speaker, we can address this problem by eliminating the \$80 ceiling on rent that can be deducted and keep the deduction at the same level it is today. We are going to have well over 1 million people in this country badly affected by the change on March 1.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that, pursuant to the provisions of clause 9(a), rule I, closed circuit viewing of House floor proceedings will resume effective Monday, February 19, 1979.

The Chair would stress that under clause 9, rule I, the closed circuit system to Members' offices is for viewing purposes in Members' offices only, and is not to be utilized for commercial or political purposes. The Chair requests the cooperation of all persons concerned to assure that the dignity and integrity of the proceedings of the House are upheld.

The Chair's Informal Advisory Committee has informed the Chair that a system for complete and unedited audio and visual broadcasting and recording of House proceedings will be available beginning in early March. The Chair will announce his full implementation of that system in the near future.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan and Mr. BUCHANAN of Alabama.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. MURPHY of New York;
Mr. HOWARD of New Jersey;
Mr. FISH of New York; and
Mr. GREEN of New York.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

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

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during our initial deliberations on the 1980 budget, one concern which has already come to the fore in the defense arena is the all-volunteer force—its costs, success to date, and prospects for the critical years ahead. Like many other Members, I am still in the process of digesting the Defense Department's massive tome on the AVF issued at the end of 1978 and of analyzing the many conflicting reports and predictions currently being generated with respect to the future of our Nation's military manpower. We are again approaching a crossroads in terms of a volunteer or conscripted military force, as well as some type of required "national" service, and I feel it is im-

portant that we air and debate a wide variety of alternatives.

Aside from the obvious question of how we will obtain a sufficient quantity and quality of young men and women to meet the requirements of our Armed Forces in the 1980's, 1990's, and the 21st century, there is an even more immediate question—how do we retain those high-caliber personnel already on board who, for a variety of reasons, are abandoning military careers.

In his January 5, 1979, report to the House Armed Services Committee, the Secretary of the Navy advised that the Navy is currently short about 17,000 skilled petty officers with 9 to 16 years of service. Aside from the critical gap in leadership this causes, these petty officers are also the backbone of the Navy's technical proficiency. Unfortunately, the Navy is by no means the only service which has been faced with a substantial downturn in reenlistments—both first-term and subsequent.

Those we are losing are often the individuals in the most highly skilled occupations in whom we have invested months and generally years of training. Obviously, the reasons are myriad. One primary factor is the competition from the civilian job market. The problem, however, transcends just the opportunity for a better-paying job.

From my conversations with young men and women in the services, I find considerable skepticism relative to the Government's ability and determination to meet its commitments to them in terms of pay, retirement, medical care, and so forth. My purpose today is not to discuss at length the "benefits erosion question," but rather to indicate the general malaise which seems to pervade much of the force, with a predictable impact on retention.

I also find that personnel leaving the service cite—with increasing frequency—the fact that they face a cut-off of their Vietnam-era GI bill educational benefits in the not too distant future. They want to assure they have at least the opportunity of using the educational entitlement provided for their battlefield colleagues who did not choose to make a career in the military service of their country.

My feedback from conversation and correspondence is apparently not an isolated observation. In her report to the Senate Armed Services Committee, incorporated in the Defense Department's AVF report, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Antonia Chayes noted:

The 31 December 1989 termination date for the old G.I. Bill works at cross-purposes with our retention goals which will, in turn, generate increased recruiting requirements.

In expressing Department of the Navy views on AVF alternatives, Bernard Rostker, Principal Deputy to the Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, cited the need to eliminate "legislative incentives to separate," specifically the December 31, 1989, cutoff date for use of Vietnam-era educational benefits:

This legislation [P.L. 94-502] provides a strong incentive for experienced careerists to leave the service in order to take advantage of previously earned educational benefits.

This "negative bonus" can be eliminated at minimal costs by extending eligibility for benefits for a minimum five years from the member's date of separation from active duty.

I am, therefore, today introducing legislation which would give military personnel entitled to educational benefits under the pre-1976 GI bill a period of 6 years from their release from active duty in which to use their educational benefits entitlement, even if they leave the service after the December 31, 1989, termination of the Vietnam-era program. With 6 years, the individual will have an opportunity to use his or her full 45-months of education and will have approximately a year's "grace period" in which to get relocated, attend to family problems, establish or shore up finances, and so forth. The 6-year time limitation does not extend the program for an inordinate period of time for the Government, but it does give the individual some degree of flexibility for unanticipated crises and financial obligations.

Why extend the program now—1989 is a decade away? As previously noted, rates for both first-term and subsequent reenlistments are already plummeting. As we enter the early 1980's, that trend can be expected to escalate rapidly. If Congress waits until 1988 or 1989, it will, frankly, be too late. Ironically, those individuals who will leave in order to use their educational benefits will be the most highly motivated and the best trained—in other words, the cream of our midcareer force.

I urge my congressional colleagues to look at this retention disincentive in 1979, while there is still time to correct a major part of the damage. A decade from now will be too little, too late, and we will all be the losers for it.

□ 1110

THE PRESIDENT'S FAILURE IN IRAN

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of 1977, President Carter toasted the Shah of Iran at a New Year's Eve celebration. The President praised the Shah's "great leadership," called Iran "an island of stability," and referred to the "respect and admiration and love which our people give to you."

Little more than 13 months have passed since the President spoke those words. The Shah has fled from Iran and a new, anti-American government is now in power. Everywhere I go the questions come fast and furiously. What gives—where is this administration taking us?

The administration's handling of foreign affairs is so inept, so incompetent, so totally lacking in consistency or direction that it has now become dangerous to our national security.

CRISIS IN IRAN

(Mr. SCHULZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep sense of outrage at the events which took place at the American Embassy in Iran yesterday. The inept handling of this situation from the first rumblings of revolution to the sacking of our Embassy is a severe, personal blow to the American people.

Congress and the American people are experiencing a combination of consternation and outrage over this latest indignity. We have every right to know why this situation has been permitted to deteriorate, and why our Government failed to prepare itself for these contingencies. I ask Mr. Speaker:

Why was our Embassy in Iran not more heavily guarded, in view of the threat which has obviously existed for several months?

Where were our Marine reinforcements?

What was happened to our expensive intelligence-gathering apparatus?

This "Valentines Day Massacre" touches me, personally, with the cold-blooded wounding of Sergeant Kraus of Lansdale, Pa., after being ordered to surrender by the Ambassador, Sergeant Kraus was disarmed, knocked to the ground, and shot at point-blank range with his own weapon.

How can we ask young Americans, like Sergeant Kraus, to serve our country without support and with indecisive leadership? How many more young men, like Sergeant Kraus, will be sacrificed on the altar of the administration's inept foreign policy?

INFLATION—THE OVERRIDING CONCERN OF ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today the overriding concern of all Americans is the inflation with which they have been forced to live. In recent years concern about inflation has been transformed into fear. If we, as their representatives, do not do something quickly to stop this destructive process, this fear will turn to panic.

Not one Member of this House publicly endorses inflation as a proper economic policy. We all denounce the evil that it brings, and yet the inflation continues at an unprecedented rate.

If all our colleagues are well intended, as I sincerely believe, why are we so unsuccessful in providing an economy with falling or stable prices?

I would like to suggest to you and to my colleagues that perhaps the conventional definition of inflation is incorrect. If it could be shown that our basic assumption about the cause of inflation is wrong, it would help us to understand why the concerted efforts of Republicans, Democrats, liberals, and conservatives, have failed so miserably in the past 10 years, in accomplishing anything whatsoever in restraining the destructive forces of inflation.

THE 61ST ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) in welcoming here today as the Chaplain of the House Father Ziuraitis, and to indicate that I intend to participate in the special order which the gentleman from Illinois has taken today in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the nation of Lithuania.

We all know that the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, have been suppressed and oppressed—by the Soviet Union. It is heartening that these people continue to preserve their great heritage and culture, and to express their aspirations, hopes and prayers for a restoration of freedom and independence for their beloved Lithuania and for the other Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

SIXTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENT LITHUANIA

(Mrs. FENWICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, 1979, is the 61st anniversary of the establishment of an independent state of Lithuania. Lithuanians throughout the world—including a large number of Lithuanian-Americans—remember this date as a milestone in their nation's struggle for independence and self-determination. The democratic state of Lithuania, which adopted a constitution preserving freedom of the individual, was short-lived, however, for in 1940 it was invaded by the Soviet Union and declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. This was carried out despite the explicit provisions of the 1920 peace treaty signed by the Soviets recognizing Lithuania as a free and independent state, and renouncing any rights of sovereignty over it.

The past 39 years of Soviet domination have not wiped out the spirit of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. The Helsinki accord of 1975, signed by the Soviet Union, guaranteed them certain rights, and on this 61st anniversary of the founding of their republic we must renew our faith that these rights and pledges will some day be honored.

A CONTINENTAL DOLLAR

(Mr. COLLINS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy, I frequently heard the expression "as sound as a dollar." If you were in good health, they would say you were "sound as a dollar."

Today we all know the dollar is sick, but America and Congress seem to lack the courage to face the facts.

I recently read an interesting speech made by Ira E. Corn, Jr., of Dallas who is a noted American historian, economist, and successful businessman. He spoke concerning the similarities between 1978 and 1778 with particular reference to the experience of the Continental dollar.

Do you remember how the Continental dollar dropped to where it was eventually redeemed for only 1 penny on a bond to take care of a dollar of paper money? The dollar dropped from 100 to 1.

Corn's conclusion is the country must face up to its responsibility of taxation to have a balanced economy. I agree completely with the balanced budget and sound economy with Government spending. However, the answer is to reduce spending, as we have too much excessive taxation already on our backs. Back in 1961 we were spending less than \$100 billion. This year we will probably see Congress spend \$500 billion.

The courage and perseverance of our forefathers in winning our battle for independence is an inspiration. But at that same time they learned a lesson about a loosely handled dollar. The U.S. experience with the dollar is a factual history of 1778. Now as we look at 1978 we see where we stand, and we are heading into 1979 and 1980.

With 42 cents out of every dollar going to taxes today, the way to strengthen the dollar is not to raise taxes. We need to cut down on excessive Government spending that is going beyond the 42 cents expenditure.

Let me give you some of the highlights of the Continental dollar experience that Corn discovered as he compared 1778 to 1978.

NOT THE FIRST TIME—1778 vs. 1978

In 1778, General George Washington faced an invading army to his front while behind him an impotent and fractured government staggered from crisis to crisis, refusing to face up to realities and putting off the inevitable day of fiscal and monetary reckoning. Facing his own realities as well as incredible obstacles forced George Washington to become the greatest fund-raiser in history.

And the results—rampant inflation—almost destroyed Washington's army and the new nation it represented.

We tend to think that only in the Sixties and Seventies of this century have Americans "lost their way," discovered self-doubt and found their government unable to cope with economic, political and military dilemmas. Events each day provide educational—and chilling—parallels to the struggles unfolding 200 years ago when our infant American Republic fought to be born and to survive. And today, our central government exercises powers that the Continental Congress of 1778 would hardly have dreamed of, nor even considered seeking.

Yet, today's government, likewise seems to stagger from crisis to crisis, unable to deal with political, economic and military dilemmas facing us at home and around the world, unwilling to face realities, and incapable of coping with its own inabilities. Let's look at some of the events of 1775-1781 and look for today's parallels.

It was in 1778 that the Continental Congress began to wake up to the disaster caused by unsupported paper money and the attempts to control price rises. Sheer knowl-

edge by the public of the facts—in both 1778 and in 1978—explains the results.

The First Continental Congress has dissolved itself after a brief session ending October 22, 1774, without taking any practical steps to prosecute the approaching American Revolution. Congress had issued its "Declarations and Resolves" setting forth rights claimed by the Colonists and petitioning for their inherent rights as English subjects of the British Crown and also for redress of grievances listed. Most hoped for reconciliation.

Instead, hopes faded as Parliament refused even to receive Colonial emissaries. British troops increased military activities in New England, and on April 19, 1775, General Gage sent his Redcoats from Boston to seize the Colonists' munitions at Concord, leading to the "shot heard 'round the world" and the Battles of Lexington and Concord.

Some of the delegates to the Second Continental Congress already were en route to Philadelphia. Officially, that new body opened its deliberations there on May 10, 1775. Most members of the First Congress returned. Noteworthy additions included Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson.

The Second Congress also had no authority to levy taxes and even refused to debate whether Congress should seek powers to tax in support of the national defense effort. Its delegates knew that the 13 colonies' legislatures were strongly against giving taxing authority to the Continental Congress.

While the British occupation tightened in New England, the Second Continental Congress unanimously named George Washington as Commander-in-Chief on June 15, 1775. Although most of the initial military action involved the New England militia, Washington, a Virginian, was elected without opposition.

Washington proved to be the right man at the right time for the job. He retained the trust and confidence of his soldiers throughout their ordeals, which he shared with them. He effectively exhorted, cajoled, and otherwise inspired and pressured both his troops and the Congress to achieve the essentials for victory. He became almost a "beggar"—if a brilliant one—on behalf of his troops and the cause of independence.

Washington also wrote to John Hancock, then President of the Congress, seeking aid for the troops:

"Being only provided for a summer's campaign, their clothes, shoes, and blankets will soon be unfit for the change of weather which we every day feel. At present we have no tents for more than two-thirds—many of them old and worn-out; but if we had a plentiful supply, the season will not admit of continuing in them long. The case of our sick is also worthy of much consideration. Their number, in the returns, forms at least one fourth of the army. Policy and humanity require they should be as comfortable as possible."

Congress knew it had to act, taking the only practical measure open—one for which it had no authority whatever: It began to issue paper currency.

Congress' initial issue of "Continental" was to have been for \$2 million, but another \$1 million was authorized even before it had been accomplished.

Estimates of the sums issued by years:

1775	6,000,000
1776	19,000,000
1777	13,000,000
1778	63,500,300
1779	90,052,380

Wiser heads attempted to stop the escalation. Benjamin Franklin said, "After the first emission I proposed that we should stop, strike no more, but borrow on interest those we had issued. This was not then approved of and more bills were issued."

Pork rose from 4 cents to 8 cents per pound.

By November, 1777, commodity prices were 480 percent above the pre-war average. The Pennsylvania Legislature decided to try a "period of price control, limited to domestic commodities essential for the use of the Army."

Quickly, the controlled items, the most essential, became unavailable; prices for uncontrolled goods shot sky high. Congress recommended that regional conventions be held to set prices for particular areas. New England and the middle states held such conventions, but the states south of Maryland did not.

States passed laws to counteract growing refusal to accept Continentals in payment at controlled prices. The same goods would sell when paid for in specie (hard money). Pennsylvania provided penalties—up to banishment—for refusal to accept Continentals.

In February, 1778, the Pennsylvania Assembly appointed commissioners "in every city of the state with full power to purchase or to seize, at stated prices, all provisions necessary for the army." But appeals to patriotism, accompanied by increasing threats of more force, failed to bring out the necessary provisions. The farmers would not trade the fruits of their hard labors for paper money which bought less and less.

As the market broke down under refusals to give up goods for paper of ever-declining acceptance, military forces had to intensify impressment from the surrounding populace.

The self-defeating policy of attempting price controls was abandoned. By June of 1778, the act of "regulating the several articles on the price lists" was wholly suspended. After that date the military commissary agents were instructed "to give the current price . . . let it be what it may, rather than the army should suffer . . . and the intended expedition be retarded for want of it."

Of course, the end of price regulations did not halt inflation. Neither had the regulations. And Congress continued to refuse to consider the only effective action: acquiring—and using—the power to tax.

Each year that passed with Congress refusing to seek authority to collect taxes resulted in further sharp declines in the value of its paper currency.

While the Declaration of Independence was adopted early in July, 1776, the Articles of Confederation proposed at the same time were not adopted by Congress until November 15, 1777, and not ratified by the States until later (March 1, 1781).

While confidence and morale had been rising as a result of early skirmishes, such as Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, and others, plus the Declaration of Independence, Congress could do nothing to sustain the euphoria. The smashing victory over Burgoyne in late 1777 had no effect on the declining value of the Continental. And the states would not permit effective action.

The troops in the field suffered most of the consequences. The poverty suffered by Washington's troops should not be attributed to any general conditions in the American colonies during this period of relative prosperity, of no droughts, and no crop failures. More than 80 percent of the economy was agrarian. Industry, though small, was booming with the population growing rapidly.

All the fighting took place along the sea coasts, affecting less than 15 percent of the inhabitants. The other 85 percent, in effect, got a free ride. They paid no national taxes and few local ones. The cost was borne by the soldiers and those citizens forced to take the paper currency, which turned out to be "not worth a Continental"—a term used for 150 years thereafter to describe a person or object considered worthless.

By January, 1777, the Continental's value in relation to specie was down 33 percent; in January 1778 it was down 75 percent, and in January 1779 it had dropped to 90 percent below face value. Then it went down

"like a collapsed balloon," as historian George Trevelyan wrote.

"In June of that year \$50 were paid in Philadelphia for two pairs of shoes, and \$60 for two silk handkerchiefs. Fish-hooks, in that piscatorial city, cost half a dollar apiece. In October 1780 beef sold in Boston for \$10 a pound, and butter for \$12. Samuel Adams, who was not a dressy man, paid \$2,000 for a hat and a suit of clothes."

Despite partial redemption and retirement after 1779, and despite efforts to enforce laws on the acceptance of the currency at par value, Continental currency collapsed in May, 1781; two months later, only hard money was used in the market. Under the funding act of 1790 the old Continental issues were accepted at the rate of 100 to 1 in U.S. bonds.

Today's similarities become obvious. Congress, although possessing the power to tax to fully support the dollar, refuses to do so. Although the American people lost the right to own gold for use as money in 1933, the nominal backing of the dollar with gold owned by the government was continued, at least on a percentage basis.

In 1968 Congress eliminated the final requirement of 25 percent gold backing on March 19, 1968. On March 17, 1968, a two-tier price system was established, by which the U.S. and six western European nations agreed in Washington to stop buying and selling gold in the international markets, retaining an "official" monetary price of \$35 per ounce but leaving the private market price to fluctuate according to supply and demand.

The dollar printed today by the U.S. Government has finally become the same kind of dollar that was printed by the Continental Congress, purely paper currency. As a result, we have dollars thought to be not so good chasing tremendous numbers of goods—goods with well-recognized value.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 14, 1979.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 1:22 p.m. on Wednesday, February 14, 1979, and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the Sixth Special Message for Fiscal Year 1979 under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EDMUND L. HENSHAW, JR.,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

SIXTH SPECIAL MESSAGE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1979 UNDER THE IM- POUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESI- DENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 96-56)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report re-

visions to three previously transmitted deferrals increasing the amount deferred by \$33.8 million. These revisions to existing deferrals involve programs in the Departments of Transportation and the Treasury and the International Communication Agency.

The details of the deferrals are contained in the attached reports.

JIMMY CARTER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 14, 1979.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 19, 1979

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority whip the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If my friend the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished minority whip (Mr. MICHEL) will yield, the program for the week of February 19, 1979, is as follows:

On Monday, the House meets at noon. There is no legislative business but there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

On Tuesday, the House is not in session.

On Wednesday the House meets at 3 p.m. to consider a series of 10 House administration funding resolutions for House committees.

On Thursday, February 22, the House meets at 11 a.m. to consider House Concurrent Resolution 3, our Merchant Marine March.

On Friday, February 23, the House is not in session.

The House will adjourn by 5:30 p.m. on Thursday.

Any further program will be announced later.

□ 1120

Mr. MICHEL. Might I make this inquiry: I see no reference to the debt ceiling legislation which will have to be considered here quite soon.

Can the gentleman enlighten me on that subject?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman will yield further, that measure will be taken up either Tuesday, February 27, or Wednesday, February 28, under the present plan of the leadership.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVID- ING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTI- GATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-12) on the resolution (H. Res. 98) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the committee on Foreign Affairs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVID- ING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTI- GATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-5) on the resolution (H. Res. 60) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Armed Services, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVID- ING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTI- GATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON IN- TELLIGENCE

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-11) on the resolution (H. Res. 96) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVID- ING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTI- GATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-3) on the resolution (H. Res. 35) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVID- ING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTI- GATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-10) on the resolution (H. Res. 92) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVID- ING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTI- GATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 85) to provide for the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FUTURE EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-4) on the resolution (H. Res. 45) to provide funds for the further expenses of the investigation and studies of the Committee on Small Business, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-8) on the resolution (H. Res. 88) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-7) on the resolution (H. Res. 87) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on House Administration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BRADEMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 96-9) on the resolution (H. Res. 91) to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1979, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY NEXT TO WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1979

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next, and that when the House adjourns on Monday next, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1125

CONGRATULATIONS TO PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA ON THEIR 61ST ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again I am delighted to join today with my colleagues and with people throughout the world to commemorate tomorrow February 16 as the anniversary of the Independence Day of Lithuania.

Since 1940, this small Baltic nation has been dominated by the Soviet Union, after Hitler and Stalin struck a pact that sold into bondage the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, to say nothing of the people of Poland.

To move for Lithuanian independence from Russia actually began back in the 1880's. Finally, after years of struggle and with the defeat of Tsarist Russia, Lithuania declared her independence on February 16, 1918.

The next 20 years saw a great cultural revival in Lithuania. Literature, music, and dancing flourished throughout the nation. But this free and good life for Lithuania was not long to be, and cannot really come again until Soviet control over this separate country has been relinquished.

As a point of law, the Soviet Union really has no right to control Lithuania. The Soviets actually signed a treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, and in that treaty renounced all claims to Lithuania. To quote from the treaty, the Soviet Union agreed without any reservation the sovereignty and independence of the state of Lithuania, were recognized and, furthermore, all territorial claims to Lithuania were "voluntarily and forever renounced." Another promise broken.

Free people everywhere should always remember the sacrifices Lithuania has made that she might secure liberty. In the years 1940 to 1952 more than 30,000 freedom fighters lost their lives on the plain of battle with Soviet warlords. All these brave people sought was that they and their children's children might be able to live in a land of freedom and not a land of serfdom.

Reminiscent of the Nazi persecution of the Jewish people, some 350,000 Lithuanians, we are told, have been sent to

labor camps in Siberia, because of their desire for freedom and independence.

Yet even today the struggle for Lithuanian independence continues. It continues in large part, because Lithuania is a nation whose belief in God Almighty has never been shaken.

In 1972 more than 17,000 Lithuanians petitioned the United Nations for the restoration of religious freedom. The people of Lithuania continue to attend their churches despite all the obstacles the Russians have placed in the path of simple worship.

Despite Soviet rules forbidding religious instruction, religious publications, charity work, the ordination of new clerics to replace the old, and discouraging church attendance, Lithuania is still clearly a Christian nation.

I am proud that last August I was honored for my efforts on behalf of the cause of Lithuanian freedom, by being given the Father John C. Jutt Friend of Lithuania Award by the Knights of Lithuania. So once again I reaffirm my dedication to the cause of Lithuanian freedom, and call upon my colleagues in the House, and on all Americans, to reaffirm their own commitments to hasten the day when the land and people of Lithuania shall once again bask in the sunshine of liberty.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO).

□ 1130

A TRIBUTE TO ARCHBISHOP OSCAR ROMERO OF EL SALVADOR AS A NOMINEE FOR THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and applaud my distinguished colleague, Mr. DRINAN, for the leadership he has taken in bringing the work of Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames—or as he is simply known Archbishop Oscar Romero—of El Salvador to the attention of the Congress. Congressman DRINAN ventured into El Salvador in 1977 as part of a fact finding mission on the human rights practices of El Salvador. Through the work of Congressman DRINAN, 21 of our colleagues joined us in signing a letter to the Nobel Peace Prize Committee nominating the archbishop for the Nobel's cherished prize for peace activism. I am delighted to be given this special time on the House floor to discuss this important nomination for the 1979 prize awards.

Archbishop Oscar Romero, a telegraph operator's son, has risen from the anonymity of an obscure diocese in the

interior of El Salvador to worldwide renown. The 60-year-old Catholic leader has stood up in the face of some 40 years of repression and violence in El Salvador to rally nonviolent peasant revolt.

The year 1931 was when the last free election occurred in this tiny Latin American country. At that time a liberal reform oriented leader came to power and promised to share the land with the people. This was too much for the powerful elite—now only 1.9 percent of the population; but owning almost 60 percent of all the lands—and they enlisted the support of the military to oust the reformists and institute the repressive practices which have come to dominate El Salvador today.

In 1968 the Catholic Church began publicly to ally itself with the rural peasants and developed what is becoming known today as "liberation theology"—wedding the moral power of the church to the social goals of the populous. From 1974 to 1976 Luis Chavez was archbishop and attempted to follow liberation theological practice by issuing a number of pastoral letters protesting violations of human rights within El Salvador. But as a reaction to this progressive move the wealthy elite again summoned the repressive force of the military and Archbishop Chavez was ousted. At this point the mild-mannered Oscar Romero, who many regarded as a spiritualist rather than an activist, was appointed in hopes that the church would be seen and not heard.

But immediately Archbishop Romero sent a signal that this would not be the case. He began a campaign for the welfare of the peasants. He refused to attend the inauguration of President Humberto Romero (no relation to him) who was installed as the new dictator in July 1978.

Soon after Archbishop Romero's appointment in February 1977, two grotesque executions took place. First Father Rutilo Grande, a popular priest, along with two of his parishioners were mercilessly submachine-gunned down. He was on his way to support a protest by workers of the unfair contracts which bound them to the rich private landowners. Then in May 1977, Father Alfonso Navarro and a teenaged boy were shot while talking in a parish house in San Salvador.

Archbishop Romero's reaction was swift and decisive to these horrendous murders—he closed all Catholic schools and colleges for 3 days and held a special mass in front of the National Cathedral in the major city of San Salvador. One hundred thousand people attended this important mass. For the peasants the Catholic Church, under Archbishop Romero's leadership, was a vehicle to express their opposition to the repressive Romero regime.

In order to negate the impact of the Catholic Church the Romero regime has resorted to the most deplorable tactics. President Romero and the national press has labeled members of the activist church subversives or Communists. The current government has tacitly if not

openly given support to right wing paramilitary or vigilante groups—most notably ORDEN—which carry out the horrible executions like those I just described as well as abducted peasants who express discontent with Romero and his regime.

In the face of this violence and terrorism Archbishop Romero has always counseled his followers to be nonviolent. He rejects violence and refuses to endorse armed revolt. He has risked his own life in criticizing the Romero regime and protesting to the world the regime's heavy-handed tactics. He set up his own permanent human rights monitoring committee and prompted the Organization of American States (OAS) to make two onsite inspections of human rights conditions. The report of OAS is anticipated very soon.

The conditions that prevail in El Salvador are not too different than other Latin American governments where the wealthy elites are teamed up with a repressive military junta. Guatemala, Chile, Argentina are three countries that come to mind. I wrote President Carter last year protesting the conditions in Guatemala where a violent assassination squad much like ORDEN has free reign—the ruling junta refusing to take decisive action.

The struggle of the people of El Salvador and the courageous determination of Archbishop Oscar Romero has not received enough attention in our country, or for that matter the world. This inattention in itself may facilitate the kind of radical abuse of human rights which we see today. Inhumanity and terror predominate the social atmosphere as a result.

Amnesty International, the Nobel Peace Prize winning human rights monitoring group, reports that the wealthy ruling elite of El Salvador exports cash crops abroad while 73 percent of Salvadorean children under 5 years old suffer from malnutrition.

This is totally unacceptable and we must encourage and promote respect in El Salvador with all our diplomatic and economic resources for human rights.

Archbishop Romero deserves global recognition for his responsible leadership. Similar to Martin Luther King—as the Times of London stated—Archbishop Romero has stood for peace and justice through nonviolence. That is why 118 Members of the British Parliament and 23 Members of the House have nominated him for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1979.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post Magazine, Sept. 10, 1978]

FROM HERE TO ETERNITY—HOW A PRIEST-CONGRESSMAN AND THE PRESIDENT OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY HAVE TRIED TO STOP MURDER, BUT NOT NECESSARILY REVOLUTION, IN TINY EL SALVADOR

(By George Anne Geyer)

On Feb. 14, 1977, a scene as strange as any from the 12th century was acted out in the cathedral of San Salvador in Central America.

The cathedral, a vast and empty barn of a place with none of the gilt and marble

of the Old World, was jammed with nearly 10,000 crying, singing, chanting, stricken people. The building, thrusting eight empty but vigorous stories toward heaven, had been left deliberately unfinished to symbolize the church's dedication not to its own glory but to the suffering of the people.

The seething masses seemed to sense that. Intently and passionately, they clung from balconies, from stairways and from rafters. In the minds of many were the killings—the murders of two priests, the killing of so many peasants in the countryside. And in many minds, there were thoughts of all those who had been exiled.

As he was about to award a great honor to Salvador's unimposing Archbishop Oscar Romero, Georgetown University's President Timothy Healy that day had other thoughts.

"The wonder of it is that the archbishop survives," Father Healy remembered thinking afterwards. "Against him is arrayed every force in Salvador. There is literally nothing that prevents the blow of the fool who would strike him down."

That was why Healy, a glib, robust priest with an amiable, cultured face, had come to El Salvador's capital city to give the little, dark-skinned archbishop an honorary degree from Georgetown. He was trying to prevent the "blow of the fool." He was trying to focus the center of power in the world, Washington, D.C., and the power of one of the greatest Jesuit universities of the world, to help a simple parish priest who, to be honest about it, had attracted no attention at all before being named archbishop of the Latin nation's 4.2 million people.

The ceremony was as simple as it was imposing. In his praise of the middle-aged man who is a hero to many Salvadoreans and as likely a candidate for martyrdom as Thomas Becket in the 12th century, Father Healy began, "It is seldom easy for us to understand what God 'needs,' what he asks of those men and women on whose shoulders he lays the weight of His Church. He gives us hints, and probably the principal hints are the time and place where he puts us."

"In North America," Healy went on, "the nation precedes the church in time and in our people's consciousness. For us, the greater risk is that civil religion blocks out revelation. But in both our nations, balance is everything. Ideally, the claims of politics and faith are complementary. In the practical world of limited men, with limited vision and limited resources, faith and politics can frequently collide."

The audience was noiseless in face of the honor being bestowed upon all of them as Healy ended with a quote from Thomas More: "God made plants for their simplicity, animals for their innocence, but he made him man to serve him wittily in the tangle of his mind."

The archbishop then spoke of "the cause of Christian humanism" which had been developing in the church, and the important new emphasis of "beginning with the realities of this world" where we must implant His kingdom now. He spoke of how the honorary degree showed solidarity with the sufferings of Salvadorean peasants. Then he pleased everyone by taking off his cape and putting on his honorary robe.

As they walked out of the cathedral, the American and Salvadorean priests were alternately stopped by the passionate mob of humans and carried along by it. The Rev. Robert Mitchell of Georgetown University recalled later with an irony touched by awe that "the scene . . . had little resemblance to more traditional ceremonies for honorary degrees."

But Father Healy, a robust Irish Catholic whose hearty, puckish face contains the wisdom and freshness of all the vales of Ireland, had the last word. "We are 1978," he mused

later, sitting in his elegant university office, "and we're right back to 1170. And we wonder how we got there."

At precisely 5 p.m. last Jan. 10, the Rev. Robert Drinan, Democratic congressman from Massachusetts, called upon another important but unrelated Romero—one President-General Carlos Humberto-Romero. They met in Romero's office at the presidential mansion in San Salvador. The meeting was not friendly, despite the beauty of the old colonial building and its vast courtyard.

At one point the president arose in a rage and stalked across the large office to his desk. From a top drawer he withdrew a picture of the murdered Father Rutilio Grande. The peasants who loved Father Grande had, in a reproduction of the picture, put a crown around his head, as though he were already officially sanctified. But the words underneath read, "Our Government Has Done This to Us."

"How can they do this to me?" President Romero demanded, livid with anger.

And, he must have wondered, how could yet another Washington priest be "interfering"? Father Drinan, already an alumnus of an Amnesty International investigation in Argentina and a tall, dark man with the piercing eyes of a Shakespearean devil, had gone to Salvador at the request of the archbishop to investigate.

The drama between the two men takes form:

Drinan: I have talked with dozens of people in the countryside, and they tell me a grim tale of intimidation and harassment by forces responsible to the government. As a matter of fact, it is intimidation against the Catholic Church. The National Guard and the ORDEN [a right-wing group] tell people not to attend mass or go near the priests because they are Communists.

Romero: If you have gone . . . and heard these things, I think you should go to other places and other churches where the people of ORDEN themselves have suffered and where FECCAS and UTC [church-related peasant groups] commit degradations and intimidate the people. Some people have even been killed.

Drinan: I recognize that there has been violence by the other side, but I am speaking of something different. The government of El Salvador . . . is making it difficult or impossible for masses of the people to participate in religious services. This is the denial of a basic human right. The government is trying to divide the church. That is what you are trying to do right now. You are harassing the archbishop.

Romero: [with growing impatience] I have tried to seek an understanding with the clergy. I have talked to Father Jerez of the Jesuit Order and others. I provided security when they were threatened. I have gone and talked with priests . . . I have invited the archbishop. He came here, and we talked. He asked for the return of all the exiled priests. I said I could not do this because my colleagues and associates listen to the priests' broadcasts over radio stations and would put pressure on me not to allow them to return. I invited the archbishop to fill any vacancies with priests from abroad. I said to give me a list of the vacancies and of the candidates to fill them. We would investigate and decide who can come.

Drinan: [angrily] That is interference in the Church. It is not for a president to say who is a good priest and who is a bad priest.

Romero: [slowly, with impatience] Yes it is, if they interfere in the business of the government!

It is a typically busy day at the big, white, tropical-style American embassy in Salvador. Surrounded by lush gardens and a high fence, watched over by armed guards, the embassy foyer nevertheless is filled with Salvadoreans passively waiting for visas to

leave their population and violence-doomed country.

Inside, an officer is upset. The ambassador, Frank Devine, must wear a bulletproof vest this day because a veiled bit of intelligence has come that "someone" might attack him that day. Who?

He shakes his head.

It could be so many people. Almost like a child's chant, he says it could be the right, it could be the left, it could be the government, it could be the guerrillas, it could be the "ins," it could be the "outs," it could be the Marxists, it could be the Catholics.

Perhaps the strangest part of the violence in this country is that it is all so frighteningly anonymous. In sprawling hot San Salvador, with its dialectic of shanty slums and elegant walled houses, nobody really knows who the murderous, rightist White Warriors or the leftist guerrillas or the BPR (Popular Revolutionary Block) or the others really are. Unlike many revolutionary or prerevolutionary situations, the Salvadorean groups rarely take credit for their terrorism or attempt to explain their actions.

An American embassy officer in San Salvador finds it puzzling. "It is singularly disorganized," he said. "The country is in the process of breakdown, and it has about run its course. The mysteriousness is a function of breakdown. Nobody knows what's going on. I've never seen a country harder to know."

The problems of El Salvador in 1978 began in 1931. That year, the only free elections in the entire history of this little mestizo country were held and the liberal reformer Arturo Araujo came to power, frightening the "14 families" who had always ruled.

The military "solved" that problem by immediately taking over for the wealthy, only to be met by a massive peasant uprising in the coffee-growing region in the west. The upper-class Salvadorean "memory," therefore, is haunted by machete-wielding peasants arising like fearful shadows out of the land.

Hundreds died before the revolt was over. And that revolt was the first in the Western Hemisphere in which Communists played a significant role.

In the years following the revolt, the rest of Latin America went through change after change. Salvador stagnated and abnormal extremes of wealth and poverty became the status quo. Even today, the average per capita income is estimated at \$440 a year, and 2 percent of the population owns 60 percent of the land. And there is another problem: Salvador, the smallest nation in Latin America, is also the most densely populated, with 550 persons per square mile.

The Catholic Church, not blind to such social conditions in Latin America, held an extraordinary conference in Medellin, Colombia, in 1968. Historically, one of the three pillars of the Establishment in Latin America, along with the military and the aristocracy, the church suddenly aligned itself with the poor and even with revolution. A "theology of liberation" and even a "theology of violence," hung from the church's tattered edges, catching even the most fervid radicals within its web.

With an unusually high number of foreign—especially European—priests, Salvador became a testing ground for the Medellin documents. And so, through the church, groups such as FECCAS (the peasant organization) and the umbrella group BPR and others were formed. All were illegal, because Salvadorean law prohibits such organizing.

The government, fearing all attempts at change equally, hated them quite as much and perhaps even more than the true Marxist groups—the Soviet-line ERP (Revolutionary Army of the People) and the Maoist-Castroite FPL (Farabundo Martí Brigade). By 1977, the country was in flames.

Marxist groups assassinated Foreign Minister Mauricio Borbonovo Pohl, a former president and the rector of the National University. The government's paramilitary groups—the White Warriors and ORDEN, a group numbering in the 60,000s—retaliated. Activist priests Rutilio Grande and Alfonso Navarro were murdered last year. Several score more priests were exiled.

Throughout the violence was the eerie specter of anonymity. The rector was assassinated in front of 200 eyewitnesses. When the investigation came, there were no witnesses.

Then, in July last year, the mysterious White Warriors told the Jesuits, who comprise the largest order in Salvador, that 33 Jesuits would be systematically murdered unless they left the country immediately. At that point the archbishop and the American priests, along with many American Protestant clergymen, decided to act.

The passion with which they acted suggests a spiritual and a psychological dimension that is even more fascinating than the actual situation. Why should these two Irish-American priests, settled so comfortably in the lap of world power, become so obsessed with primitive, unimportant Salvador?

For Drinan, tall and dark and gaunt, the motivations seem to be two: a concern for human rights and the camaraderie he felt for his old Jesuit colleagues. Born in Boston, he had always been concerned with human rights and his Amnesty trip to Argentina two years ago had filled him with compassion for the people of Latin America and anger at injustices there. In addition, there were his Jesuit missions in Brazil, Jamaica and Honduras where some of his former classmates are among the approximately 850 clergy and nuns who have been harassed, tortured or murdered in the last 15 years.

For Healy, who sits atop the bluff in Georgetown in one of the most beautiful offices in Washington—a French Gothic room circa 1890 with cherry wood paneling and exquisite stained glass windows—the motivations are more complicated. The son of an Australian father and a Texan mother (with a lot of Irish blood mixed all through), he went to Woodstock College before getting his doctor of philosophy degree at Oxford.

He is also a Renaissance man of sorts. He trap-shoots. He loves good jazz and is known to tinkle a few. He teaches poetry to medical students to bring body and spirit together.

When you talk to him about Salvador, he talks with a passion about the "underground church," or the "original church" or the "church of the catacombs." One has the feeling Father Healy has found in Salvador and the archbishop a deeper dimension to his faith.

Then there is, as one of Healy's top aides put it, "the Jesuit in him coming out." The Jesuits have been, after all, in the forefront of action and change within the church. They founded schools, missions and churches and moved on to leave the dull, day-to-day administration of their structured flocks to others less involved in adventure.

Last spring, in response to the threats of Jesuits being murdered, Healy, along with Protestant churchmen, urgently requested a meeting with Secretary of State Cyrus Vance to ask that the U.S. make the strongest possible protest to the Salvadorean government.

Vance responded immediately. The plea was precisely in line with the new human rights policy and passion of the Carter administration.

Personal meetings between State Department officials and Salvadorean officials here and in El Salvador led to the threats being called off. The U.S. responded to apparent im-

provement by finally granting a held-back \$90 million loan. But the violence in the countryside and in the city continued.

By February 1978 with spurious elections in the offing, the opposition political coalition had called a rally for their candidate, Col. Ernesto Claramount. Into the massive throng on Feb. 28 went security forces and ORDEN thugs. Five deaths were officially reported, but eyewitness observers say that more than 100 were slaughtered.

An American journalist who was there said, "I was kept out of the plaza, so I could only hear the screaming and the shooting. Then, when it was over, I got in and found it literally covered with blood, although the bodies had been removed. But perhaps the most horrible thing was when I returned again an hour after that to find they had hosed down the plaza and there was a chill as though nothing had happened at all."

The massacres continued. Villages were attacked. Individual peasants simply "disappeared," never to return. The State Department's human rights division named El Salvador one of the worst human rights violators in the hemisphere, if not the world.

The struggle in El Salvador is not simply one of violence and human rights. The conflict has overtones of some of the most complicated ideological and theological problems of our time.

A leading Jesuit in San Salvador, for instance, tried to explain the difficult path facing an activist church in the midst of Marxist politics and revolution.

"Our Christian faith has in part the concern for justice of the old prophets," he said. "It is the same as Jesus Christ in front of the social problems of his times. This goes back to the sources of the Bible. It is not only the pragmatism of the faith but justice. And the cost is very high."

"I distinguish politics in terms of parties, and that is not particularly Christian. But a Christian who works at the front of social problems is another thing. Here, we enter the area of justice, and that is really biblical."

Could a system be "sinful," as many of the Jesuits who lean toward a Marxist interpretation of history say? The priest paused. "In our work it is very important to distinguish a personal sin from a structural sin. The system is of such a type that it can form a person in sin. Sure, there is a little of Marxism in this, but we believe that this idea of sin is what Christ meant when he talked about the world as sin."

"Here, the idea of a system and the structure as sinful means . . . that the system can make one sinful, too."

Such thoughts bring up the question of whether a Christian can also be a Marxist. Or whether some of the Salvadorean priests are already Marxists.

Father Mitchell, a theologian, does not find those questions altogether relevant. The archbishop, he said, works "from clear facts and clear injustices. Although there is a liberal theology in the background, he is not working explicitly out of it. He is aware of the Marxist and the liberal analysis, but he is not using it. The injustices and discrepancies are so obvious. The theology he's in is quite faithful to [the pope], Vatican II and Medellín."

Then he added thoughtfully, "If you take the whole idea that there can be 'sinful' structures, then that opens up the possibilities of there also being 'graced' structures. Perhaps it is not sin in the same sense in which we know it, but you can see where selfishness, greed and pride can become encased in cultures and in laws and in economic systems so the thing is positively unjust. It is original sin extended to society. Therefore, the whole idea of grace and redemption is extended to it. Structures can share in grace and redemption. Structures which help people to live a just life have grace."

And Father Healy said, "Didn't the early attitudes toward the Roman Empire treat the system as evil?"

Heady stuff for a primitive country that never distinguished itself in the world for its intellectual, cultural or moral excellence. But then, the priests would add mystically that God always chose the poorest in whom to make his messages known.

Napoleon Duarte, the enormously popular former Christian Democratic mayor of San Salvador who was elected president in 1977 and immediately deposed by the military, said there are three political "fronts" that have emerged: 1.) the priests and Marxists who work together, 2.) the Christians who believe violence is the only solution but not Marxists, and 3.) those looking for a solution somewhere "between humiliation and violence."

"They all go to meetings and provoke the police," Duarte said. "People are ready to kill, and they want people to be killed. At the moment the Marxist ideology is not important to them. What is important is how to get the rich scared. The leaders, however, are the products of the Marxist mind, and the priests have much the same concerns. I would say they're all frustrated and confused but feel there is no other means to solve the people's condition."

Which might cause one to wonder if the priests and the Protestant clergy raising their voices in Washington have done any good.

They have.

With the help of the State Department and others, they have certainly stopped the killing of the priests, although there still are bitter complaints that American officials haven't put enough pressure on the Salvadorean government about the continued "disappearances" of poor peasants. The priests also believe that American Embassy officials in San Salvador haven't done enough. Embassy staff, on the other hand, think they have gone very far, such as holding up that \$90 million loan until the government reigned in the rightist terrorists.

So the tension between the churchmen and the U.S. government continues, though both want the same thing. The differences are a matter of degree and tactics.

Meanwhile, however, the government and church positions have made Western democracy and Christianity respectable among the Salvadoreans.

As to outside forces, Cuban policy there seems to be, as in neighboring Nicaragua, to support guerrilla morale and to provide advice, but not to give money or military help. The Cubans seem to want guerrillas in Central America to support moderate, coalition candidates to decrease the likelihood of "Yanqui" intervention.

The Vatican, meanwhile, is another question. The priests say the apostolic nuncio in Salvador is against the archbishop. He purposely did not attend the honorary ceremony for the archbishop and has spoken out against the Jesuits in ways that many feel is historically untenable. The Vatican itself, however, has not acted—the Jesuits in Salvador feel they have fed enough of their own information back to Rome to balance the nuncio's negative reports.

American priests, in addition to sincere concern for their brethren, have found inspiration, perhaps even salvation, in the situation.

"It is in Latin America these days that it is a tremendously exciting thing to be a priest," Healy said, sitting in the so-different splendor of his Georgetown office overlooking the meandering Potomac. "It is not in North America. It is still true that those of us of intellectual words do not know the front line. Those pastors, like Romero, remind us that the church is the people of God first. Here

is the reality, and it is a good reminder to me. I've been hearing these footsteps all my life."

Drinan had a similar reminder. The usually dry and outspoken churchman speaks with awe about going out one night to the countryside where Father Grande had been killed. The peasant families had chosen an isolated plot to hold the eucharist, a place where the police could not find them in a vast sugar plantation.

"Like the early Christians in the catacombs and the Catholics in the Reformation period in England, we celebrated the eucharist," he said. "Simple peasants came up to embrace me, while others watched on the lookout. They told me, 'My husband disappeared, my brother disappeared . . . It is a torment, but it is so beautiful.'"

The tragedy Healy sees in El Salvador is one that should speak with particular poignancy to U.S. Catholics reared on the memories of suffering Ireland. In a speech last St. Patrick's Day, he said, "The echoes of Ireland are too numerous to deny. We are talking of an agricultural people [in El Salvador] who starve to death on rich land while they farm it. We are talking of distant and absentee landlords who suck the land dry, return nothing to it or the people, and live a safe and protected distance from their oppressed peasants. The only ally they lack is famine—since you can't blight cotton. We are talking of a government tied totally to the power structure and quite content to let the peasants starve if it keeps the rich happy."

"Finally, we see what we have seen so often in Ireland and among the Irish outside of Ireland. When the government looks the other way and the police and the army and the rich and the powerful are all against the little people, the only voice left is that of the church. It has made martyrs before. It may, God help us, make more in El Salvador. If it does, the church and her crown of thorns will be recognizable to every Irishman any place on the face of the earth."

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

London SW1A 0AA, October 1978.

STORTINGETS NOBEL COMMITTEE,
Drammensveien 19,
Oslo, Norway:

We would like to strongly recommend Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames, Archbishop of San Salvador, El Salvador for the Nobel Peace Prize.

There is growing international awareness and concern over the increasing and widespread violations of human rights in so many countries throughout the world. Those who have the courage to speak out against abuses of human rights often run very grave risks. Archbishop Romero is an inspiring example of such a person. Since his appointment as Archbishop, he has consistently and uncompromisingly denounced the numerous arbitrary arrests, detentions, tortures, disappearances and killings taking place in El Salvador today. As a committed man of peace, he has rejected violence from whatever quarter and has advocated social and economic reforms to remove the injustices of El Salvador's poverty-ridden feudal society. Almost alone he has become the champion of the poor and the defenceless. As a result he is subject to daily vilification in the press and elsewhere as insane, subversive, as a man who "sells his soul to the Devil."

On the thirtieth anniversary of the UN Declaration of Human Rights, we feel that Archbishop Romero is a particularly suitable candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize and we hope that the Committee will take his candidature into serious consideration.

Yours sincerely,

THE 1979 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE NOMINATION

A letter signed by 118 Members of Parliament and Peers of all parties was sent today to the Nobel Committee in Oslo nominating Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero, Arch-

bishop of San Salvador in Central America for the 1979 Nobel Peace Prize.

Archbishop Romero has been nominated because of his courageous stand in defence of human rights. Since his appointment as Archbishop he has consistently and uncompromisingly denounced the numerous arbitrary arrests, detentions, tortures, disappearances and killings taking place in El Salvador today. Almost alone he has become the champion of the poor and the defenceless. As a result he is subject to regular vilification in the press and elsewhere as insane, subversive, as a man who "sells his soul to the Devil".

He is a committed man of peace and has rejected violence from whatever quarter and has advocated social and economic reforms to remove the injustices of El Salvador's poverty-ridden feudal society. In recognition of his stand for human rights, he was awarded an honorary doctorate earlier this year by the University of Georgetown, Washington.

The 118 signatories to the nomination (77 Labour, 27 Conservative, 11 Liberal and 3 others) include from the Labour Party, Deputy Party Leader Mr. Michael Foot, Mrs. Shirley Williams, Minister for Education, Mr. Eric Varley, Minister for Industry, Mr. Tony Benn, Minister for Energy, Mr. Stan Orme, Minister of Social Security, Mr. Roy Hattersley, Minister for Prices and Consumers Affairs, Mrs. Judith Hart, Minister for Overseas Development, Mr. Peter Archer, Solicitor-General, Mr. Frank Allaun, current Chairman of the Labour Party. The Conservative signatories include Mr. Norman St. John-Stevas, Shadow Leader of the House, Mr. Mark Carlisle, Shadow spokesman on Education, Mr. John Moore, Vice-Chairman of the Conservative Party and Mr. Peter Walker and Lord Carr of Hadley, former Cabinet Ministers in the Heath administration. The Liberal signatories include the Party Leader, Mr. David Steel and Deputy Leader John Pardo. 13 signatories are Privy Counsellors.

The nomination has been supported by Trade Union Leaders Mr. Joe Gormley (NUM), Mr. Alex Kitson (TGWU), Mr. Jim Slater (NUS), Mr. Sam McCluskey (NUS), Mr. Danny Crawford (UCATT) and Mr. Ray Buckton (ASLEF).

A full list of signatories, together with a copy of the letter to the Nobel Committee is attached. Also enclosed is a background article on Archbishop Romero which appeared in Time magazine of July this year.

For further information contact: Mr. Kevin McNamara M.P., House of Commons; Mr. Gerry Wade, Tory Reform Group; and Mr. Julian Fllochowski, 01-935-5260.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 26, 1979.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE COMMITTEE,
Drammensveien 19,
Oslo, Norway.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: We write to you to nominate Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames, Archbishop of San Salvador, El Salvador for the Nobel Peace Prize.

In a nation notorious for its disregard of basic human rights, Archbishop Romero stands out as an eloquent and unshakable opponent of oppression and violence. In calling for social and economic reform and in condemning government sanctioned violence that has taken the form of widespread "disappearances", arbitrary arrests, murder and torture, Archbishop Romero has become the most prominent spokesman in El Salvador for peace and justice.

He has persevered in pursuit of these noble ends despite the ongoing vilification campaign that has been waged against him. An individual of unsurpassed courage and integrity, Archbishop Romero has not allowed government persecutors to frighten him into silence or submission. He has remained a

forthright and compelling advocate of human rights, nonviolence, and social progress—setting a standard in defense of human liberty which can be applied not only in Latin America, but throughout the world.

Because we believe that Archbishop Romero's conduct is an inspiring example for men and women everywhere who cherish freedom, we are proud to join with many people from various nations in asking that you give serious consideration to awarding Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames the Nobel Peace Prize.

Sincerely,

Members of Congress: Robert F. Drinan, Walter E. Fauntroy, Richard L. Ottin-ger, William S. Moorhead, William J. Stanton, Berkeley Bedell, Thomas J. Downey, Millicent Fenwick, Frederick W. Richmond, Stanley N. Lundine, Baltasar Corrada, William S. Green, Frank J. Guarini, Nicholas Mavroules, Don Edwards, William M. Brodhead, Robert W. Edgar, Tom Harkin, Stephen J. Solarz, Edward J. Markey, Ted Weiss, Vic Fazio, and Michael E. Lowry.

□ 1135

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DRINAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from New York (Mr. Weiss) and I have called this special tribute to the El Salvador Archbishop, Oscar Romero, at a particularly timely moment in the history of this Central American nation. Recent events in El Salvador, and at the Conference of Latin American Bishops in Puebla, Mexico, have brought into focus the continuing polarization between the dictatorial regime in San Salvador, and the people of El Salvador.

The current crisis in El Salvador has only begun to be fully understood by the American people. Yet the continued need for a resolution to the grave human rights violations in that country goes on. El Salvador's human rights record is one of the worst in this hemisphere, with the outlook for improvement—bleak. In the "Report on Human Rights Practices in Countries Receiving U.S. Foreign Aid," recently released by the Department of State, numerous types of violations were cited. Detailed accounts of torture of prisoners by security guards, degrading treatment of prisoners, arbitrary arrests and imprisonments, frequent judicial delays, unwarranted searches of homes and religious sanctuaries, restricted freedom of speech, restricted freedom of the press, and restricted freedom of the right of assembly are cited in the report. Further, untold numbers of administrative improprieties, manipulation, and fraud have impaired the political process. In light of the fact that the El Salvador Government is a signatory to the American Convention on Human Rights ratified in June 1978, clearly the human rights situation in El Salvador in nothing more than deplorable.

During the summer of 1978, the national guard detained two priests, and two church workers; one disappeared for a time and the other three were badly beaten. In July 1978, heavily armed security forces searched an urban Jesuit household for evidence of subversion and

then invaded a rural parish house in an attempt to arrest a local priest. And only very recently, on January 20, a fourth priest was murdered when a band of armed militia units stormed a peaceful, nonviolent, nonpolitical meeting in a parish hall. Through a completely reliable source, and with the assistance of the Washington Office on Latin America, an eyewitness account of this deplorable event has been recorded. I have inserted the report into the RECORD on January 25, 1979, on page 1079. And in an article which appeared in the February 10, 1979, issue of America, Father James R. Brockman, S.J., explores the events in El Salvador firsthand. I am inserting this article into the RECORD at this time:

PERSECUTION IN EL SALVADOR

(By James R. Brockman)

Four parish priests have been murdered in less than two years in the San Salvador archdiocese. In March 12, 1977, Father Rutillo Grande, S.J., died in an ambush between the towns of Aguilares and El Paisnal, along with an old man and a boy. On May 11, 1977, Father Alfonso Navarro and a teen-aged boy were shot while talking in a parish house in San Salvador. Last November 17, security forces killed Father Ernesto Barrera and reported that he died in a shoot out with urban guerrillas in his parish on the outskirts of San Salvador. The archdiocese suggests, however, that he was killed elsewhere and his body taken to the scene of the battle. After the shoot out, an extremist captured with a wound in his throat appeared on television answering questions in writing for the police and journalists. The police later declared that he died of a bullet in the head during the skirmish, and so the only witness to Father Barrera's death disappeared.

Two days ago, Father Octavio Ortiz, pastor of San Francisco Parish, was with a group of teen-aged youths in a retreat house owned by the archdiocese next to the rectory of San Antonio Parish. They were making a "Christian initiation course" with the help of a nun and a laywoman. At about 6 A.M., while all were still sleeping, security forces surrounded the building and sealed off the neighborhood. With an armored car, they broke down the door of the retreat house, named El Despertar, "The Awakening," and entered in a hall of gunfire. Father Ortiz and four of the boys died, the priest of a crushed skull (perhaps the armored car ran over him), the boys of causes that I have not yet learned. Today's newspapers show two bodies on the roof of the building, where the boys may have fled from the bullets or where the police may have placed them.

For the police suggest that the boys were on the roof to shoot at the police. No guns are visible in the photos, however, and the police story is part of an amazing tale told by the security forces of a police patrol peacefully investigating a report of "something strange" going on in the retreat house and meeting gunfire from the building, of returning the fire and entering to find a terrorist training center, complete with a store of firearms and a mimeograph for turning out subversive literature.

The archdiocese immediately denied the Government version of the killings, and yesterday, in a funeral Mass consecrated at the Cathedral of San Salvador, the Archbishop called it "a lie from beginning to end." He went on to contradict flatly President Carlos Humberto Romero, who a few days before had told Mexican journalists that there is no persecution of the church in El Salvador. "There is persecution of the church," said the Archbishop. The presence of the bodies on the cathedral steps, he said, "shows how untruthful that is." His

words could also be translated: "Shows what a liar he is," referring to the President. However, I hesitate to interpret his words so strongly. Either way, once again battle lines seem to be drawn between the two Romeros. The softspoken Archbishop seems an unlikely man for such a role. Two years ago, the Government and the ruling class fought for his appointment, and priests and others committed to a pastoral approach of identification with the poor fought against it. But a few weeks after his installation, high-powered bullets cut down Rutlillo Grande on the road to El Paisnal, and for Oscar Romero the shots were like the bolt that struck on the road to Damascus. Now he is clearly the moral leader of the church in El Salvador, loved by countless thousands of the ordinary people, for whom he speaks and who listen to his words each week on the Catholic radio, YSAX, and supported by his clergy, who know that any of them could be the next victim.

In his homily at yesterday's Mass, he summed up the state of things when he said: "The conflict is not between the Government and the church. The conflict is between the Government and the people. The church is with the people, and the people are with the church, thanks be to God." The Government and the ruling class it represents persist, however, in seeing themselves as beset by an army of terrorists, whom "Marxist" priests abet. Several groups of extremists who presently hold four kidnapped men has frustrated efforts to find them. The Archbishop and the clergy, however, never cease to condemn such tactics and appeal for the release of the captives and against violence. But their appeals for the release of political prisoners, for an end to killing of peasants, for a more equitable social order, are "subversive" and "Communist" to the rulers and to the newspapers that support them. The newspapers, while mentioning the archdiocese's version of the killings and printing pictures of yesterday's concelebration (in two of which America's correspondent appears), nevertheless give greater prominence to the Government's version and carry such banner headlines as "Five Killed in Confrontation" (today's *La Prensa Grafica*), and "Four Dead in Armed Clash" (yesterday's *El Diario de Hoy*). Today's *El Diario de Hoy* places next to the photo of the concelebration an unrelated story headed: "John Paul II Attacks Marxism Again."

Among El Salvador's five other bishops, Archbishop Romero can count on support only from Bishop Arturo Rivera of Santiago de Maria. His own auxiliary, Marco Rene Revelo, opposes him and was pointedly absent from yesterday's concelebration. It is Bishop Revelo that the bishops have elected to attend the Puebla conference. But Archbishop Romero will also be there, albeit without a vote, as a member of the papal commission for Latin America. In his homily yesterday, he asked his people permission to go to Puebla. Those of us who saw their faces and heard their applause do not doubt that he takes with him their support and their hopes.

In January 1978, I accompanied Prof. Thomas Anderson, one of the foremost scholars in North America on El Salvador, and John McAward, director of the international programs of the Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee, on an investigatory mission to El Salvador. During that trip I had the honor of meeting the Archbishop Oscar Romero. I was deeply impressed with this leader by his tremendous strength and commitment to a more righteous, egalitarian society in his country. Since my visit, I

remain convinced that the United States must become fully aware of the events in that nation, and of the remarkable efforts of the archbishop in cultivating human rights.

To honor this special archbishop, who has remained vigilant in the face of great odds, over 20 Members of this body have joined me in nominating the archbishop for the Nobel Peace Prize. This nomination serves as a symbol to the people of El Salvador that the world has not forgotten, nor forsaken their efforts to achieve their rights of fundamental political expression. This nomination will serve as a sign of our gratitude to Archbishop Romero for his lead role in the struggle to secure these rights. I call on my colleagues at this time to join in praise of Archbishop Romero, and to wish him every success in his future endeavors.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend our distinguished colleague for the tremendous leadership role he has asserted in this, as well as numerous other human rights efforts in this country and other parts of the world.

□ 1145

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in bringing to the attention of all the Members of the House of Representatives the work that is being done by Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador. As a cosigner of a letter nominating Archbishop Romero for the Nobel Peace Prize, I praise his commitment to the cause of human rights and a decent living for the people of El Salvador and all people throughout Latin America and the world.

The continued polarization which exists between the poor and the rich in that country has led to violence; just last January 20, another priest was killed and the violence shows no sign of abating. As the recently concluded Third Conference of Latin American Bishops held at Puebla, Mexico, continues to make clear, the job of a priest in Latin America is multidimensional, for they often have to deal not only with the spiritual well-being of their parishioners, but also with the day-to-day problems of subsisting which they face.

Archbishop Romero is an example of a priest who has been able to balance both obligations in order to lead his people toward a better life and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing his efforts.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Puerto Rico for the excellent comments he has made.

□ 1145

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York upon one of the finest statements, if not

the finest statement I have ever heard about the deplorable situation in El Salvador. As a person who has been very familiar with the plight of this tragic country, I commend my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Weiss).

I know that he is going to continue in his crusade to do all that we can, all within our power, to bring about freedom and liberty in that country.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

I am honored to be associated with him in this endeavor.

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in endorsing the nomination of Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero of El Salvador for the Nobel Peace Prize.

El Salvador has one of the poorest human rights records in the Western Hemisphere, and Archbishop Romero has demonstrated remarkable courage in standing up to its brutal regime and defending the rights of the poor.

In the face of countless acts of violence committed against the peasants and the priests who have tried to help them, the Archbishop has responded as a true man of peace. He seeks a nonviolent solution to the enormous political and economic problems of El Salvador. His call for social and economic reforms, however, have met with charges of Communist subversion. His condemnation of tortures and unjust arrests have met with increased persecution of his church.

The Government of El Salvador has attempted in vain to discredit him. The increased international recognition of Archbishop Romero's moral courage and integrity will strengthen his efforts to achieve greater social justice for the people of El Salvador.

He is truly deserving of the prestigious Nobel Peace Prize and merits our support and admiration. ●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to add my words of support for Archbishop Oscar Romero and his nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize. As Archbishop of San Salvador, he has been an outspoken critic of government repression against the peasantry of his country—El Salvador.

El Salvador is Central America's smallest, most crowded country and is typified by a polarization of the rich and poor, the military and civilian. A resulting series of battles has caused the death or disappearance of hundreds of peasants, a number of wealthy businessmen, a government minister and at least two priests. Violations of human rights have been rampant and Archbishop Romero has surfaced as one of the few voices calling for social reform and an end to repression.

Until more just economic and social structures are created, the violence can be expected to continue. And despite the increasing threat of personal danger, Archbishop Romero has continued to speak out against injustice and to aid peasants in need. He has taken a clear stand against violence in expressing his concern for social justice.

Archbishop Romero's efforts to assist the impoverished people of El Salvador

regain "their inherent human dignity" are, indeed, worthy of recognition. He is a champion of the poor and the defenseless and is, in my opinion, an excellent candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize. ●

CONGRESSMAN WHITE COSPONSORING HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION TO AMEND U.S. CONSTITUTION TO ESTABLISH BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

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

● Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, today I address the House both as Congressman RICHARD C. WHITE of the 16th Congressional District of Texas and as chairman of DRO, the Democratic Research Organization. I am joined here by several of my DRO colleagues to announce that I have introduced today, on behalf of myself and 44 other cosponsoring Democratic Members of the House who are members of DRO, a House joint resolution to amend the U.S. Constitution to establish a balanced Federal budget as the norm for managing the Federal Government's fiscal affairs, while providing the flexibility to handle situations when a balanced budget is not feasible.

After long, careful and thorough review of our budgetary situation together with the remedies available, the cosponsors of this proposed amendment and I have reached the conclusion that a constitutional amendment is the only effective way to make a balanced Federal budget the norm. Let me explain how we arrived at this view.

In late 1975 and 1976 the DRO Committee To Investigate a Balanced Federal Budget conducted hearings on this matter. Approximately 40 witnesses were heard from the President's Cabinet, Congress, academia, the Federal Government, and the business world. We studied these 1,600 pages of testimony carefully. Then, in mid-1978, I, as chairman of DRO, again contacted those witnesses who had appeared before the committee to get the further benefit and updating of their views. Only at the culmination of this lengthy process did we reach the conclusion that a constitutional amendment was the only effective remedy. On August 16 and 17, 1978, the committee report on these DRO hearings was published in the RECORD.

Let us look again at the record. Since 1961 the Federal budget has been in deficit every year except one. Conventional economic wisdom holds that budget deficits are beneficial to stimulate the economy in bad economic times, and that, correspondingly, good economic times should produce surplus budgets. Yet, a continuous chain of large budget deficits both in good times and bad has become the general rule since 1971.

We all know that large budget deficits fuel the fires of inflation and that the interest costs of the debt are staggering. The relationship between the deficits and inflation is unmistakable. Since the mid-1960's the U.S. economy appears to have

suffered a permanent shift toward higher rates of inflation. Price increases averaged less than 2 percent a year from 1950 through 1964, but this average yearly rate of inflation almost tripled to 5.5 percent in the next 12 years. In 1978, it was about 9 percent. During the 1950-65 period, the Federal deficit averaged only \$2.6 billion a year. Large deficits occurred during recessions, but the budget moved back toward balance or even to small surplus in periods of prosperity and rapid growth.

After the mid-1960's, all that changed. Federal deficits became much larger, and the budget usually did not move back to balance or surplus during upswings in the economy. Federal deficits averaged \$23 billion a year from 1965 to 1978, which is almost nine times the average deficit for the previous 15 years. During the current fiscal year, when the economy is more than 3 years into a strong recovery, a \$39 billion budget deficit is contemplated. The real problem is the lack of a responsible and disciplined fiscal policy.

Speaking of the need for fiscal responsibility, former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns made the following comment in an interview in the July/August 1978 issue of Public Opinion magazine:

I think we need to introduce some firm discipline into the management of fiscal affairs. Simple majority government has led us into the position in which we now find ourselves—with deficits persisting year in and year out, with inflation itself accelerating in this country at a time when the rate of inflation is diminishing in most other parts of the world. The legislating of deficits by simple majority rule has led to a depreciation of the dollar in foreign exchange as well as in domestic markets. It has led to great uncertainties about the future of free enterprise in our country. It has led also to a lowering of our national prestige.

Whether the rule should be a two-thirds majority in order to run a deficit, or a 60 percent majority, I don't much care. But in view of the experience that we have gone through, something more than a bare majority is needed to regain responsibility in financial and economic management.

Faced with this situation, we have no alternative but to make balanced Federal budgets the norm. ●

● Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor for me, as a new member of this body, to rise to indicate my support for and sponsorship of the House joint resolution requiring a balanced Federal budget introduced by my distinguished colleague, RICHARD C. WHITE of Texas. With the passage of this resolution, the Congress will be taking the next logical step in its effort to build a budgetary process which is manageable, effective, and most importantly, credible to the men and women paying the bills, the American taxpayer.

This amendment, supported by 45 Members of this body, would require a balanced Federal budget, except when we declare a national emergency because of war or economic disaster.

With the creation of the Congressional Budget Office, and the establishment of the Senate Budget Committee and the House Budget Committee, on which I am

privileged to serve, the Congress has provided a method for obtaining the information on which budgetary decisions should be made. That process, although still in its infancy, seems to be working well. No longer must we solely rely on information supplied by the executive branch—information which in the past has so often been self-serving. We must now commit ourselves to taking the next step toward fiscal responsibility. The Federal deficit is, in my view, a major cause of the inflation which is gripping our Nation. It must be stopped in all but the most dire circumstances.

We must no longer ask ourselves only if the people of this country want a program, we must now ask if they can afford a program.

The history of this country over the past 40 years has amply demonstrated that the temptation for legislators not to say "No" to groups continually asking for more funding is simply too great to be overcome through the exercise of self-discipline and self-restraint.

We talk a lot about balancing the Federal budget, but when the time comes to cut spending, we do not respond. I have, therefore, come to the conclusion that the only way to bring spending under control and to balance the budget as soon as possible is to impose the discipline this Congress needs by way of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will force the United States to live within its means. Yet it preserves the ability of the Congress to respond in times of war or economic disaster when unusual measures are necessary to assure the stability of our free market economy.

The country is demanding restraint in spending. Only with the restrictions provided in this amendment can the people be assured of that restraint. ●

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today's special order for the resolution proposing a constitutionally balanced Federal budget is an event worth celebrating. Only a prior, personal commitment prevents my being in Washington to share in the historic occasion—but this statement is a reminder that I am with you in spirit, if not in body.

It is said that all good things come to those who wait. Well, I and all who share my deep concern for the fiscal integrity of our beloved Nation have waited a long time indeed. After working toward this end for so long, now our time has come.

Recent events have indicated that the people have had enough of local and State government spending programs and taxes with ever-upward spiraling costs that are driving up inflation to where it is oppressive to everyone who works for a living—and even those who do not. The same would apply to the Federal Government.

Although I have never been a big spender, neither have I been an irresponsible budget cutter for publicity's sake. I believe, as a Member of the House, that I have used a discerning eye and exercised considerable prudence in reaching final judgment on every program, proposal, or appropriations measure which came before me. So as I ap-

plaud the actions of so many I also caution them in their rush to judgment. The scalpel, not the meat ax, should be employed with skill.

But the sentiment to which the people themselves are now giving expression throughout the country was very much on my own mind way back in 1965, when, on January 4—my very first day in Congress—I introduced the first of eight joint resolutions—spanning a period of 15 years—that called for the balancing of the Government's books. I could not get cosponsors, or hearings, many of my colleagues laughed, but we continued our efforts. And look where we are today.

Though then a lonely voice in the wilderness, I had determined that only an amendment to the Constitution, mandating pay-as-you-go Government—such as we have in the State of Texas—would serve to bring Federal spending under control. And so I introduced in the House a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to provide that Government appropriations should not exceed Government revenues, except in time of war or national emergency.

In the years that followed, other voices were raised, and in each succeeding Congress, they grew louder in their plea for national fiscal sanity. Now dozens of similar congressional resolutions stand beside mine—and I am pleased to add my name to this one, as well as my support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this Congress now consider a proposal whose time has clearly come. The cosponsors of this measure come from both sides of the aisle, and from all over the country. In the present climate, three-fourths of the States should have no trouble at all in transforming an income-outgo resolution into the next amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is not so lonely any more.

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress more than 6 years ago, among the first bills I introduced was a proposed constitutional amendment to require a balanced Federal budget except in times of national emergency. I have continued to sponsor and cosponsor such legislation until this very day, and I am pleased that many States of the Union are demanding such action.

Placing constitutional limits on the power of the Federal Government to incur debt is an extremely important goal. Immense Federal borrowing in the capital markets is an inflationary force.

However, there are difficulties in addressing this problem in terms of balancing the budget. First, there is the issue of off-budget borrowing that will run to \$12 billion in 1979. Secondly, there is the question of how to prepare a balanced budget when the desired result depends on estimates of revenues and outlays affected by changing economic conditions. We also face the issue of how to define a national emergency. And I am constantly aware that a budget can be balanced by increasing the tax burden, a prospect which alarms me.

It is doubtful whether these concerns can be adequately resolved in a constitutional amendment to require a balanced Federal budget, but we can achieve our goals by other means in a constitutional

mandate. I have prepared an amendment which I believe solves some of the major difficulties inherent in the balanced-budget approach, but would bring us to that same result. My amendment says:

Congress shall not make any change in tax law that would increase the revenue of the Federal Government, or take any action that would have the effect of increasing the public debt, except by affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of all Members elected to each House of Congress.

This amendment would cover off-budget borrowing. It controls congressional action on taxes and debt without relying on estimates based upon economic variables. The condition of national emergency is defined by the requirement for a two-thirds vote, which would be extremely difficult to obtain except under conditions of true national emergency.

I have asked for cosponsors on this constitutional amendment. I hope that many Members who have sponsored or cosponsored balanced budget amendments will join me in cosponsoring this formulation that would bring us to the same result.

● Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which the members of DRO have introduced today is the product of 3 years of intense research on the part of myself and my colleagues in the Democratic Research Organization. In 1975, DRO established an Ad Hoc Committee To Investigate a Balanced Federal Budget at my request. As its chairman, I took testimony from 39 expert witnesses including William E. Simon, then-Secretary of the Treasury; Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Dr. Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the President's Economic Advisers; Elliot Richardson, Secretary of Commerce; Carla Hills, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Roderick Hills, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; James J. Needham, chairman of the board of directors of the New York Stock Exchange; Alice Rivlin of the Congressional Budget Office; Elmer Staats, Comptroller General; Dr. Leon W. Taub, vice president of Chase Econometric Associates; and numerous other representatives of government, academia, and business. Consistently and convincingly, the testimony of these witnesses advocated one step toward a health economy: a balanced Federal budget.

And then came 1978. An inflation rate of 9 percent, an unemployment rate of 6 percent, and an fiscal year 1978 budget deficit of \$48.8 billion combined to burden the American public with one of the financially toughest years in recent memory. And, symbolized by proposition 13, the public mandate has also been consistent and convincing: a balanced Federal budget.

In response to urging from both the experts and the public, as well as a growing number of State legislatures (currently the number is 27), DRO established a second committee to develop language for a constitutional amendment, which I also chaired. Again with the guidance of respected economists, we devised an amendment which would re-

quire a balanced Federal budget except in times when a deficit would be necessary or desirable. We defined the areas of Federal expenditures which would be affected by the amendment, and we set forth a process through which any deficit—anticipated or unanticipated—would be swiftly reduced. It is this legislation which nearly 50 DRO members proudly introduce today.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation now has a national debt of \$781.1 billion with an interest charge of \$57 billion for the next fiscal year. We are currently considering a fiscal year 1980 deficit of \$29 billion which, together with off-budget items, could swell to twice this size. The experts tell us that deficits lead to inflation and to unemployment and to lowered productivity and investment. And the public tells us that these figures which we juggle so casually translate into human costs as well.

It is high time that we face reality. We can no longer labor under the illusion that Government spending can solve every problem—that deficit spending will continue to gallop to the rescue and support us forever in this manner to which we have become so accustomed. Deficits are a cause, not a cure, of inflation. And if inflation is allowed to continue, the one dream which we want to sustain—that of competition for every citizen in a climate of freedom and opportunity—will be eroded slowly but surely.

Mr. Speaker, our wants exceed our resources. A budget stuffed to the brim with goodies for specified constituencies may pacify some folks, but a budget trimmed down to the necessities promises to take the edge off inflation and higher taxation for us all. And until we prove that we have learned this economic lesson, we will continue to spawn hundreds of special interest groups that stamp their feet like spoiled children when they do not get a large enough piece of the Federal pie.

After 3 years of study of the problem of achieving a balanced budget, I can well understand the reluctance of certain economists to mandate fiscal constraints which in their view would tie the hands of the Congress and the Executive, making it more difficult to respond to emergencies; to prime the pump when the economy is slow; or to take the opposite steps when the economy is too hot. They are merely stating the ideal and we all know what the ideal is. The political reality is that the Congress and the President have only balanced the budget one time in the last 19 years and the politically sophisticated know that the chances of doing so in the future are almost impossible without some kind of mandatory fiscal restraint. Everyone knows that what we are doing is wrong but those who would correct our misdeeds do not want to reduce spending for their own favorite projects. The result is we continue on an economic merry-go-round year after year.

My district, like yours, is full of frustrated taxpayers who see their hard-earned and sorely needed dollars being spent for exactly what they need the least—bigger, greedier, inflationary Government. As they struggle once again

this year to balance their own personal budgets against the cruel odds of high taxes, high costs, and decreasing purchasing power, let us take steps to pass legislation which will make a balanced Federal budget and a healthier economy a norm, not a luxury. Then, and only then, will we regain our distinction as a Union made of ideals—not appetites.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to reserve this special order in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day and I want to thank all of the Members who are joining me today to help focus attention on the plight of the Lithuanian people who continue to struggle, to pray, and to work for the day when Lithuania can once again enjoy liberty.

Sixty-one years ago, on February 16, 1918, a courageous people proclaimed to the world its right to stand proudly among free countries. The very brief time—less than a quarter of a century—that the Lithuanian people enjoyed the privilege of living in independence has left an important impression on the Lithuanian people, and the years of Communist domination and Nazi occupation have made their love of freedom all the more keen.

Lithuania has been known to history for almost a 1,000 years. During the Middle Ages, education and religious toleration were encouraged, and as a result, the people of Lithuania enjoyed more freedom than their neighbors in adjoining areas. Her people have been strong in faith and spirit surviving as a cultural and political entity during long periods of foreign domination.

One of the first duties of the representatives of the Lithuanian people after they signed the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania on February 16 was the adoption of a national flag for the new state. The new national flag of three horizontal bars symbolized the natural beauty of the Lithuanian countryside as well as the courage of its people. At the top was a bar of deep yellow, symbolic of the golden rye fields and agricultural wealth of the land. In the middle came a rich green stripe, a reminder of the abundant forests and natural resources of Lithuania. The deep red bar at the bottom of the flag symbolized the blood shed by Lithuania's sons in the defense of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the national anthem of Lithuania follows as published in a booklet entitled, "Lithuania," pub-

lished by the Lithuanian American Council of Chicago, Ill.:

NATIONAL ANTHEM OF LITHUANIA

Lithuania, our country,
Land of might you'll ever be;
Through the ages your fond sons
Have gathered strength from thee.
Lithuania, your children
Paths of righteousness shall tread;
For their native land they'll labor
Earth's aspiring aims they've bred.
Fount of light, may your bright sun
Pierce all that's in darkened sheen,
Show us Truth's noble way,
And we'll follow in your gleam.
In our hearts, Lithuania,
Love for you will dwell fore'er
Spirit of the world is soaring
Caught in your exalted glare.

Under the brutal domination of Soviet communism, the Lithuanian people have been under intense pressure to forsake their history and traditions, and to this day, Lithuanians have proudly resisted outside pressures and remain faithful to their language, culture, and religion.

Mr. Speaker, excerpts on the lack of religious freedom in Lithuania from a publication by the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Religious Aid entitled, "In Defense of Human Rights" follows, as well as an excerpt on cultural freedom from a publication by the Lithuanian American Community entitled, "The Violations of Human Rights in Soviet Occupied Lithuania."

EXCERPT FROM "IN DEFENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS"

In 1940, when the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania by force, 85.5% of the country's more than 3 million inhabitants were Roman Catholic, 4.5% Protestant, 7.3% Jewish, 2.5% Orthodox, and 0.2% of other persuasions.

In the two archdioceses and four dioceses were: 708 churches, 314 chapels, 73 monasteries, 85 convents, three archbishops, nine bishops, 1271 diocesan priests, 580 monks, of whom 168 were priests. Four seminaries had 470 students. There were 950 nuns.

Nuns cared for 35 kindergartens, 10 orphanages, 25 homes for the aged, two hospitals, a youth center, and an institute for the deaf-mute.

There were 18 Catholic primary schools, and the same number of Catholic high schools. Religion was taught in all public schools.

Catholic organizations numbered about 800,000 members. In 1935, there were 28 Catholic magazines and newspapers, with a total circulation of 7,000,000.

On June 15, 1940, the Red Army marched into Lithuania; the independent government was replaced by a puppet regime.

On July 14–15, rigged elections were staged. On July 21, with the Red Army surrounding the assembly house, the new People's Diet "unanimously" declared Lithuania a Soviet Socialist Republic.

On June 25, 1940, the Church was declared separate from the state, and the representative of the Holy See was expelled.

Parish lands were confiscated, clergy salaries and pensions were cut off, and their savings confiscated. Churches were deprived of support. Catholic printing plants were confiscated, and religious books destroyed.

On June 28, 1940, the teaching of religion and recitation of prayers in schools was forbidden. The University's Department of Theology and Philosophy was abolished, and all private schools were nationalized. The seminaries at Vilkauskis and Telsiai were closed, and the seminary at Kaunas was permitted to operate on a very limited scale. The clergy were spied upon constantly.

On June 15, 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were packed off in cattle-cars to undisclosed points in the Soviet Union. After World War II, the mass deportations resumed and continued until 1953.

Relaxation of pressure on religious believers soon revealed that the Lithuanian people were still deeply religious. It was decided in the mid-fifties to resume the attack. The principal means of attack would be unlimited moral pressure, since physical terror seemed only to strengthen and unify the faithful.

In 1972, the *Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania*, clandestinely published in that country, began to reach the free world at irregular intervals. Primarily intended to keep Catholics in Lithuania informed of the situation of the Church there, these Lithuanian *samizdat* also serve as a constant appeal to the free world not to forget the plight of a people struggling against overwhelming odds to defend their religious beliefs and to regain their basic human rights.

EXCERPT FROM "THE VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHT IN SOVIET OCCUPIED LITHUANIA"

The situation of the Lithuanian language is difficult. Five times as many Russians are living in Lithuania today than prior to World War II, especially in Vilnius and Klaipeda. Therefore, in some offices it is impossible to make oneself understood in Lithuanian, for instance, in the Vilnius railway station in some post offices, on the street with the policemen on duty, etc. In Latvia, where on the eve of the war there were eighteen Lithuanian schools, they have all been closed. Many lands, recognized as part of Lithuania by the peace treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union, signed on July 12, 1920, today are under the Belorussian administration. Lithuanians are autochthonous in those lands. They have no Lithuanian schools, while in Apasas and Vydzai the churches have been closed; the church of Pelesa, built by Lithuanians after World War I, has been transformed into a warehouse, its towers have been razed, while Rector Vienazindis was imprisoned in 1950. Consequently, Lithuanians in Belorussia have no schools, no churches, and Lithuanian priests are not allowed to take up residence there.

The census data indicate that the number of Russians and of Poles in Lithuania is about equal, but various advertisements, slogans, posters, booklets, etc. in Vilnius are in two languages—Lithuanian and Russian—only. There is a Russian drama theatre in Vilnius, Russian-language classes are set up in Lithuania's higher education establishments, while the Polish language is allowed only in the Vilnius Pedagogical Institute.

The smaller national minorities are faring even worse. During the war, the Jews suffered more than any other inhabitants in Lithuania. Prior to World War II, they had 122 primary schools, three grammar schools, and 14 high schools. At present, the Jews do not have a single school, or a press of their own, although, according to the 1970 census data, there were 16,000 of them in Vilnius alone, and 4,000 in Kaunas. Twenty-four thousand declared themselves as Belorussians in Vilnius, but they do not have their own school and the Belorussian religious services were also abolished in churches in the postwar years. When private schools were forbidden after the war, the Karaites suffered a special loss, because the *Kenese* (Karaitic place of worship. Ed.) of Trakai had a parochial school attached to it; the Tatars also suffered a wrong with the closing of their mosques and schools.

The Lithuanians in Latvia are given the explanation that, if they want to study in Lithuania, they must go to Lithuania, but the Russians are not told that their children should go to Russia to learn Russian. The Ministry of Education has specified that the

curriculum of the senior class in Lithuanian high schools contain only four weekly hours of Lithuanian language and five hours of the Russian language. The same Ministry manages to demand and obtain a fluency in Russian from all Lithuanian graduates, but the same Ministry is helpless to make the same Russian graduates to learn at least a little Lithuanian. The publishing houses have even gone further: in some Lithuanian books Russian texts are now being printed without a Lithuanian translation. Various administrative officials and the press have begun talking about the bilingualism of Lithuanians—the Lithuanians are alleged to like Lenin's language. But what is to be done if in Lithuania itself it is impossible to communicate in Lithuanian?

Today, only old maps of Europe show Lithuania as a distinct entity, but the newer ones display her territory as part of the Soviet Union. However, the U.S. Government and other great Western powers have steadfastly maintained a policy of nonrecognition of the forcible annexation of Lithuania. All Americans must continue to encourage the heroic Lithuanian people in the continuing struggle for freedom and must speak out against the Soviet policies of Russification and their brutal attempts to absorb the Baltic States and destroy them as peoples.

It is for this reason that I introduced a House concurrent resolution, the text of which follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Whereas the United States does not recognize the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

Whereas the United States as a member of the United Nations has pledged, in article 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter, "... to take joint and separate action ... to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion";

Whereas the House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83rd Congress thoroughly investigated the seizure of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union and, in its Third Interim Report, concluded, "The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R.";

Whereas the United States, as a signatory to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, endorsed Principle VIII, relating to equal rights and self-determination of peoples, which states, "... all people always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development..." and, "The participating States ... also recall the importance of the elimination of any form of violation of this principle.";

Whereas the House of Representatives in the 94th Congress, by adopting H. Res. 864 reaffirmed the United States policy with respect to the Baltic nations (and thereby urged positive actions): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union to secure the

withdrawal from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania of all military forces and political, administrative, and police personnel not under the auspices of those respective countries;

(2) another purpose of such negotiations should be to secure the release of political prisoners of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nationality from prisons, labor camps, psychiatric institutions, and other detention centers within the Soviet Union and their return to the countries of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania, as the case may be;

(3) the President should instruct the United States delegation to the preparatory meeting of the 1980 Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to present as specific agenda items—

(A) the illegal seizure and annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and

(B) the denial by the Soviet Union of self-determination and territorial integrity to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union; and

(4) the President should make every effort to gain the support and cooperation of all nations in achieving the objectives of the negotiations set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) and in securing the agenda items set forth in paragraph (3).

Mr. Speaker, I proudly join with Americans of Lithuanian descent in my own 11th district, which I am honored to represent, in the city of Chicago, and all over this country as they share with Lithuanians everywhere the fervent prayer that their bravery and strength of character will soon be rewarded, that right will triumph over injustice, and that Lithuania will be free once more.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what our friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) has done to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives, as he has done in such a constructive way, the desires of the people in Lithuania to be free. The gentleman from Illinois has always been a strong supporter of the concepts of freedom for those who presently find themselves behind the Iron Curtain. My colleague has been a champion of the many people who are literally in chains under oppressive dictatorships and further, he knows that the people in Lithuania look to America for the concepts of freedom and liberty and for support in the hope that some day they will again be a free people and live under true independence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues and the Lithuanian-American community in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is my wish that one day Lithuania will again be a free and autonomous nation and that her heritage of heroism, bravery, and dedication to the right of freedom will continue to be a source of inspiration for all of the oppressed peoples of the world.

It was after World War I that an independent Lithuania emerged as a free nation and declared her independence from a long history of Russian and German rule. The small country's declaration marked the beginning of a fight for freedom and resulted in an independent

nation, truly capable of achieving tremendous social and economic strides.

Today, no flags of independence are flying. The country's independence was seized in 1940 by the Soviet Union and she has remained under Communist dominance for the past 39 years without any opportunity for the self-government she once enjoyed and prospered under. Miraculously, Lithuanians still remember their freedom and they have continually resisted Soviet attempts to destroy their strong unity and identity. An ardent desire for autonomy survives in Lithuania today which is reflected in the way the people steadfastly adhere to their cultural heritage which embraced the value of freedom. It is deplorable that the Soviet Union continues to deny Lithuanian citizens the right to exercise the principle of self-determination and continues to suppress their human rights. As Lithuanians struggle to practice the freedom their declaration of independence once gave them—their culture, literature, customs, and religion, they live in constant fear of Soviet retaliation for these efforts.

As our Nation champions the cause of freedom and human rights throughout the world, let all Americans, Mr. Speaker, show compassion to Lithuanians and hope that some day they will be allowed to realize their God-given rights we enjoy and they once declared.

I thank my colleague for taking this time to bring to the attention of the House a recognition of this important day and what it means as a symbol for freedom.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the special order.

On the occasion of the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence, I wish to give assurances of my continuing support of the efforts of the citizens of Lithuania and of all Lithuanian Americans. Their ongoing struggle to help their homeland of Lithuania once again to regain her freedom and independence from Russia is an example to us all of unquestioning commitment to a worthy goal.

I am proud of the Lithuanians who reside within the 13th District of Illinois, including my friend, Ed Skalsis and my District Administrative Assistant, Dee Kweder Griesheimer. They not only persist in their efforts to keep alive the great traditions and culture of their country, but also earnestly strive to assist their fellow countrymen to regain that valued privilege of liberty which we in this country hold so dear.

I have read the resolution which the Joint Baltic American National Committee has proposed with respect to the feelings of and the efforts by the United States to assist these courageous and freedom-loving people. It is my understanding that Congressman Ed DERWINSKI is planning to introduce a similar resolution soon, and I plan to support

and be an original cosponsor of that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it seems as if the hardships the Lithuanians have undergone in the past 61 years have only strengthened their determination to be free from Russian oppression. As the Lithuanians in my district and throughout the world commemorate this great occasion, I urge them to continue their valiant and dedicated efforts in behalf of the great citizens of this small but important Baltic country.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contributions of my good friends, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY). I am sure that the Lithuanians throughout the entire world will be grateful for their encouraging remarks.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

TAIWAN—A BIPARTISAN ISSUE FOR THE 1980 ELECTIONS

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, some idea of the severe and intensive opposition which followed the sellout of Taiwan by this administration can be gleaned from recent remarks of National Commander in Chief Eric Sandstrom of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Recalling President Franklin Roosevelt's observation when Benito Mussolini invaded helpless France in 1940 that the hand that held the dagger plunged it into the back of its neighbor, Commander Sandstrom stated:

The Republic of China has been accorded the diplomatic equivalent of Mussolini's 1940 action.

Fortunately, the VFW does not intend to indulge in handwringing and commiserating over this tragic action but is looking to the 96th Congress for corrective action on a bipartisan basis. The use of the 7th Fleet "as a shield and guarantor of the Republic's safety" is one specific recommendation by the VFW national commander.

A bipartisan approach to the Taiwan question is, of course, the only way to go as the responsibility for Free China's present tragic state must also be shared on a bipartisan basis. A Democrat administration presided over the fall of Chiang Kai-shek and the mainland in 1949; Republican leaders softened up free world opposition to Red China by visits to Peking; and it remained for the present administration to effect a Jekyll-Hyde transformation of a barbarian regime into one of respectability by diplomatic recognition, while at the same time rendering our longtime friend and ally a geopolitical nonentity.

In true bipartisan fashion Congressman John F. Kennedy in 1949 criticized his own Democratic administration when the Nationalist government fell:

This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away.

Present-day "diplomats and our President" have again further crippled our Taiwan ally and the present home of the free Chinese by helping to remove Taiwan as a recognized state among the family of free nations.

There are almost 30 million veterans in the United States, many of whom were the "young men" cited by John Kennedy in the above-mentioned quote. Concerned veterans, and concerned voters in general, would do well by adopting Commander Sandstrom's directive for the future and getting their message through to Congress:

We will work in a bipartisan way with members in the 96th Congress who share our sense of outrage and betrayal.

I insert at this point the VFW press release of December 18, 1978, along with the exchange of letters between Commander Sandstrom and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.

V.F.W. LEADER: "THE HAND THAT HELD THE DAGGER . . ."

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Mr. Eric Sandstrom, decorated Marine Corps veteran who serves as National Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, today recalled, as applying to President Carter's betrayal of Free China, some words spoken in 1940 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the occasion of Benito Mussolini's invasion of prostrate France: "The hand that held the dagger plunged it into the back of its neighbor."

"The Republic of China," Mr. Sandstrom continued, "has been accorded the diplomatic equivalent of Mussolini's 1940 action."

"The President chose a weekend during the Christmas season with Congress out of session to announce his cave-in to all three Communist Chinese pre-conditions for recognition. His almost covert message, of necessity, spared us any mention of 'human rights' on the Communist Mainland."

"As far as the V.F.W. is concerned:

"We will work in a bi-partisan way with members in the 96th Congress who share our sense of outrage and betrayal."

"We will seek to initiate prompt and practical military steps to assure the security of Free China; for but one example, using the U.S. Seventh Fleet as a shield and guarantor of the Republic's safety."

Mr. Sandstrom concluded by noting:

"I attach hereto copies of recent correspondence, initiated by me, on this matter with Secretary Vance. I note with sadness Mr. Vance's now hollow assurance that 'it is not the intention of the U.S. government to abandon Taiwan.'"

"If the English language has any use as a conveyor of meaning, that is exactly what President Carter has done."

"Finally, the England of the 19th century earned the description of being 'Perfidious Albion' because of the mechanical way in which allies were either sought or shed. We Americans, to this point, have stood by our pledged word. Our people, unlike this Administration, are not cynical."

"I close with a question for the so-called 'realists' who abandoned Free China: how do you think Menachem Begin views American assurances today? And, can you 'realistically' blame him?"

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

OF THE UNITED STATES.

October 5, 1978.

HON. CYRUS VANCE,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There has developed a pattern of U.S. conduct towards our friends

and allies from the Republic of China that may not have been brought to your official attention.

My Washington staff, at my request, has investigated the range of U.S.-Republic of China official contacts and reported to me the following chronology:

(a) ROC Ambassador Shen, among other envoys, met with President Carter at a White House reception which was held for the Diplomatic Corps immediately after the President's inauguration. Since that formal occasion, Ambassador Shen has not had a private audience with the President.

(b) On September 10, 1977, you received Ambassador Shen at the State Department after your August visit to Mainland China. Since then, we have no evidence of any further contact between you and the ROC Ambassador.

(c) Prior to Mr. Brzezinski's visit to Mainland China (May 20-25, 1978), Ambassador Shen tried several times (through Michael Oksenburg of the NSC) to meet with Mr. Brzezinski, but our ally was told that Mr. Brzezinski had no time to spare before his trip. Instead, I understand that Mr. Oksenburg promised Mr. Brzezinski would see Ambassador Shen soon after Mr. Brzezinski returned. Nothing has happened.

(d) Incredibly, no Senior American military official has seen fit to visit the U.S. Taiwan Defense Command since Admiral McCain's period as CINCPAC, some years back.

This pattern apparently pre-dates the current Administration. For but one example, it was only following vigorous V.F.W. objections that former Vice President Rockefeller was added to the U. S. delegation that journeyed to the Republic of China to attend the funeral of President Chiang Kai-shek.

I understand the geo-strategic imperatives that undergird our emerging relationship with Mainland China—principally the 45 Soviet Divisions along the Sino-Soviet frontier which, I suspect, caused the Mainland Chinese to approach us in the first instance.

Two things strike me as being certain:

(1) The Mainland Chinese will develop not respect, but contempt, for an America that does not meet its obligations; and,

(2) We will never make new friends by betraying old allies.

Throughout this period I have been deeply impressed by the magnificent display of correctness and good manners provided by our friends from the Republic of China. We are losing by not listening to them.

I regret that our members and posture have not been equally admirable.

I urge you to:

(a) Meet with Ambassador Shen;

(b) Arrange an appropriate meeting between the Ambassador and President Carter; and,

(c) Permit and encourage the U. S. Military—notably CINCPAC—to visit the Republic of China on Taiwan as a matter of high importance to the command.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter of central importance.

Sincerely,

ERIC SANDSTROM,
National Commander-in-Chief.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 27, 1978.

MR. ERIC SANDSTROM,
National Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SANDSTROM: Thank you for your letter about the United States Government's China policy and our relations with the Republic of China. Let me respond to the points you raised.

Ambassadors do not meet with the President as a matter of course. Nonetheless, Ambassador Shen has had access to a number

of senior Department of State officials. I have met with him, as have the Under Secretary for Political Affairs and the Assistant Secretary for East Asia and Pacific Affairs. Because the State Department is in close and frequent contact with the Embassy of the Republic of China, I do not believe its representatives have encountered any obstacles to the conduct of business with our Government.

Concerning your assertion that "no Senior American military official has seen fit to visit the US Taiwan Defense Command since Admiral McCain's period as CINCPAC," it is a fact that a number of flag and general rank officers have recently visited Taiwan. For example, Vice Admiral Foley (Commander, Seventh Fleet) was there in September, Major General Poston (Commander, 13th Air Force) visited in January and August of this year, and Brigadier General Schwarzkopf (CINCPAC Deputy Director for Plans) was there this month.

Finally, I want to assure you unequivocally that it is not the intention of the US Government to "abandon" Taiwan. The President and I believe that it is most important for peace in East Asia and in the world that the United States achieve a normal relationship with the People's Republic of China.

However, as we have both said many times, in pursuing improved relations with Peking, the Administration has no intention of ignoring the wide range of mutually beneficial relations we maintain with Taiwan or jeopardizing the prospect that the people on Taiwan will continue to live peacefully and prosperously.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE.●

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his very excellent statement, and I deeply appreciate his joining all of us today in paying tribute to the Lithuanian people.

● Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania as we have commemorated it for too many years—with deep sorrow.

In Lithuania today, there is no independence, except in the hearts and minds of the people who seek to be free. There is no independence from the tyranny of Moscow which seeks to eradicate the cultural heritage of a proud people. Nor is there independence from a government in Moscow which has used its might to stifle religious expression.

Daily, Lithuanian citizens seek the rights guaranteed them by the Soviet Constitution and by the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Daily these rights are blatantly violated. The people of Lithuania are denied their basic rights while in their country. At the same time, they are often prohibited from exercising their right to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my prayer that one day we can truly celebrate a Lithuanian independence day on which the people of Lithuania will be free not only in mind and in spirit but in fact.

This is a goal to which we ought to commit ourselves and our Nation.

For too long in too many nations strong and proud peoples have been subjugated—peoples whose contributions to the future of the world would be tremendously enhanced by their freedom.

Lithuania is such a nation.

Perhaps one day the light which did shine 61 years ago today will truly shine again. If that is the case, the world will truly be a brighter place.●

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we live in a country where we have the right to live and express ourselves freely, without fear of government reprisal. Our freedom is so much a part of our lives that we sometimes take it for granted, forgetting that it was won as a result of our forefather's steadfast refusal to accept the rule of an unfair government.

We also sometimes forget that in other countries of the world the rights which we enjoy are denied. We are free to celebrate our Independence Day with patriotic speeches, fireworks, parades, and picnics, but tomorrow Lithuanians will not be able to celebrate the 61st anniversary of their Declaration of Independence from the Soviet Russian Empire on February 13, 1918. Their freedom is only a memory and a dream of the future.

Lithuanians enjoyed just 22 years of freedom from Soviet domination before the Soviet Army invaded and again annexed their country in 1940. Since the Soviet takeover, this once proud and free people have endured an oppressive and tyrannical government. In an effort to destroy the Lithuanians' sense of unity and identity, the Soviets have removed many Lithuanians from the country. Yet the drive and determination of the Lithuanian people to reestablish a free and independent state where they may preserve their historic, religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage lives on.

Lithuanians are a brave people who serve as a source of inspiration for all the world's oppressed peoples. I salute their valiant struggle to regain their freedom and hope that they may soon be freed from oppression. Their plight also serves as an example of what the loss of freedom represents and a warning that those of us who are fortunate enough to live in a free state must continually guard against the loss of freedom and also work to uphold the rights of all peoples who suffer from tyranny.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my distinguished colleagues today in observing the 61st anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

In this day of extensive public concern over basic human rights, we must never forget that national peoples also have basic rights. Preeminent among these is the right to self-determination and self-governance, free from foreign oppression. In the last 60 years, however, Lithuania has enjoyed but two decades of independence. Caught between Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, Lithuania's independence, though courageously defended, was finally ground into oblivion by the Soviet Union's onslaught.

Not content with the forcible annexation of Lithuania, the Soviet Union embarked on an even more brutal policy of subjugation. In case after case, helpless people whose one desire was to live in peace under their own government, were torn from their families and shipped to the Soviet Union's bleak gulag archi-

pelago. There, many would vanish in the trackless wastelands of Siberia, victims of numerous incidents of gross inhumanity.

Yet despite this blatant oppression, which surely would have broken less resolute people, the Lithuanians have struggled to maintain their national character and their hopes for the day when, once again, the light of freedom will shine throughout their land.

Though the circumstances prompting our observance today are tragic, the courage of the Lithuanian people should serve as a reminder that as long as freedom-loving peoples suffer the mantle of aggression, the struggle for human rights, both national and individual, must continue. Let us hope that liberty, the very essence of democracy, will one day soon prevail in Lithuania.●

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues and my friends throughout the Lithuanian-American community and commend them for their laudable efforts in commemorating the 61st anniversary of their independence.

It has been 61 years since the Lithuanian people displayed their high degree of respect for human dignity and fundamental freedoms by declaring their independence from Soviet Russia.

In the years between 1918 and 1940, Lithuania attempted to develop its economic and social sectors while keeping its basic respect for man in the forefront. Lithuania's adherence to the principles of individual freedom, however, failed to impress its neighbor. The tragic historical domination of Lithuania by Russia was reimposed by the Soviets in an action designed to forestall an attack by Nazi Germany.

Despite continued Soviet dominance in recent decades, Mr. Speaker, the commitment to individual freedom and national sovereignty continues in Lithuania today. Human rights activists including Balys Gajauskas, Viktorus Petkus, Jonas Petkevicius, and countless others courageously express the Lithuanian yearning for democratic freedoms. The samizdat publications, including *Ausra*, the *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church*, *Varpas*, and others provide an unofficial alternative to the monotonous, Soviet-controlled media, which stifles free speech and debate and alters accurate reporting of internal conditions in Lithuania.

This continued commitment to individual rights and fundamental freedom reflects the remarkable spirit of the Lithuanian people, who continue undaunted in this commitment even in the face of continued Soviet domination. I offer my personal and sincere commendation for this commitment, and hope that the yearning of all Lithuanians for a restoration of human rights will soon be fulfilled.●

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

This tiny Baltic State enjoyed freedom in this century for only a short time.

The independent Republic of Lithuania was established on February 16, 1918 and was extinguished when 300,000

Soviet troops overran the country in 1940.

Lithuania never again enjoyed republican freedoms, or its own autonomous government.

Today, that short lived period of independence is still a bright memory for many Americans of Lithuanian descent, who will not let the world forget that their country is one of the Captive Nations of Eastern Europe.

The Captive Nations—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, were all taken over by the Soviets, who depopulated these countries of their native inhabitants in order to quell dissent.

Once a people experience the beginnings of free government, however, not even violence and terror will subdue that memory.

Hopefully, the stubborn refusal of the Lithuanian people to give up hope of freedom will serve as a beacon to others in the world, and help us appreciate here in the United States the precious freedoms we enjoy.●

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, February 16 will commemorate 61 years since Lithuania declared her independence. Unfortunately, only for a brief period since that time has she actually been free. As we pay tribute to this courageous state, we are reminded of our own country's struggle for independence.

During the 20 years since 1918 in which Lithuania was a democratic state, the nation experienced great cultural and intellectual growth. This golden era brought advancements in the areas of agriculture, literature, and opera.

Unfortunately, since the Soviet takeover in 1940, the brave Lithuanians have experienced severe oppression. But the determination of these great people have enabled them to continuously persist in their goal of freedom. Their spirit is uncrushable. Recognizing the persistence of this attitude, we can anticipate Lithuania's ultimate victory.●

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join my colleagues in extending warmest regards to the Lithuanian people on the eve of their 61st independence day.

In 1918, Lithuania proclaimed independence from Russia and Germany, and established a democratic government. Shortly thereafter, a peace treaty was signed with the Soviet Union under which the Soviets recognized "without any reservation the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania" and "voluntarily and forever renounced" any rights over the Lithuanian people and territory. This treaty, however, was disregarded following the Hitler-Stalin pact, and by 1940 Lithuania was once again under Soviet control. Since that time, the Soviet Government has consistently oppressed traditional Lithuanian customs and culture, and sought to stifle dissent from established party policies. I am happy to report, however, that the spirit of Lithuania could not be dominated, and that increasing protest has yielded some measure of relief from this oppression.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union, the United States, and many other nations

signed the 1975 Helsinki accords seeking a new recognition of human and national rights. The Soviets have dishonored this agreement through the continuing suppression of these rights in Lithuania and the other Baltic States. Now it is our duty to encourage fulfillment of the ideals embodying the "spirit of Helsinki." Accordingly, I applaud the determination of the Lithuanian people to reclaim their national heritage. The strength and perseverance of their spirit should be an inspiration to our own.●

● Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have addressed this Chamber commemorating the anniversaries of Lithuanian Independence Day and expressing the sense of outrage felt worldwide concerning Soviet violations of human rights in that country. We all hoped that the 1975 signing of the Helsinki accords would finally force the Soviet Union to bestow upon its citizenry the basic and fundamental rights enumerated in its constitution. Sadly, this has not been the case.

On February 16, 1979, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent will celebrate the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and once again I come before this Chamber to extend my very best wishes to the people of Lithuania and to all Americans of Lithuanian descent. I wish that I could report some major progress of human rights in that and other Eastern European countries under the domination of the Soviet Union. While the Helsinki accords have increasingly focused world attention upon the violation of human rights made by the Soviet Union, it has only encouraged Moscow to crack down upon dissidents demanding compliance to the treaty.

Lithuanian dissidents have helped spearhead this movement and at the same time have suffered the consequences of their brave actions. Political and religious persecution continues unabated today. Dissidents have increasingly been harassed and interrogated by the Soviet KGB. If they are arrested, their trials become a mockery of justice.

The people of Lithuania have struggled long and hard to maintain their sense of cultural identity and independence in the face of continued Soviet pressure to do otherwise. Americans of all backgrounds support this struggle of the Lithuanians and will continue to demand that the Soviet Union comply with the Helsinki accords.●

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, Americans of every national origin today reflect on the 61st anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania. The American-Lithuanian community can be especially proud that despite the adversities of cultural, political and economic oppression, Lithuania remains a distinct and vibrant political community. The Lithuanian people continue to resist the suffocation of Soviet assimilation despite all official efforts to suppress Lithuanian national identity and self-expression.

Today is a time for reflection, but it is even more a time for hope. Hope that Lithuanians around the world will continue to call attention to this important

day in human freedom. Hope that Lithuanians will continue to resist the illegal occupation of their territory and interference in their lives by an imperial power. And, above all, hope that Lithuania will once again be free to decide its own national welfare and destiny.

The United States has never recognized Lithuania and her sisters Estonia and Latvia as Soviet entities, and America should continue this policy of self-determination in Eastern Europe. Our own Nation was born in self-determination, and we must never forget our revolutionary heritage. Let our example, both painful and glorious, stand as a monument to freedom of national choice. Let us plot our own course and, yes, make our own mistakes. We demand no less for ourselves and we should demand no less for others. May Lithuania again enjoy those freedoms which many in America have come to regard as routine, and may the Lithuanian people keep that spirit which will make those freedoms a reality.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate in this observance of Lithuanian Independence Day, which is a day of mourning for freedom lost.

We think today of the great and ancient civilizations of Eastern Europe which have been conquered by the Russian Empire and endure the tyranny imposed by the Kremlin.

Some, like Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, retain the legal status of independence while they are held by threat of overwhelming military power in the grasp of the Soviet despotism.

Others, such as Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, have literally been swallowed into the Soviet Union, which brutally attempts to stamp out any spirit of national independence.

We honor Lithuania today. We honor those Lithuanians who keep the flickering hope of independence alive in their suffering land. We honor those who have given their lives for Lithuanian independence.

But we also remember the patriots of the other captive nations and their unceasing quest for independence, and we should be thankful for the freedom we enjoy and strengthen our determination to defend it.●

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We mark that independence best by sharing one of the goals of AUSA, one of the remaining journals of Lithuanian culture, and look to the future of this and other Captive Nations. That future depends upon the continued and expanded exercise of Lithuanians' basic human rights—the right to their language, their religious heritage, their literature, their music—rights essential to the maintenance of an independent national character.

Despite the crushing weight of Soviet domination for over 40 years, Lithuanians have struggled to maintain their national character. Ethnically distinct from their oppressors, many Lithuanians have been deported from their homeland to even the eastern parts of Soviet Asia, splitting families in the process. One of the last peoples to convert to Catholicism in Europe, Lithuanians' close affiliation

with the Catholic faith endures in the face of outright elimination of their religious institutions. Possessed of one of the oldest Indo-European languages to survive upheavals in European migrations, and foreign occupations, Lithuanians must tolerate continuing pressures to abolish the use of their native tongue.

Testimony to Lithuanians' persistence and desire to maintain their cultural identity is the high rate of listening in Lithuanian to broadcasts of overseas radio stations. Statistics indicate that especially frequent listeners are those under 30 years of age, and the better educated segments of the population. And all Lithuanians constitute a larger than normal population of those preferring broadcasts in their native language rather than Russian, the so-called official language.

Most disappointing is the complete subjugation of Lithuanian political institutions, and discouragement of learning in studies of Lithuanian history and literature. Lithuania, historically an important independent state in Eastern Europe, in modern times has known only a brief flourishing of political liberty and self-determination. Nonetheless, Lithuanians have kept alive and intact their national character even today. The restoration of the rights of national existence, and of other basic human rights, must be accorded a high place in Western policy toward Lithuania. Lithuanians have earned it because, as Father Svarinskas has said: "In Lithuania, everybody is a dissident."

The expansion of these basic human rights necessary to the identity of the Lithuanian national character must be supported by the United States. We have never recognized the bloody takeover of that nation by the Red Army in 1940. We have pursued the development of human rights in Lithuania through the vehicle of the Helsinki agreements. We must now take steps to further aid Lithuanian liberty.

This can best be accomplished by heeding the advice of expatriate Lithuanian Tomas Venclova:

If the Soviet leaders are convinced that protests about persecutions in Lithuania are not merely a temporary expedient of the West, but will lead to a consistent and steadfast policy on the part of the West, they will have no choice but to recognize this. . . .

Americans everywhere share the sentiments of Tomas Venclova. Congress has repeatedly expressed its ongoing dedication to the struggle for Lithuanian freedoms. We in Congress will lead a "consistent and steadfast policy" of opposition to the suppression of the Lithuanian national character. We will encourage all Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans to keep the torch of liberty burning brightly by the courageous examples modern Lithuanians offer us.●

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognition of the 61 anniversary of Lithuanian independence, celebrated to commemorate the brief flicker of independence in 1918, so quickly and sadly extinguished in 1940. But we can take heart at this time with the spirit of the Lithuanians and all the Baltic peoples in their resist-

ance to Soviet domination. These people wish only to pursue their customs without being forced to lose their distinctive character to the ways of the Soviet Union—to carve out a meaningful existence, free of Soviet constraints and restrictions.

The Lithuanian people have struggled valiantly, provoking revolts in the late 1800's and the early 1900's, and regaining their freedom. The proud spirit of these people has never succumbed, and their dream of independence continues to flourish. Their spirit and their desire for freedom will not be easily diminished. Today, we renew our support and encouragement to them in their struggle for self-determination.

It is particularly important that we understand the significance of the Baltic nations and the importance of the maintenance of their distinctive cultural and ethnic identities. The Soviet Union has forced numbers of Baltic peoples to move into central Russia, and forced emigration of Russian peoples into the Baltic States, thereby lessening their national cohesiveness and cultural uniqueness. Despite these attempts to dilute the language, religion and culture of the Baltic people, they continue to speak in their own tongues, worship in their own way, and maintain their own distinctive customs. In light of the many obstacles before them, the efforts of these people are truly remarkable.

The free exercise of human rights has always been the example set by the United States. We should reach beyond example setting, however, and see to it that the theme of human rights is felt around the world. The support of people, like ourselves, in the free countries of the West is imperative to the spirit and high hopes of the Baltic people who yearn for their freedom. We must affirm continuing support for Lithuanian independence and the independence of her sister states. As a people who cherish liberty as much as we, the gallant Lithuanians have suffered hardship and loss in their struggle to determine their own destiny. Their cause must not be abandoned. Today, we pause to remind ourselves of our good fortune to be able to live in this free land, and hope that some day, the people of Lithuania may also be able to enjoy these same freedoms.●

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. On this day, I wish to commend the bravery and determination of the Lithuanian people. After 123 years of Russian domination, at the close of World War I, Lithuania became a sovereign and independent state.

They adopted a republican form of government based on strong democratic principles. In 1920, Russia recognized Lithuania as an independent nation, dissolving any rights of sovereignty over her. However, their independence was short lived. After only two decades of freedom, Lithuania was again taken over by the Red army during the Second World War.

The people suffered greatly under Soviet occupation. Many were deported to Siberia; others who were political pris-

oners were executed. Following Soviet occupation, Nazi Germany moved in and overtook Lithuania. Almost all Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazis. When the Nazis lost control, Lithuania was retaken by the Soviet Union and all of Lithuania was occupied.

Since then the Lithuanian people have been subjected to immense cruelties. All who practice religion are persecuted for their beliefs. Human rights are virtually nonexistent.

Through all of this, the people of Lithuania have continued in their quest for independence. They have not given up hope that they will again someday be a free nation. On this day, let us reaffirm our stand that basic human rights be the inherent right of all people. Let us remember today that the rights we so often take for granted are the same rights that other people struggle all their lives to obtain. Today we commemorate such people, those of Lithuania who have never given up and have maintained their freedom loving spirit in their battle for independence. We offer them our support and blessings.●

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to take this opportunity and join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On this day in 1918, the Lithuanian people broke a long period of Soviet domination and declared themselves an independent nation.

Oppressed for centuries because of their geographical location, Lithuanians have suffered invasions from the East by the Russians and from the West by Teutonic knights. They have demonstrated incredible spiritual and ethnic strength by surviving these continued attacks.

Ever since this gallant Baltic country was incorporated into the Soviet Union by the Russians, the Lithuanians have struggled to throw off the chains of their conquerors. Thousands of these freedom fighters have sacrificed their lives in an attempt to secure independence for their beloved country. From 1944 to 1952 alone, approximately 50,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters gave their lives as part of an organized resistance movement. However, the cessation of armed guerrilla warfare has not resulted in the end of resistance against Soviet domination. Rather it has created the impetus for the introduction of passive protest.

Even today, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of their right to national self-determination, and religious and political freedom continues despite Soviet oppression. With this in mind we must attempt to match the courage of Lithuania by reaffirming our dedication to the principles of self-determination and human rights.

As a nation, it is our obligation to confront the Soviet Government with the fact that despite being cosigners of the Helsinki Accords, they have blatantly ignored many of the provisions guaranteeing human rights. We must continue to speak out against the denial of human rights and not succumb to any temptations which permit us to neglect the inhumane treatment of those less fortunate.

nate throughout the world. Instead, we should continue to fight vigorously for those rights to which all people are entitled.

On this day as all others, we should extend whatever support we can to the people of Lithuania and their dreams for freedom. Let us all hope for the day in the future when our Lithuanian friends can celebrate their renewed independence as a nation free from outside domination and oppression.●

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be here today to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. During the past two decades we have heard much talk of civil and human rights; but it is sometimes forgotten that national rights are an integral part if not the basis of all other rights.

National rights define the right of a people to retain its ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic identity. It is the very basis from which a nation can begin to address the problem of granting to its citizens the human and civil liberties they absolutely deserve.

The Lithuanian people enjoyed this national right from 1918 until 1940 when they were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed to the U.S.S.R.

During their 22 years of independence Lithuania made considerable progress in its social, cultural and economic life. A constituent assembly was elected in 1920 and a democratic constitution was adopted. Lithuania was also the first post-World War I European country to institute a radical land reform program. As a result, 717,968 hectares were redistributed to the farm population; about 89 percent of the rural population became landowners.

In 1940 the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania ending its brief modern nationhood. There followed a new colonial era for this proud people. Mass deportation of thousands of dissidents was reported by the Lithuanian Red Cross. Western books and publications were forbidden, land was nationalized and many churches were either closed down or converted for other uses.

Despite the drastic measures taken by the Soviet Union in its efforts at domination and Russification, the proud nationalism and uniqueness of Lithuania survives today.

The United States supports the Lithuanians in their drive for national self-determination by refusing to recognize the illegal Soviet invasion. Our country continues to recognize the diplomatic missions from the last independent Lithuanian Republic, along with the Latvian and Estonian missions.

For our part we are here today to offer our support for this small but vital country and to recognize its continuing struggle for nationhood. A right which is basic to all other rights.●

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps less difficult to be courageous and expressive in a society which encourages its people to vocalize and indicate the extent to which they cherish freedom and liberty.

Although even in a free society, its people must be always alert and watchful in safeguarding those freedoms, it

takes a very special sense of courage to continue the struggle for human and religious freedom when none exists.

And, so it is with the people of Lithuania, whose independence as a nation became nonexistent in 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded and absorbed the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

February 16 marks the 726th anniversary of the coronation of Mindaugas as the first Christian King of Lithuania. It is an anniversary of considerable significance. It reminds us that, for two centuries following that coronation, Lithuania was a powerful force for freedom throughout Eastern Europe. Not only did Lithuania enjoy broad political, cultural, and commercial relations with her neighbors, but in her belief in independence through strength, she also kept in check the German drive to the east, and the assaults of the Mongols and Tartars against the west.

Through subsequent subjugation, born of the duplicity of the Czarist Russia of the 18th and early 19th centuries, the people of Lithuania never lost their Christian faith nor their burning desire to again be free. That moment came, appropriately enough, on February 16, 1918. For the next 2 years, Lithuania again made marked progress in economic, social, and scientific fields. Then, in the World War II year 1939, the great people of Lithuania again fell victim to international greed and duplicity, this time through the signing of the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact with which Hitler-ruled Nazi Germany and the Stalin-ruled Soviet Union drew their blueprint for the division of Eastern Europe between them.

Little more than a year later the famous Lithuanian flames of faith and freedom were dimmed anew. Supported by armor and air power, a Soviet Red Army force of 300,000 rolled into, and over, that essentially agrarian land. Yet, to keep these people in check, it became necessary for the Kremlin to station 1 armed soldier there for every 10 or 12 inhabitants, as Lithuania was ruthlessly absorbed into the Soviet Union.

But, again, the incredible character of the Lithuanian people, with their tremendous faith, and their undying dedication to freedom showed itself. This was documented no better than in the 1954 report to the Select Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression, chaired with such great distinction by the late Honorable Charles J. Kersten of Wisconsin.

That chilling report contained a document which, drafted and executed by Soviet General Ivan Serov, listed more than 100 categories of people as subject to arrest, deportation, and mass human extermination. Carried to the extreme, that heinous Red plan provided for the elimination of virtually every man, woman, and child except a member of the Communist Party of unquestioned reliability.

By the time the Kersten report was issued, Soviet occupation of Lithuania was in its 14th year. Her people had been submitted to one of the most brutal occupations in modern history. One-sixth of

the population had been shipped, in chains, to Russia or Siberia. Others had been killed outright. The Catholic Church, to which 85 or 90 percent of the Lithuanian people belonged, had been severely persecuted. Armed guerrilla resistance had ended. Passive resistance had taken over. It continues today, driven by devoted religious feeling, fierce national pride, and that equally fierce Lithuanian desire for freedom.

In 1975, preceding the European Security Conference in Helsinki, several of my colleagues joined with me in introducing a resolution that it be U.S. policy that the Soviet annexation of Lithuania (as well as Latvia and Estonia) should in no way be honored with U.S. recognition.

As my colleagues know, of course, this resolution was passed unanimously by this body and, in turn, by the Senate. Then, both before and after the Helsinki Conference, then-President Ford reaffirmed that policy. Consequently, the non-Communist Chargé d'Affaires of the Lithuanian Legation here in Washington, like his Latvian counterpart here, and Estonian counterpart in New York, remains recognized by our Government as the true representative of his people.

Together with his Latvian and Estonian colleagues in freedom, the Lithuanian Chargé d'Affaires continues to provide us with valuable insights with which we can compare the Soviet promise at Helsinki with the Soviet performance in Lithuania and in her Baltic sister states.

Monitoring that performance, officially, for our Government, of course, is our Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Established by the Congress, the Commission is, as my colleagues know, composed of six Members of the House, and six Members of the Senate, with one member each from the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce.

The Commission has advised us that, in the Soviet Union, the initiatives of some citizens, in particular the brave actions of Viktoras Petkus, "in support of (Helsinki) Final Act compliance have been answered by acts of repression," and that such acts "are jeopardizing progress toward the overall goals of the Final Act."

Sadly, that information, coupled with information from the Lithuanian American Council, the Lithuanian Human Rights Commission, and the Joint Baltic Committee, leaves no doubt that much remains to be done before the Soviet promise of freedom is matched by Soviet performance.

The undaunted spirit and the determination of the people of Lithuania have somehow filtered through the iron wall of Soviet domination. By commemorating the occasion of their former independence as a nation, hopefully, the support and encouragement of the American people will permeate that iron wall and will clearly indicate to the Lithuanian people that they are being seen and heard, clearly and loudly, by a nation which remembers.

I know that on this meaningful 726th anniversary of the Mindaugas coronation, my colleagues join me in the hope and prayer of the Lithuanian people that freedom—true freedom—will, one day, be

returned to that great and noble country, as well as to her Baltic sister states.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1979, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuania's establishment as a modern Republic. Established in 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was overrun by Nazis 22 years later when Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

The Lithuanian people, while under Communist domination, continue to actively work for the restoration of individual human liberties which they enjoyed between 1918 and 1940. While the dedication to human freedom symbolized by the brief existence of the Republic of Lithuania has been suppressed, it should serve to remind us just how important the intangible freedom really is.

Even those Lithuanians who have left their homeland, continue the quest for Lithuania's freedom. The pride and peace-loving nature of these people has become part of their national heritage and I want to commend Lithuanians throughout the world for their strength and determination as they continue their course toward freedom and independence.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, superior force may hold a people prisoner, but it cannot capture their dreams, hopes, and aspirations. This fact is reaffirmed every day as the people of Lithuania reject Soviet efforts at Russification and continue to maintain their religion, their culture, their identity, and their dream of once again being free.

This month, we in the Congress join with Lithuanian Americans across the country, and with the people of Lithuania in observing February 16 as the anniversary of their independence.

The commemoration of Lithuania's independence, however, is markedly different from our Fourth of July celebration. For unlike our country, the sovereign nation of Lithuania presently exists only in the hearts and the minds of her people, and of people, everywhere, who cherish freedom.

Sixty-one years ago, the people of Lithuania, along with their Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, fought and won their independence from Russia to reestablish themselves as sovereign nations. Under this independence, Lithuania flourished and experienced progress in all areas—land reform was instituted, industries reestablished, transportation facilities expanded, social legislation enacted, and educational institutions enlarged.

Yet this new independence was to last for only 22 years. In a swift and brutal move, Soviet forces rolled over these nations and imposed their tyrannical yoke in 1940.

Only the people of these Baltic nations know the true cost of these 39 years of subjugation. We have seen glimpses of the cost in terms of the lives lost through the Soviet's extermination practices and the exile of the people to Siberia. We were reminded of the tyranny being experienced when we saw the unsuccessful escape attempt of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, and the self-immolation

of Romas Kalanta. Most recently, we witnessed the charade of a "fair" trial as Lithuanian dissident, Viktoras Petkus, was sentenced to a prison term of 15 years. His crime was that he was a member of a Lithuanian group which tried to oversee compliance by the Soviet Union to its human rights commitments made under the Helsinki accords.

Mr. Speaker, if the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were really part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the evidence clearly shows that the Soviet Union is not living up to its pledge, under the Helsinki accords, to guarantee human rights to her people. However, by its continued subjugation of these sovereign Baltic nations, an even greater injustice than the breaking of her pledge is being perpetrated—the Soviet Union is denying the most basic principle of self-determination to these people.

During these past 19 years, we have never recognized these nations as part of the Soviet Union, and we must never do so. The people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States have clung to their hope of freedom. As we commemorate their brief independence, let us once again reaffirm our support of their aspirations and express our hope that they may celebrate the next independence day as free and independent nations.●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1979, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent throughout the United States will commemorate the 61st anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania and the 728th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State. I wish to join my colleagues and the Lithuanian American community in commemorating this anniversary observance of Lithuanian Independence Day and salute the people of Lithuania who steadfastly cling to the richness of their cultural heritage and seek freedom of expression, religion and basic individual human rights in the country of their birth.

As we reflect on the history of the Lithuanian, we look to the country of Lithuania situated at the southern end of the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea, right at the European continent's geographic center. Historians tell us it emerged as a unified state in the early decades of the 13th century and became internationally recognized as the Kingdom of Lithuania in A.D. 1251.

After centuries of vast expansion eastward and southward, in 1569 Lithuania became a partner in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which lasted till 1795 when it was partitioned between Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Lithuania fell under the Russian rule.

Lithuania succeeded in reestablishing its independence in 1918, at the end of World War I but was occupied again in 1940 by the armed forces of Russia, now known as the Soviet Union.

In the past the Congress was instrumental in establishing the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Public Law 94-304) to monitor international compliance with the Helsinki agreements. We also reaffirmed our Nation's policy of nonrecognition of the legality of the 1940 incorporation into

the Soviet Union of the independent states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I was pleased to sponsor and vigorously support these congressional resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that there is a continuing need for concerted action in mustering world opinion as a viable force in achieving universal understanding and agreement on basic human rights principles to eliminate government controls that dominate the personal freedoms of the individual to live and worship in the land of his or her choice and stifle the independence and sovereignty of a nation of people.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey, I join in the annual observance of our Lithuanian heritage and trust that through our mutual endeavors and responsibilities that we will strive to continue to achieve international understanding and agreement that will eliminate the oppression of people and restore "human rights" and the rights of self-determination by the people of Lithuania and other captive nations of the world.●

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak on the anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day.

It was February 16, 1918, that the Baltic State of Lithuania declared its autonomy from the long period of Russian hegemony and German occupation it had suffered during World War I. This tiny state was again destined to fall under Soviet domination; Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. in 1940. Having fallen into Nazi hands, Lithuania was reoccupied by the Soviet Union in 1944, and has been considered a component republic by the Soviet Union ever since. The United States never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania or any other Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

Soviet policy implementation during the Stalin years forced a dramatic change in the composition of the Lithuanian population. Some 80,000 Lithuanians fled to West Germany when the Soviets took over the Baltic region in 1944. An additional 60,000 were found in East Germany and deported during 1945 and 1946. Their passive resistance to the collectivization of agriculture brought the deportation of some 60,000 Lithuanians in 1949. The death of Stalin eased these displaced people, and about one-third of those who had been deported were permitted to return to their homeland. Yet, this cannot erase past cruelties committed by the U.S.S.R., nor the continuing effort by the Soviets to destroy the Lithuanian national spirit.

The Soviet constitution supposedly guarantees freedom of religion. Yet in the past 3 years, the Soviets have greatly increased terrorist tactics perpetrated against the faithful and all readers of religious publications. The most vitriolic attacks have been leveled against readers of chronicles of the Catholic Church. The Lithuanian population is 90 percent Catholic, and this group has lost their jobs, or worse, because of their religious tenets.

Lithuania is a travesty of international

justice. The U.S.S.R. signed the Helsinki agreement, yet Lithuania has yet to be granted any human rights that were called for in the agreement. Soviet authorities prohibit the speaking of Lithuanian in public. Reading materials are controlled and censored by the Government. The citizens of Lithuania are subject to unexplained and unwarranted searches. In late 1977, reports leaked out of the Soviet Union telling of thousands of Lithuanians rampaging the streets of Vilnius, shouting anti-Soviet and nationalist slogans. Police cars were set on fire, windows were smashed, and Soviet propaganda banners were torn down. Soviet troops patrolled the streets to restore order.

It is good to be reminded today that this noble country, which was once free, is not the subject of the violent repression of the Soviet Union. The 1 million Lithuanians living in this country have certainly not forgotten this fact. For it is only by remembering their repression that we can strive to alleviate the conditions of this satellite of Soviet hegemony that we can prevent further encroachment of this hegemony. And, perhaps, one day it will be possible for us to be commemorating another day of Lithuanian independence from the U.S.S.R.●

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

The restoration of the Republic of Lithuania is a high point in Lithuanian history, and it is painful for us to realize the suffering that has occurred there under foreign domination over the past four decades. The Lithuanians are a brave people who yearn for freedom, and the massive violation of human rights that occurs simply by this denial of political freedom is an outrageous indignity.

This is a day to remember past independence and to look forward to and work for the day when the Lithuanian people will be free to form their own, independent government. Only then will this annual event be the real celebration it ought to be.●

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence on February 16 again reminds us of the pursuit of independence not realized in Lithuania for nearly 40 years. At a time when the cause of human rights has been raised as a guiding principle of American foreign policy, it is appropriate that we once again call to the attention of all the sad plight of the people of Lithuania, a nation occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940 and still held under the yoke of Soviet domination.

Because the Lithuanian people have been unwilling to abandon the ideal of national integrity which illuminated their national integrity which illuminated their existence for a brief 22 years, they have been systematically uprooted and dispersed from their homeland in an attempt to destroy their identity. More than one-fourth of the population has been relocated, many dying in the process. The continued dedication of Lithuanians and other Baltic peoples to the

struggle for freedom must command the respect and admiration of freedom-loving people everywhere.

To further the hopes and efforts of these courageous people, I sincerely hope that we will implement the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 416 and reaffirm our commitment to Lithuanians who continue to strive toward the realization of liberty, independence and human dignity in the face of totalitarian oppression.●

● Mr. LEDERER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to rise and join with me in accordance with the special order to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, for 22 years, Lithuania was a free and independent state which made great strides in modernization, raising the standard of living, and so forth. For 22 years, the people of Lithuania were able to live their lives as they saw fit, under their laws, their customs and in their culture. Much of this progress and heritage has either been destroyed or repressed by the Soviet Government.

Mr. Speaker, the United States does not recognize the unlawful occupation of Lithuania or any of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. This action is in clear violation of the wartime agreements among the allies. Furthermore, the so called "plebiscite" to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union was a farce, supported solely by the rifles of the Red Army.

Mr. Speaker, on this day, the 60th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Republic of Lithuania, I feel that we, as members of an institution which epitomizes the belief in freedom, should rise and commemorate this great day, and pray for the time when a free Lithuanian nation will again be a reality.●

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This day serves as another reminder of the need for Congress and all people of the free world to support the cause of bringing freedom back to the people of Lithuania and the entire Baltic region.

The Lithuanian people today long to recapture two very basic rights: The right to independence and self-determination as a nation, and the right to open and freely-chosen religious worship. We in the free world almost take these rights for granted. Yet they are valued as the single most important goal by those people who have had these freedoms taken away.

The people of Lithuania have not enjoyed those freedoms for 61 years. They have been subjected to forceful domination by the Soviet Union since 1940. Even the Lithuanian language, which is one of the oldest known to man, is subjected to Russification efforts by the Soviet Union.

Yet, these people have continued to demonstrate a strength of spirit and commitment to their goal of a free and independent Lithuania. Men and women like Viktors Petkus, Balys Gajauskas, and Ni-

jole Sadunas to name only a few, continue to speak out for their national and religious rights, even though they have faced unjust persecution as a result of their bravery.

We must show our support for these brave individuals and others like them who continue to strive so valiantly for their rights. We cannot forget those who seek only to reestablish their national rights within a free and independent country where their religious practices are not subject to government control.

I will be hosting a reception on Friday, February 16, at 2 p.m. in room 2128 of the Rayburn Building to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. All of my colleagues are invited to attend. A number of Americans of Lithuanian heritage will be present to participate with Members of Congress in a flag exchanging ceremony to signify our strong support in the struggle to bring self-determination back to the Baltic States. I urge all of my colleagues to continue with renewed efforts to lend their support for the goal of a free and independent Lithuania and Baltic region.●

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 61st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Republic of Lithuania to be observed on February 16. Lithuania was once a proud nation which now suffers under the yoke of the Soviet Union. Lithuania's sad history should serve to remind us that there are still many people in various parts of the world who cannot call themselves free.

The Lithuanian nation attained its hard won independence in 1918 only to lose this independence in 1940 when it was seized by the Soviet Union and renamed the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. This Soviet domination may sound the death knell for the ethnic identity of an entire people. The Lithuanian culture and language is so severely restricted and repressed as to be in danger of being finally extinguished. This type of political and cultural sublimation represents an incalculable loss to people everywhere.

While we certainly must continue to seek an easing of tensions with the Soviet Union, we must not forget the many people who suffer under this type of severe repression. The recent final document of the Belgrade conference on the Helsinki accords, which made no mention whatsoever of human rights, illustrates the lack of seriousness with which the Soviets approach basic human freedoms. We must not forget that there are many in the world who do not enjoy the fruits of freedom and are not accorded basic human rights and civil liberties.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in commemorating the Lithuanian proclamation of independence. Let us not forget these proud people.●

● Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleagues in observing the 61st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, a time to pay tribute to the endeavors of a courageous people.

The Lithuanian quest for independence is the story of a dauntless peoples' con-

tinuous fight for freedom from the powerful Russian Empire. In 1940, a mere two decades after their declaration of independence, the Lithuanian Republic lost its precious freedom. Soviet troops overran Lithuania, and Lithuania was absorbed into the Soviet Union. Thousands of Lithuanians were forced to flee their beloved homeland to seek refuge in foreign havens while others were incarcerated in Siberian prison camps.

Nonetheless, the efforts of the Soviets to obliterate the identity of the Lithuanians were futile. The Lithuanians will never forget who they are, and will always demand that their descendants share in so proud a heritage.

Sixty years after their independence was first announced, in 1978 the Lithuanian populace throughout the world observed for the first time the anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence. This annual celebration exists as a bright symbol of hope for all Lithuanian-Americans and is especially encouraging to the oppressed native masses still seeking freedom from tyranny.

In empathy for a cause close to the core of American democratic sentiment we salute the noble efforts of the Lithuanian people toward human rights and their inalienable right to self-determination.

● **Mr. RODINO.** Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16 marks the anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania and the 728th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state. The proud history of Lithuania reveals a people who have been devoted to individual liberties and national self-determination. However, their fundamental right to national independence has been denied since 1940.

As the world's leader in the call for human rights, America cannot ignore the denial of basic personal and political freedoms which Lithuanians endure.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day and to call attention to the Lithuanian struggle.

● **Mr. PRICE.** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

On February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their land free of the tyranny of the Russian czars. Now, 61 years later, these people still labor under a harsh regime not of their own choosing. For some nations so long a period of domination by foreign rulers would ultimately cause the people to lose their own identity as a nation and take on the character of the dominating power. Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans are proud to say that this is not the case in their country. For despite years of hardship, years of poverty and even of forcible displacement, Lithuania is still a nation in its own right. In the hearts and minds of those within and without the borders of Lithuania, the land still lives free.

Today I would like to join with all those of Lithuanian ancestry in voicing my hope that the day will soon come when their nation will be free in word

and deed as well as in spirit. I say that I hope the day is coming soon, but even if it is not, let me give warning to those people and nations who grow in strength and territory by seeking to enslave smaller nations that the people of Lithuania will not give up. They have fought for their freedom for 61 years and they will fight for another 61 or 161 years until that goal is reached. For freedom knows no time limit.

● **Mr. HUGHES.** Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1979, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence from foreign domination. For over a century, from 1795 to 1915, the people of Lithuania courageously withstood subjugation and political domination by the Russians. Then, during World War I, this Soviet oppression was succeeded by the devastation of German occupation.

But in 1918, the Lithuanian fervor for freedom was forever affirmed. The brave people of this struggling nation cast off their yoke of oppression, and declared their homeland to be a sovereign state. International recognition of the Republic of Lithuania was formally granted when nations around the world, including the Soviet Union, signed the Peace Treaty of 1920.

Each year, we Americans joyfully recall our nation's independence day, the Fourth of July, with fireworks and festivities; for the brave people of Lithuania, however, there will be no national celebrations. The Lithuanians mark the recognition of their anniversary of independence with silent contemplation and tears. For, in 1979, Lithuanian independence remains little more than a vivid memory for some, and a dream for others.

In 1940, after only 22 years of freedom, the promise of Lithuanian autonomy was inexorably broken by the Soviet Union. During World War II, Soviet forces again invaded Lithuania, their troops occupied Lithuanian territory, and the Lithuanian homeland was forcibly incorporated into Soviet boundaries. Soviet suppression called an abrupt halt to the great strides which Republic of Lithuania had made both economically and culturally in this short time.

The people of Lithuania cannot be denied their national identity. Despite the Russification process, the steadfast Lithuanians continue to retain their own language, their religious preferences, and their unique culture and heritage. In an effort to support the Lithuanian struggle for freedom, the United States refuses to acknowledge a permanent incorporation of the Republic of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. While the Russians continue to maintain control over Lithuanian territory, the people of this courageous nation remain free in spirit.

On the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, let the United States again affirm its national commitment to the inalienability of basic human rights for all. The strength of the Lithuanian dissidents may serve as a beacon to oppressed individuals throughout the world.

I urge the Soviet Union, and all of the signatory nations, to comply with the Helsinki Accords, which set forth the

principles of individual liberty and basic human rights. I salute the courageous people of Lithuania, and share their hope that once again they will be granted the right to self-determination and individual freedom that we in the United States so dearly love.

● **Mr. BAILEY.** Mr. Speaker, the basic freedoms enjoyed by Americans, the right to worship as we see fit, to choose our governmental representatives, to speak out on public issues, and many others are denied to the courageous people of Lithuania.

Therefore, it is entirely fitting that on this day, February 15, 1979, the U.S. Congress, representing the American people, commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. This is a symbol of hope for all Lithuanian-Americans and especially for those struggling to gain independence for Lithuania.

As freedom loving Americans, we condemn the continued oppression of the Lithuanian people, the callous disregard for their human rights. We sincerely hope that the will of the Lithuanian people is heard so that they can again enjoy the benefits of freedom and self-determination.

● **Mr. PEPPER.** Mr. Speaker, as we pause in our great body's day-to-day business to remember the fate of a small nation on the Baltic Sea, called Lithuania, I would like to caution ourselves that, in our time of modern changes and proliferating political priorities, those unable to learn from history may, more than ever, be prone to its repetition.

When Joseph Stalin's armies invaded Lithuania during the Second World War, they were in the process of rolling back Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union. When Hitler was finally beaten with our help Lithuania remained under the yoke of Russian Communist occupation, ending an era of distinctive culture and independence for the Lithuanian people.

For hundreds of years, the Russian Tsars had relentlessly enlarged their territory to establish predominance over the Eurasian continent and gain valued access to the oceans of the world. At the expense of China, of Poland, of Austria, of Rumania, of Turkey, of Iran, of the Tartar and Mongol peoples, and others, was this process accomplished. Lithuania remembered is evidence of those nations totally submerged by Russia until a real respect for other people, other ways of life may make itself felt in the U.S.S.R. and be translated into policy. In our time, following Lithuania's capture, Russian imperialism has been seen to involve itself in Cuba, in Africa, in Somalia, then Ethiopia, in Afghanistan, in Czechoslovakia, and in most of the other farflung troublespots of the world, most recently Indochina.

The Soviet Union's continuance of Tsarist territorial opportunism and utter lack of respect for individual desires of the world's nations and their striving for independence have kept the Baltic nations imprisoned and made them a symbol of the Russian empire's intemperance and greedy traditions. Let us hope that we may learn this lesson from the past and thus avoid panic as well as ruin in our future dealings with the Soviet

Union. May we command the wisdom and experience to help alleviate the fate of Lithuania's people and aid in the hopeful creation of a peaceful and plentiful future for all the nations willing to live together in a constructive, more tolerant world, yet in the distant future. ●

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1979, Lithuanians around the world commemorate the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Today, in honor of this anniversary, I would like to reiterate my support of the position of the United States in regard to national sovereignty and human rights. Military occupation and broad scale ravaging may well be buried in the Lithuanian past, but so, too, are the freedoms of thought, speech, and national self-determination. It is with hope that the Lithuanian people may again enjoy those human rights that the 61st anniversary of their independence is hereby commemorated.

Lithuanians across the globe have maintained the heritage, culture, and faith of their forefathers. Lithuanian nationalism has found a variety of expressions, especially in recent years. More and more, overt assertions of identity have come to the fore in that area, proving again that ethnicity and nationalism are perhaps the most powerful forces at work in the world today.

The rulers of the Soviet Union would do well to note that truth, and accept it. In the history of the world, there has never been a country that would voluntarily renounce its own freedom and independence and submit itself to the control of a foreign ruler. But that is exactly what the Kremlin is trying to tell the world, claiming that the Baltic States joined the Soviet Union voluntarily. How ridiculous such a claim sounds when we observe scores of nations emerging from colonial rule and insisting on their right to self-determination and independence.

The ideas of individual liberty and representative government are no more distinctly illustrated than in the efforts of Lithuanians to preserve the heritage established in their once-free Baltic State. However, denationalization continues today as great numbers of non-Baltic peoples are by Soviet Government direction moved into the Baltic States—severely altering the national, cultural, and economic life of those non-Russian areas.

And so, on this 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I condemn the Soviet Union's suppression of human rights in Lithuania, as well as the denial of the principle of self-determination for Baltic peoples. I hope that Lithuanians will have freedom, self-government, and release from Soviet domination in the near future. Then, they may attain their national goal, independence—this time permanently. ●

● Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Speaker, we are commemorating today that date in 1918 when the people of Lithuania proclaimed the reestablishment of Lithuanian independence after 123 years of oppression under the Czars of Russia. Less than 2 years later even the Soviet

Union recognized the Lithuanian Republic and voluntarily relinquished all sovereignty claims formerly possessed against this tiny nation. That noble existence ended 22 years later when on January 15, 1940, the Soviet Union under force of arms reoccupied Lithuania under the guise of the Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939. When World War II ended, Lithuania as well as its Baltic neighbors of Latvia and Estonia—with Western acquiescence—became the Soviet spoils of war.

Even though the Lithuanian people have little in common with their Slavic neighbors, the Soviet Union since reoccupation has forced assimilation upon these Baltic people by eradicating all elements of their separate national identity as well as their independent nation state. The Soviets have killed, imprisoned, or deported tens of thousands of Lithuanians and have totally repressed all political dissent. The Lithuanian language is one of the primary targets of this eradication of identity. Lithuanian is an ancient language with its roots in the proto-Indo-European family of languages and should never be confused with the Russian language with its Slavic origins.

Finally, religion, especially Roman Catholicism, has become a special target of Soviet attack. In 1940 when the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania 85.5 percent of the country's more than 3 million inhabitants were Roman Catholic. Despite nearly 40 years of Soviet oppression of religious expression, Lithuania today still has the greatest number of Roman Catholics in the Soviet Union and the only remaining seminary for training priests in the Latin Rite, even though they have not had a bishop since 1947.

The Lithuanian people have remained faithful to their language, their religious beliefs, and their national identity. Though world attention is presently focused on other troubled areas, the Lithuanian flame of nationality still burns. We honor today not only that date in 1940 when Lithuanian independence was declared, but that continuing goal of a free and independent Lithuania. The silent struggle continues. ●

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues and the Lithuanian American community in commemorating the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day which will fall on February 16. It is most fitting that the U.S. Congress pay tribute to the people of Lithuania who steadfastly cling to a cultural heritage which reflects the values of bravery, heroism, and dedication to the cause of freedom that is a source of inspiration for all the oppressed peoples of the world.

Sixty-one years ago, after World War I, the proud people of Lithuania valiantly proclaimed their right to stand among the free people of the world. Lithuania had emerged from the ruins to begin rebuilding her land, establishing her own government, and in essence determining her own destiny. This progression was halted by the Stalinist Soviets who ruthlessly seized Lithuania in 1940.

While under Soviet domination for the past 39 years, Lithuania has not been

given the opportunity to govern itself. However, the people of this country have resisted persistent Soviet attempts to destroy their unity and identity and a strong desire for individual freedoms and self-determination survives in Lithuania today.

Today the Soviets believe that the Helsinki Accord of 1975 legitimizes their sovereignty over Lithuania. While tanks and missiles may give them physical control, the Russians cannot rule the minds and spirits of the Lithuanian people.

On this day, let us condemn Soviet domination of a land that reminds us of how essential and how precious freedom truly is, and what its loss can signify. And let us remember that as long as there are free Lithuanians—like the millions of Lithuanian-Americans—there will always be a free Lithuania. ●

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, the association between Poland and Lithuania has been a long and, for the most part, a happy one. Today, the association of the two nations continues and so does the friendship between Lithuanian-Americans and Polish-Americans in this country. So, it is appropriate that Poles all over the world commemorate this 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence with their Lithuanian neighbors.

The Polish and Lithuanian nations have shared much in the past. In 1386, Poland's Queen Jadwiga married the Grand Duke of Lithuania, Jagiello, converting him and his countrymen to Roman Catholicism. In 1569, the two countries were legally united under one ruler. This harmonious union lasted until the late 18th century when Russia, Prussia, and Austria took it upon themselves to partition Poland, removing her from the map of Europe. With the last partition, in 1795, Lithuania was engulfed by Russia. Just as the two countries had shared a period of expansion and well-being, they shared captivity, Russification, and suppression of their unique cultures.

With the First World War came the end of Russian influence and, on February 16, 1918, a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates proclaimed their country an independent, sovereign state. Under Marshal Joseph Pilsudski, the Polish army helped to maintain that status by driving out the Red Army which took over Vilnius, the capital city, in 1919. Once again, Poland's situation paralleled her neighbor's and both enjoyed a short period of freedom that lives in the memories of both peoples.

Unfortunately, the divorce of Lithuania from Poland caused disagreement over Vilnius. Lithuanians considered it their capital city even though the population was predominantly Polish. However, this was the only blot on an otherwise longstanding friendship.

The Second World War brought with it the end of that short period of freedom from domination that had been marked by a renaissance in the arts and by social reform. Because Lithuania was forcibly annexed by Russia, the United States continues to recognize only the independent Lithuanian Government. Poland's path has diverged from Lithu-

ania's in that, since World War II, Poland is no longer an independent state.

Nevertheless, Poles and Lithuanians still maintain close ties. Because the printing of religious books is forbidden in Lithuania, Polish Bibles and religious books are imported into Lithuania for use by the persecuted church there. So, just as the two nations were once joined by the marriage of Jagiello to Jadwiga and subsequent Christianization, they are connected once again today by their common religion.

The continuing friendship between these nations is reflected by the Lithuanian-American and Polish-American communities in this country. In Chicago, which has the largest Lithuanian population outside Lithuania, the Poles and Lithuanians are neighbors, carrying on the long association of the two peoples.

Therefore, it is fitting that Polish-Americans observe Lithuanian Independence Day with the neighboring Lithuanian-Americans, because the two nations have a common history. Unlike the Poles, Lithuanians both in their native country and outside it can hope for independence once again. We can only hope that one day, they will be able to celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day with true joy and thanksgiving for the realization of their dream of an independent, free homeland.●

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to express my gratitude to Representative ANNUNZIO for taking the time to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

It is important that we in Congress and in this Nation continue to express our strong support for the freedom of Lithuania, and of the other Eastern European nations that remain under the domination of the U.S.S.R. The United States must continue to stand by Principle VIII of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which states that—

... all peoples always have the right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development...

I continue to endorse and support legislation which would call upon the President to do all that he can to see that Lithuania, and other Eastern European countries which were forcibly occupied by the Soviet Union after World War II, are again given the right to self-determination and territorial integrity.●

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share with my colleagues a few words commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day.

The peoples of Lithuania have been in a constant struggle. They yearn to regain the independence that was granted in 1918 and taken away by the Soviet Union in 1940.

We, in the United States, may have a hard time relating to their struggle. For the basic freedoms, which are taken for granted here, are forbidden in Soviet-dominated Lithuania.

The rights to speak and gather freely are denied. The opportunity to elect their

own leaders is not granted and those who exercise their right to worship are harassed.

I think it is important for us to pause and reflect upon the repression and persecution that is part of everyday life in the Soviet's Lithuania.

But we must also do more. We must speak out against these injustices and work to gather support to bring change about in Lithuania. We must work to help preserve Lithuanian identities, language, and culture.

Our Nation must be the leader and champion the cause of oppressed peoples throughout the world. We should advocate the principles of liberty and democracy incorporated in our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence for all captive nations.

Lithuanian Independence Day serves as a perfect opportunity to express our support for the freedom-loving people of this Baltic nation. Let it be known that America stands by all those who still seek to be free.●

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in observing the commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

The struggle for human rights continues in Lithuania. It is a bitter struggle recorded in a sacrifice of a courageous people.

Against crushing miseries of war and foreign domination, the Lithuanian people have remained steadfast in their commitment to those principles of national self-determination and individual freedom which were proclaimed in their homeland over a half century ago. Neither the military might of the Red Army nor the cruel Communist oppression that followed has dimmed the spirit of freedom living in the hearts of these proud people. Through endurance and unity they have preserved their national identity and perpetuated the traditions of a rich cultural heritage.

In Congress, let us today join with voices raised across the land calling for the liberty of all mankind, and let us give strength to the living hope of independence in Lithuania.●

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to commemorate a memorable date in a long struggle, a struggle that continues even as we speak.

Sixty-one years ago tomorrow, on February 16, 1918, independence was restored in Lithuania; a proud land that had been suffering under foreign occupation and oppression for the previous 120 years. That reclaimed freedom, which we are celebrating today, was not long-lasting. It could not withstand the tyrannical might of 300,000 Soviet troops that stormed the country in August of 1940.

But even this was not sufficient to crush the spirit of the brave Lithuanian people. In June 1941, Lithuanian patriots rose up and overthrew their Soviet oppressors, establishing a provisional government. This represents the last period that Lithuania was free. Six weeks later, the Nazi troops of Germany crushed out that freedom.

Today, the Soviet Union claims Lithuania as one of its "Republics." So the

struggle goes on. And so long as it does, those of us who are free to speak our minds can not be quiet. Only through reminding the world of this continued oppression, can we hasten the day when there will be a new Lithuanian Independence Day for us to celebrate.●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1979, is a date commemorated around the world by persons of Lithuanian descent as the 61st anniversary of an independent Lithuania. It is also the 728th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state.

It is fitting that we pause for a few moments to ponder the fate of these freedom-loving people.

At one time, Lithuania was the largest

At one time, Lithuania was the largest nation in Europe. Hundreds of years ago the Lithuanian people gave birth to, and nourished, a body of cultural excellence that mankind still can cherish.

As we all know, the people and state of Lithuania were illegally annexed by the Soviets after World War II. It is one of the tragedies of our times that more than 3 million Lithuanians live today in bondage to the Soviets. Even so, the Lithuanian people have remained independent in spirit. But the cost of their fight has been high. Repression of those who speak out for human rights and independence is the toll exacted by the Russian communists. Freedom to practice their Catholic religion is denied the Lithuanians, although more than half the population strives to attend regular mass.

Finally, we in America, who often take our freedom for granted, must strongly and loudly condemn the Soviet Union's suppression of human rights and freedom of self-determination for all under its iron rule.●

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, no country stands free of problems and we certainly have our share. Problems can be rated according to degree, however, and we in America sometimes become so inundated with our own worries that we forget about other countries having far more serious ones. One such country is Lithuania where, unlike our own, liberty remains only a hope and free expression a dream.

In the United States, the Statue of Liberty stands tall as a symbolic reminder of our cherished ideas of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Lithuania also has a Statue of Liberty in its capital city, but it stands for a short-lived freedom whose final flicker was extinguished 39 years ago. After having been subject to Russian oppression for more than 120 years, Lithuanians finally rid themselves on November 18, 1918, from this power-thirsty nation, only to be overcome by her again 22 years later.

It is the anniversary of this short-lived yet dearly held freedom that we, in the House of Representatives, celebrate today in honor of all Lithuanians. The United States formally declared in 1940 that it refused to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania and its two neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, into the Soviet Union.

Historically, the Lithuanian polity and economy have been interrupted, discouraged and ruined many times from on-

slaughters of invading armies fighting for dominance of Northeast Europe. Despite this, however, the Lithuanian people have survived, managed to retain their particular way of living, and done it with a pride and a dignity we in America understand intimately. To keep a culture alive is a most formidable exercise, one which Lithuanians keep striving to do. For their courage and fortitude they are to be praised and appreciated.

On August 1, 1975, the United States, Russia, and 33 other nations signed the Final Act of Helsinki. If I may for a moment, I would like to cite a passage from that accord:

The participating states will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

This passage may sound familiar to my colleagues, because of its similarity to our forefather's pledge to human rights made over 200 years ago. We must not forget the importance of that pledge and the positive affects it may have on individual expression. We must continue to condemn any nation that suppresses such free expression in countries such as Lithuania and work to encourage Lithuania's self-determination as a national entity.

I ask all of my colleagues here today to continue to support Lithuania's Declaration of Independence as we remain firm in our recognition of Lithuania, its people, and their culture. ●

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, too often we, in America, take for granted our autonomy as a nation. In Lithuania, freedom is a memory that is being kept alive through the conviction and dedication of that country's citizens whose patriotic spirit has not diminished despite continued Soviet oppression.

Friday, February 16, marks the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence but, unlike our enduring heritage of self-determination, Lithuania's independence was cut short by a Soviet takeover in 1940.

For the past 39 years the Lithuanian people have struggled against political, religious, and cultural repression by the Soviets who have persisted in carrying out an ethnocentric policy that has as its aim the complete eradication of Lithuanian traditions and political beliefs.

Untold numbers of Lithuanian and Russian protesters have been arrested and imprisoned for voicing their opposition to Soviet domination of Lithuania and violations of human rights that are consistently committed against Lithuanians who refuse to deny their heritage.

In celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day, we would do well to recall the principles of the Helsinki agreements that were designed to insure that the elemental human rights of all people are protected.

Article VII of the Helsinki Act states that—

They will promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights and freedoms all of which derive from the inherent dignity of a human person and are essential for his free and full development.

Twenty-four years have passed since the Helsinki articles were agreed to by the Soviet Union, and it is painfully obvious to Lithuania and other Baltic nations that their "inherent dignity" has been vilified by the Soviet Union for nearly a quarter of a century.

This month, Americans celebrate the birth of two of their Nation's most illustrious Presidents. One, George Washington, was the commander of our revolution for freedom from colonialization. The other, Abraham Lincoln, was the proponent of a national ethic of equal rights and free-thinking that has shaped our political, social, and cultural standards for scores of years.

Now, more than ever, we must not forget that liberty, justice, and equality are not just constitutional criteria that are endemic to our country. They are universal rights that the people of Lithuania adhere to and believe in as a nation.

February 16 will not be a true independence day for Lithuania until the voices of all sovereign nations join together in support of a free Lithuania and an end to the violations of human rights that are being perpetrated by the Soviets there.

We must make a concerted effort to see that the covenants of the Helsinki accord are complied with as they were originally intended, so that this will be a year of new hope for the people of Lithuania. ●

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and those who cherish freedom worldwide in observing the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

To serve the needs and interest of our people in these great halls is surely a uniquely American experience, but one which we all must be proud of. However, it is with great sorrow that we must remember the peoples still behind the Iron Curtain unable to enjoy the same freedoms that are so much a part of our own heritage.

Many times have I shared with my Lithuanian-American friends the rich language and customs of a great people. On this occasion we must recall the many relatives and friends of American citizens who continue to carry the torch of freedom despite continuing Soviet repression and persecution.

The litany of this valiant country is one from which we can all learn. It was on February 16, 1918, that the Lithuanian people declared themselves an independent nation after 110 years of Russian domination, and a short period of German rule. It was only 21 years later that Lithuania again fell prey to Soviet domination, and on August 3, 1940, they occupied the country and declared it a Soviet republic with a Communist government.

Lithuania was briefly occupied by Nazi troops during World War II, only to be reoccupied by the Soviets and the Red Army to this day. This little country and its great people have for so long now experienced Soviet oppression, but we should remember our own American experience. Through our forefathers declared their independence in 1776, it was not until 1783 that we were actually free

from the British and our country began to take on its own form.

Lithuania has long struggled to be a free and independent nation in the world community, while enslaved by the Soviets with no self-government, religious freedoms, and no human rights. Thousands were killed in guerrilla fighting and today still countless thousands more have been sent to Siberian labor camps for their political/religious beliefs, or as punishment for resisting Soviet rule.

No longer, Mr. Speaker, can we ignore the sacrifices these people have made that embrace the very same ideals of freedom and justice that are so very dear to all Americans. So on this the eve of the 61st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I implore all that seek peace and justice throughout the world not only to learn from the Lithuanian experience, but to work stridently toward freedom and true independence for all peoples in the Baltic region who must live their lives as prisoners of conscience for ideals they have fought for with all their energies for so long. ●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, we salute the indomitable spirit of a proud people who have struggled to preserve their cultural heritage, national language, and their historic religious faith against the attacks of Soviet totalitarianism. It is especially fitting for us to pay tribute to the brave people of Lithuania and to the many contributions made to our country by Lithuanian-Americans.

The Republic of Lithuania was established as an independent nation on February 16, 1918. These freedom-loving people enjoyed their independence from the Soviet Russian Empire for only 22 years. In June 1940, the Soviet Union invaded and occupied the Baltic States and Lithuania was forcefully annexed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Earlier in its history, Lithuania had suffered under Czarist Russian rule.

However, no amount of repression has succeeded in stifling the Lithuanians' yearning to reestablish their nation as a free and sovereign state. Their heroic and inspiring struggle, despite massive persecution and suppression of their human rights, has proved their undaunted determination to overcome Soviet domination.

As we are painfully aware, the Soviet Union has denied religious freedom, and there is no indication that persecution of religious suppression in Lithuania is abating. It is compounded by official Kremlin interference against the Roman Catholic Church, which has played a major role in Lithuanian history and is symbolic of Lithuanian nationhood. Periodically stories of religious persecution and suppression of human rights break through the Soviet curtain, appearing in articles in the Catholic Chronicle, but we may be sure that there are many such violations which do not become known publicly.

When we as a nation consider the plight of various peoples around the world who face a deprivation of basic human rights, too often we neglect to emphasize the struggle for freedom in Lithuania and her sister Baltic States as

well as the other non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. Yet, the United States has consistently refused to sanction the forcible occupation of Lithuania and its Baltic neighbors. We must continue to be vocal in our objections to all Soviet violations of human rights in Lithuania and in the other captive nations. We must strive to focus world attention on these constant transgressions.

Although the oppressive Soviet occupation denies Lithuanians their political rights as well as their religious freedom and restricts their economic and cultural development, they have continued to preserve their unity and strong sense of national consciousness. It is appropriate on this occasion of the 61st anniversary of their declaration of independence, that we pay tribute to the devotion by the Lithuanian people to the reestablishment of an independent and free nation.

As we pause to mark this anniversary, we must also recognize the many contributions made to the development of the United States and the preservation of its ideals of freedom and liberty by the more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent.

Here in the United States, Lithuanians are a well organized and a hard working ethnic group who are deeply interested in maintaining their cultural background. When the time comes for the restoration of freedom for their homeland, they will be in a position to make a positive contribution to the progress of that nation.

The United States must continue to support the aspirations for freedom, independence, and national self-determination of all captive peoples. To this end, we remain committed and we must not waiver from our responsibility. ●

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the occasion of the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The treaty stated:

In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all peoples have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

Centuries of Russian imperialism and attempts at domination came briefly to an end for Lithuania with World War I. With the defeat of Germany and the turmoil of revolution in Russia a 20-member national council proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918. It is this anniversary we celebrate today. Although a Red Army tried to enforce a Communist government, they were

driven back and signed the solemn pledge I have quoted above.

Tragically, after only two decades of independence, Lithuania again fell under Russian domination during World War II, and was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. in August 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. When the tide of the war turned against Germany, Lithuania returned not to independence, but to Soviet domination.

The United States has never and will never recognize the forcible Soviet annexation of this great nation. We must continue to protest in the strongest possible terms the oppressive measures of the Soviet Union against the Lithuanian nation.

Today I salute my constituents of Lithuanian descent, and Lithuanian-Americans throughout our country who have contributed to our American dream. We pray that their own dream and the dream of those they left behind in their motherland for a free and independent Lithuania may soon become a reality.

America, as the leader of the free world, must not and will not forget the plight of the Lithuanian people who have had their sovereignty violated and their freedom suppressed. The legitimate goals and aspiration of the Lithuanian people to win back their freedom as an independent state are shared by us all. ●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, just 2 months ago we commemorated the 30th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Tomorrow, February 16 Lithuanians throughout the world will celebrate the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Yet despite the brave and courageous struggles of these people and others of the Baltic States, Lithuania is not now free, nor are her people afforded the basic rights of human dignity that we in this country have enjoyed for over 200 years.

In 1918, Lithuania rejected the specter of Communist oppression, declared herself free, and set out to establish and follow her own culture, literature, customs, and religious beliefs. Despite Russian control and repeated Soviet attempts at armed subjugation her citizens have persisted in proclaiming their own heritage. For this strength of will they are saluted.

It is relatively easy to let the matter rest there, but I have spent some time reading the latest report on the violation of human rights in Lithuania, and know that we must do more than help Lithuanians celebrate. We must encourage their search for self-determination and condemn their oppressors for unlawful aggression against the sovereign and individual rights of a free people.

Consider the abolishment of Catholic parishes, and the suppression of religious texts. Consider the cases of the Jurgutiene family, separated since 1974, because the Soviets will not allow Marija and her daughter to emigrate to the United States to join their husband and father, the Vasilyev family that is constantly harassed by the KGB, because

they belong to a Christian community, and many others who are denied visitation and reunification rights. Consider, too, the long list of dissenters who have been incarcerated for exercising freedom of thought or conscience.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to renew our country's pledge to exercise responsible leadership in the human rights field. And personally, I offer my hopes and prayers to the Lithuanian people that their next Declaration Day will find them free once again. ●

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 61st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Sixty-one years ago this month, the people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence and established their own government at the close of World War I. Lithuania became a free, independent, and peaceful nation.

This freedom, however, was to be shortlived. Twenty years later, the Second World War began and the Soviet Union aggressively began its intimidation of this tiny Baltic nation by concentrating its troops along the Lithuanian-Soviet border. On June 15, 1940, all pretense was shattered when the Red Army invaded Lithuania and began an occupation which continues to this day. During the past 39 years, Lithuanian patriots have been executed, imprisoned, or deported. Mock elections have also been held with candidates whose only loyalty is to the Communist dictators in Moscow.

Despite its adoption of the Helsinki Accords and numerous other international agreements which call upon the Soviet Union to respect the civil, religious, and political rights of all peoples, the Communist government in Moscow persists in suppressing the rights of Lithuanians.

But it is a symbol of their strength as a people that they have not been broken. Their struggle to regain their freedom deserves our respect and our support, and I am especially pleased that, each year, my colleagues and I have the opportunity to register our unity with the Lithuanian people.

Mr. Speaker, the valiant and courageous struggle which continues in Lithuania should serve notice to us all that our freedoms are not to be taken lightly, and no people is more deserving of a new birth of freedom than the citizens of Lithuania. ●

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as one who has for years watched successive administrations, both Democrat and Republican, ignore for the most part the plight of the peoples living today under Communist tyranny, I am glad for this opportunity to remind the citizens of our free land that there are forms of modern slavery existing today in foreign lands. The celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day is an excellent case in point.

It was in June 1941, that mass deportations of Lithuanians, along with thousands of their Baltic neighbors in Latvia and Estonia, were shipped to Siberia in one of the grossest violations of human rights by the Soviets at that time. In the

following years still more guiltless people of Lithuania were sent eastward to Northern Russia, Western and Eastern Siberia, and Kazakhstan. One can hardly imagine the suffering of these people as they labored in the slave labor camps, in the mines, and in the forests. Starvation, disease, and the brutally cold weather accounted for the deaths of many slated to die far from their native land. It has been estimated that the Communists either murdered or deported 350,000 people from Lithuania—approximately 10 percent of the population of that tragic nation.

As I have done in the past, I will introduce legislation asking that our Ambassador to the U.N. take steps to have placed on the agenda the issue of self-determination for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. These three of the captive nations are especially significant as the United States has—at least up to the present time—refused to recognize the incorporation by the Soviets of these Baltic States. It is not likely to happen since Andrew Young is a cream puff when it comes to dealing with his friends, the Communists. Lithuanians cannot agree with our Ambassador who maintains that Communists never were a threat to them. Lithuanians know better. He might brand them as "Fascists" if they resist communism too vociferously.

Like the thrilling escape of Simas KuDIRKA several years ago and his eventual return to the United States, all measures and activities which publicize the plight of the captive nations serve to keep hope alive in those living under tyranny. This legislation, unsuccessful in the past, helps to say to the people of Lithuania that we have not forgotten them.

● Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, the day on which an independent Lithuanian Republic was established some 71 years ago. Tragically, Lithuania has been denied its freedom and independence by the Soviet Union for the last 39 years. This deprivation of human rights began with the Soviet Union's invasion and occupation of that country in June 1940. Today, even after the Helsinki and Belgrade Conferences, Soviet repression continues. Lithuanians who attempt to exercise their basic human rights are still thrown into Soviet prisons. While these prisoners of conscience number in the thousands, only a few of their names ever reach the West.

Mr. Speaker, as we observe Lithuanian Independence Day, our hearts go out to the Lithuanians who yearn for the same freedoms we in America are so privileged to enjoy. Perhaps our sympathy stems from the belief that "No one can be perfectly free till all are free," as Herbert Spencer once said.

Perhaps someday the Soviet Union will realize that what truly cements human beings to one another is not Marxism, but their common desire to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Until that day comes, we will lend our support to all Lithuanians in the hope that they can

eventually live in freedom and independence. ●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 61st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. This day is remembered by myself and the entire Congress as a tribute to the millions of freedom-loving people in Lithuania and captive nations throughout the world. Hopefully, our words today will offer encouragement to the captive nations and reaffirm our commitment to human rights for all people.

On February 16, 1918, the date which we are commemorating today, the Republic of Lithuania declared its independence from Russian enslavement. Tragically, this freedom was to be short-lived. In June 1940, the Soviet army invaded and regained control of Lithuania. Since that time, the proud people of Lithuania have been forced to endure severe repression. Families have been disbanded and deported, an unknown number have been executed, and the industrial wealth of the nation has been exploited.

Yet, despite the suffering they have endured for almost four decades, the spirit of Lithuanian freedom fighters has never faltered, and I am confident that with a renewed commitment on our part, they will triumph in the end.

Despite our continued expressions of support for the peoples of Lithuania and other captive nations, very little has been done to improve the plight of these oppressed people. The message appears clear—we must go beyond mere expressions. We must take more definitive actions. The results of our human rights policy will not be measured by the number of speeches delivered, but instead by our ability to advance the cause of freedom in the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, today we stand in honor of a courageous people who have long sought the opportunity which we have been blessed to enjoy for more than two centuries. I am hopeful that tomorrow, these words will be reinforced by effective action.

Let me add Mr. Speaker that while the world is so supportive of improved relations between the United States and its main Communist adversaries, we must be ever vigilant about expansionist tendencies by both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Perhaps the most important United States-Soviet issue in 1979 will be the SALT II talks. We must recognize that this issue transcends more than just discussion about weaponry and strategic balances. It should be used by the United States to force additional concessions from the Soviets about releasing their stranglehold on its captive nations. This would make this a humane agreement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert a statement which appeared in a report published by the Lithuanian-American Community of 1978, entitled "The Violations of Human Rights in Soviet Occupied Lithuania." This statement details just one of the many tragic human rights violations against Lithuanian citizens:

THE CASE OF MARIJA JURGUTIENE

To all people of good will in the free world.
To the President of the United States of America, Mr. Jimmy Carter.¹

From Marija Jurgutiene, residing in the Lithuanian Republic of the USSR, in the city of Vilnius, Zirmūnų Street, No. 75, Apt. 100.

A STATEMENT

I, Marija Jurgutiene, together with my thirteen-year old daughter Daina have consistently, since December 16, 1974, requested permission to come to the United States of America, the permanent residence of my husband and the father of my daughter, Aloyzas Jurgutis (6542 S. Fairfield Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60629, USA).

My husband, Aloyzas Jurgutis, was a senior lecturer at the State Conservatory of the Lithuanian Republic of the USSR, in the Department of Choral Conducting. On May 8, 1974, my husband went to Yugoslavia as a tourist, where he decided to change his permanent place of residence. Since 1974 he has been residing in the United States of America.

I have requested the Lithuanian SSR OVIR three times for an exit visa, by filling out all the necessary forms, but have received only the following unreasonable replies:

1. In March of 1975—treason;
2. April 21, 1976—we do not have the means;
3. December 24, 1976—rejection (of the request).

I then addressed myself to:

1. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR on February 12, 1977, on October 26, 1976, on June 2, 1976, and on May 8, 1976;

2. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR L. I. Brezhnev on December 12, 1976, on January 17, 1976, and on September 1, 1975;

3. The Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet Nikolai V. Podgorny on November 12, 1976, May 10, 1975, April 17, 1975, and September 29, 1974;

4. The First Secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party P. Griskevicius on June 15, 1976;

5. The 25th Congress of the Communist Party on February 8, 1976 (I wish to note that until now I have not received any replies to my requests);

6. OVIR (Visa) Division of the Soviet Union's Ministry of Internal Affairs on February 12, 1977, and March 9, 1977;

7. The Human-Rights Committee on Geneva on November 17, 1976, on May 10, 1976, on January 20, 1976, and on October 20, 1975.

My request to reside together with my lawful husband, and of my daughter with her true father, is considered a crime by my national government.

I am constantly threatened by word and in writing that I will be sent to prison, my apartment will be confiscated, and my daughter will be expelled from school because she has no right to be in a Soviet school. On May 30, 1974, my apartment was searched. On September 22, 1974 I was discharged from my librarian position at the

¹Text of the statement received through private sources. In a subsequent statement to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, dated May 24, 1977, M. Jurgutiene renounced her Soviet citizenship and demanded permission to leave the Soviet Union. Text of the latter statement will be found in *Ausra*, No. 9 (1977). The intransigence of the Soviet regime appears to be due to the defection of Aloyzas Jurgutis, for which his wife and daughter are being punished.

society "Znanie". From May 30, 1974, to February 1, 1975, I was constantly called by the KGB for interrogations. In June of 1974 my 11-year old daughter, Daina, was also interrogated. All correspondence with my husband was, and still is, prohibited. On March 30, 1975, without any warning, my telephone was disconnected. I was called several times by the police to explain why I am not working. On July 29, 1976 my apartment was searched again. I have been under constant surveillance throughout this time.

What can be more natural than the union of a family? This is a vitally important question for our family. I wish to live together with the man to whom I have promised my destiny. I ask only that which is an undeniable right of every human.

Since the indicated facts are a denial of human rights and is a violation of the Helsinki Accords. I feel I have a right to inform you of these violations. Since I have exhausted all possibilities in my country, I appeal to you to help me in search of my human rights.

MARIJA JURGUTIENE.

VILNIUS, March 10, 1977. ●

● Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. This proud people has been subjugated by the Communist leadership of the Soviet Union since 1940.

Frequently, we hear about Communist-inspired harassment, censorship, interference with religious practice, and the denial of many other basic human rights. Such inhuman treatment has been inflicted upon the Soviet people themselves and, even more so, upon those populations subjected to that totalitarian regime. The people of Lithuania have suffered greatly in this regard.

Despite such great personal suffering, Lithuanians continue to persevere courageously in the hope that self-determination and freedom will soon be theirs. Such courage should spur us to confirm our solidarity with this noble struggle. We must commit ourselves anew to the goal of a peaceful world, a world in which self-determination for all peoples becomes a delightful reality.

Further, the plight of the captive Lithuanian nation should prompt us to pause and to refresh our memories concerning the many blessings which this great Nation of ours affords. Having been so refreshed, we can then rededicate our energies and our minds to fostering a new world order, one in which human dignity is recognized and human freedom no longer shackled.

Mr. Speaker, our forefathers gave us the gift of liberty. Dare we do anything less than to share this great gift? ●

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. Although an independent nation for a brief 22-year period, the Lithuanian people have through their efforts to regain their freedom been an inspiration to the freedom-loving peoples of the world. Since 1940, the Lithuanian people have lived under the occupation of the Soviets, Nazis, and most recently the Soviets again. Despite these hardships the Lithuanian people have never given up the hope that they will one day regain that which is rightfully theirs, a free and independent nation.

The Soviet Union's illegal annexation of Lithuania along with the other two Baltic Republics of Estonia and Latvia in 1944, was an act that has never been recognized either by our Nation or much of Western Europe. Of course, it is an act that has never been accepted by the Lithuanian people themselves. The spirit of freedom is alive in Lithuania, it lives despite all attempts by the Soviet Union to repress and extinguish it. I join my colleagues in celebrating the Lithuanian spirit, and in drawing inspiration from the determination of the people of Lithuania. ●

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to salute the Lithuanian people on the anniversary of their declaration of independence. Their history, full of great accomplishments and great sorrows, is a paradigm of the human spirit's resilient longings to be free and nurtured in a beloved homeland.

Since ancient times, the Lithuanians have inhabited the same Baltic region; they were mentioned by the Roman historian Tacitus in the first century A.D. Their language is the oldest in its forms of the world's living languages, a fact which has made them keenly aware of their individuality. In the middle ages, they controlled land from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and played an important part in the shaping of modern Europe. Their rich cultural heritage, their strong religious faith, and their willingness to fight for national self-determination were among the characteristics which motivated them to declare an independent state in 1918, at the conclusion of the First World War.

The period of independent national life that ensued from 1918 to 1940 should never be regarded as some kind of historical accident that was tragically cut short. Rather, Lithuania's modern political independence was the culmination of centuries of strong national consciousness, a consciousness intensified still further by the Czarist domination of 125 years that immediately preceded the 1918 Declaration of Independence. During that period of Czarist oppression, the occupying Russian forces attempted to weaken the Lithuanians' sense of national identity by forbidding use of the Lithuanian language in the schools, as well as the printing of books in the Lithuanian language. But that kind of attempt to obliterate Lithuania's culture only made the Lithuanians more determined to retain their identity and achieve conditions under which it could flourish. They kept their language, culture and religious traditions alive under great duress. Despite all the Czarist attempts at conditioning in the schools, their children continued to learn to know and love the ancient and enduring ways of their motherland right in their own homes.

Just as the Lithuanians persevered in cherishing their heritage throughout the 19th century Czarist occupation, they have—predictably—been heroic since 1940 in nurturing their national identity, their language, culture, and religion, their intense national pride, and above

all their determination to be free again. The Soviet forces that overran Lithuania in 1940 and have ruled there since then have never been able to subdue the people's will. This was demonstrated through long years of partisan fighting in the 1940's and early 1950's. It has been evident in demonstrations within the Soviet-managed factories, the appearance of underground newspapers and dissident journals, the brash unwillingness of Lithuanian youth to be "sovietized." And there are always special people in recent years to remind us that Lithuania is still, in the ancient phrase, a "land of heroes." Remember the student, Romas Kalanta, who immolated himself so that the world would remember Lithuania's longing to be free. Remember the sailor, Simas Kudirka, whom no prison bars could contain. Remember the prisoner, Victoras Petkus, whose spirit no Soviet court can ever convict.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Lithuania covers some two millennia of human history, and it is consistently a story of a people who have amply proven their right to be free and self-determining. The United States has never recognized the forcible incorporation of Lithuania and her sister Baltic countries, Estonia and Latvia, into the Soviet Union. Through our consistent policy in support of the Baltic countries' legitimate claim to independence and self-determination, we demonstrate that our concern for human rights is paralleled by our commitment to national rights as well.

I rejoice at the vitality, courage, and perseverance of the Lithuanian people, who continue to inspire freedom-loving people everywhere. I am confident that the essential history of Lithuania—a history of freedom—will repeat itself yet again. ●

VIETNAMESE PAYMENT FOR LEGITIMATE AMERICAN CLAIMS

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

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation with Congressman BINGHAM which will allow American citizens who have had their property and businesses expropriated by the Government of Vietnam to file claims with the U.S. Government's Foreign Settlement Claims Commission. The claims will then be adjudicated by the Commission, and, when and if normal diplomatic relations are reestablished, the Vietnamese Government will be obliged to pay the claims in a formula agreed to as part of the normalization process.

As the situation now stands, Americans who have had property expropriated by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam cannot even file claims because the Foreign Settlement Claims Commission lacks authority to accept and adjudicate them. The amendments we are proposing to the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 will remedy this situation.

The Commission will then have legal authority to determine the validity of claims as it has already done in relation to Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, China, East Germany, and Cuba.

Final agreements which have resulted in significant payments to the American claimants by the countries involved have been signed by the Governments of Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary. Negotiations are currently underway with Czechoslovakia and initial contacts have been made with the East German Government. Though the Commission has finished adjudicating claims against Cuba, no negotiations with the Cuban Government on this issue have taken place.

Perhaps the most striking example of the value of the Claims Settlement program will become visible later this month when Treasury Secretary Blumenthal will travel to China to continue negotiations and hopefully conclude an agreement which will be beneficial to the American claimants.

The Chinese example is illustrative because many of the claims which will soon be settled were filed a decade ago. I do not see any immediate improvement in our relations with Vietnam on the horizon, but it would be foolhardy to predict what our relationship might be in 10 or 20 years. It is important to give Americans the opportunity now to file their claims before personal memories and corporate records become further dispersed.

In closing, there are three points which I wish to stress. First, this bill specifically does not commit the U.S. Government to pay any claims which may be filed. To the contrary, the claims will ultimately be paid by the Vietnamese Government. The American taxpayers will not be presented with a bill for payment. Second, this bill is not designed to pave the way for rapid normalization of relations with Vietnam. What might happen in terms of diplomatic relations is another matter which will be determined by a variety of factors. Congress must have an important role to play in making that decision. Simply, this is a bill to aid American citizens with legitimate claims.

Third, we should understand that while many large corporations will probably file claims, American businessmen who had relatively small businesses in Vietnam will also benefit from this legislation.

In fact, my interest in this matter was stimulated by a Vermont constituent who first began a machinery sales business in Saigon in 1952 and had to abandon it as Saigon fell to the North Vietnamese in 1975.

A full survey of blocked Vietnamese assets in this country has never been conducted, but initial Treasury Department estimates put the figure at nearly \$100 million. The amendment we are proposing today will open the way for a full cataloging of these blocked assets. At some point in the future, should no agreement be reached with the Vietnamese, Congress will have the opportunity

to determine whether the blocked assets should be liquidated to pay the claims. This would be a drastic step and one which I am not prepared to recommend at this time. I would prefer to see the assets distributed as part of ultimate agreement negotiated with the Vietnamese authorities. However, we should prepare ourselves for the future.

I urge your support for this legislation.●

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) in introducing legislation which represents the first step toward obtaining the fullest possible restitution for Americans whose private property was taken by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam when the Government of South Vietnam fell.

The Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, which I have the honor to chair, has legislative jurisdiction over U.S. claims against foreign governments for nationalized or expropriated property, and it is my intention to give active consideration to this proposal in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, many obstacles remain in the path toward obtaining payment from the Government of Vietnam for private American property that government now controls. We currently have no diplomatic relations with Vietnam, and indeed we unilaterally embargo all trade and financial transactions with Vietnam. Furthermore, of course, the recent invasion of Cambodia by Vietnamese military forces has complicated and severely dampened for the time being any progress that might have been made toward restoring diplomatic relations with Vietnam so that negotiations of concrete issues such as U.S. claims could get underway.

It is none too soon, however, to get our own records in order as to just what American property was lost to the Vietnamese and how much that property was worth. Such records will become the basis of the total claim which the U.S. Government will someday present to the Vietnamese Government as a basis for negotiation and settlement.

The difficult task of reviewing and validating such claims is vested by existing statutes in the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—a Commission, appointed by the President, which has had extensive experience in establishing U.S. private property claims against foreign governments and assisting in the payment of restitution to claimants when settlements are reached. In the past 35 years, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and its predecessor agencies have adjudicated and validated such claims against virtually all of the countries of Eastern Europe, as well as against China and Cuba. Settlements have actually been reached with Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary. Our claims against the Peoples' Republic of China, which are now under negotiation, are based upon the work of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

There are widely differing views in the

Congress, about when and how fast we should move toward normalization of relations with Vietnam. I personally feel that we should be prepared to lift our embargo of Vietnam as soon as the Vietnamese are willing to reestablish diplomatic relations. One reason I have felt that this should be done promptly is to avoid a long delay in gaining restitution for Americans—both corporations and individuals—who suffered losses of private property in Vietnam.

Whatever one's position on normalizing relations with Vietnam, however, I believe we can all agree that we expect restitution from Vietnam for private American property it has nationalized or expropriated. The legislation we are introducing today reaffirms our commitment to the principle of restitution for American private property, and would start the process of obtaining compensation for Americans who lost property in Vietnam by specifically authorizing the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to examine all claims by Americans against Vietnam and to determine the validity and exact amount of those claims.

This legislation is clearly in our self-interest. It makes no concession to Vietnam, nor does it place any burden on U.S. taxpayers to pay for private U.S. losses in Vietnam. On the contrary, it reaffirms our expectation that the Vietnamese Government will have to pay for American property it has taken.

I want to congratulate the diligent work of my colleague, Mr. JEFFORDS, in helping to prepare this proposed legislation, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support it after full and careful consideration has been given to it by the Committee on International Relations.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians throughout the world commemorate the 61st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. It is important that Americans take time to memorialize the plight of the Baltic people who have been overcome by the ruthless tyranny of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia exemplify the true meaning of human rights. In fact, no part of the world represents a more serious denial of human rights, including the right of self-determination, than the imprisoning of the Baltic people.

Soviet repression has been consistent and harsh. Human rights have been violated in numerous ways and these violations are continuing. This ongoing repression makes it incumbent upon us to uphold our heritage of a free and open society and we must champion the cause of self-determination for the Baltic people. The United States must continue to support the aspirations for freedom, independence, and national self-determin-

nation of all peoples. We cannot accept foreign domination by any nation over another nation. To this end we remain committed and we must not waiver from our responsibility.●

ARCHBISHOP OSCAR ROMERO OF EL SALVADOR

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

● Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of El Salvador are living every day in a system which flagrantly violates their civil and human rights. The injustices they are forced to endure make a dark picture of governmental persecution, but one figure rises above all this suffering as an advocate of the poor and the defenseless. Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero y Galdames, the Roman Catholic archbishop of El Salvador, has been steadfast in his defense of the rights of his people, and in his criticism of the military government which has waged a campaign against the exercise of those rights. Arbitrary arrests, detentions, torture, and mysterious disappearances have become the order of the day—gross violations of human rights documented by such impartial international watch groups as Amnesty International, the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, the Geneva-based Commission of Jurists, and the Washington Office on Latin America.

Last month I joined 22 other Members of Congress in nominating Archbishop Romero for the Nobel Peace Prize. Despite attempts from many quarters to vilify and discredit him, he has demonstrated uncompromising courage, tenacity and forthrightness in continuing to speak out for his people. He has earned the support of freedom-loving people everywhere, and deserves consideration for the Nobel Prize.●

CRIME SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULES HEARINGS ON LEAA AND WHITE-COLLAR CRIME

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

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Crime, which I chair, will continue its hearings, which began during the latter part of the 95th Congress, on proposals to reauthorize and reorganize the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. To this end, we will hold a hearing on this subject on February 20, 1979, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

The subcommittee in its attempt to comprehensively evaluate the operations of the LEAA program has also scheduled field hearings for February 22 in Detroit, Mich.; February 23 in Chicago, Ill.; and February 26 and 27 in San Francisco, Calif. While in San Francisco, the subcommittee will also take testimony from a number of witnesses on the subject of white-collar crime.

Individuals wishing to testify or submit a statement for the record should address their request to the Subcommittee

tee on Crime, House Committee on the Judiciary, 207E Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.●

OIL IMPORT PURCHASING AUTHORITY ACT OF 1979

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the victory of the Khomeini forces in Iran, the continuing cutoff of Iranian oil, and the coming 14.5-percent hike in OPEC oil prices, all serve to remind us that the "energy crisis" is still with us. Last month the subject of energy warranted no more than 12 words in the President's state of the Union message. Today administration figures speak of gasoline rationing, bans on Sunday driving, and a situation "prospectively more serious" than the 1973-74 oil embargo. We are warned that gasoline could soon be costing us \$1 per gallon at the pump. Oil shortages (either real or contrived) and higher prices (always real) seem to be our destiny. It is a destiny we seem to accept with entirely too much equanimity. I propose that we begin to fight back.

I am introducing legislation which would begin to put the United States in control of its own energy fate. The Oil Import Purchasing Authority Act of 1979 would authorize the U.S. Government (through the Department of Energy) to act as the sole purchasing agent for all petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States. In this capacity, the Department of Energy could maximize the U.S. bargaining position by soliciting sealed bids from those oil-producing nations seeking access to the U.S. market. Such competitive bidding, by OPEC and non-OPEC states, might well have a divisive impact on the OPEC cartel and could lead to a reduction in the price of imported oil.

Legislation similar to this was considered in 1975 (Public Law 94-163). At that time Congress did enact a proposal authorizing the President to submit to Congress a plan granting the Federal Government the exclusive right to purchase foreign oil. I would delete this discretionary authority and mandate establishment of an import authority.

This legislation would help break the OPEC stranglehold. The importing of oil to this country would no longer be the special province of multinational oil companies, themselves captives of the OPEC cartel. Today energy decisions vitally affecting the United States, are made, not by the U.S. Government, but by Gulf, Texaco, Mobil, Socal, and their sister companies. They decide (following OPEC) to raise prices and they decide when to restrict sales. It need hardly be said that the 70 to 90 cents we are now paying for a gallon of gasoline is not a price dictated by market conditions but rather by the oil companies which import the oil, then refine it, and finally sell it to us. The companies' price and supply decisions are not made on the basis of our national interest but out of concern for corporate profits and the companies' interests in the oil states. Despite their American sounding names

and their familiar corporate logos, the major oil companies have long been under the inevitable domination of the oil states. The OPEC cartel has fixed the price of oil and the oil companies have carried out the OPEC price policy. The most flagrant example of the oil companies' servitude to the OPEC states—or, to be more polite, their identity of interests—came during the 1973 Yom Kippur war and the ensuing oil embargo. According to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations, the oil companies enforced the Arab oil embargo of the United States and our allies. Not surprisingly, the oil companies tried to block the U.S. arms airlift to Israel. When the boycott finally was lifted, the oil companies joined in the decision to quadruple the prices of oil. Clearly the oil companies have interests which conflict with those of the United States.

The importation of oil is, simply, too important to be left to multinational companies. Oil supply and pricing decisions are crucial questions of public policy and should be made by our Government and not by corporate chieftains. OPEC is a coalition of governments and only a strong central government authority can stand up to it. Those who argue that a government importing authority would deal a blow to free enterprise are not realistic. There is no free enterprise in imported oil. What we have is a cartel of producing nations and a friendly coalition of oil companies. I would prefer having our key energy decisions made by our Government.

One more point must be made. This bill would not add to the taxpayers' burden, and it would not create any large new bureaucracy. Funds from the U.S. Treasury would be used to pay for the oil but would be paid back by refiners who purchase the oil. The Department of Energy would not take possession of any oil. Its role would be to insure a fair bidding procedure and an equitable allocation of oil.●

COSPONSORS OF TAX EQUITY ACT OF 1979

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

● Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, I introduced H.R. 1040, the Tax Equity Act of 1979. Twenty-three Members of the House have now joined me as cosponsors. They are: Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. WON PAT.●

CONCERN FOR SAFETY OF AMERICANS STILL IN IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, during the current unrest and upheaval in Iran, all Americans were deeply concerned for the safety and well-being of our fellow countrymen who are still in Iran on assignment for our Government or as representatives of the business community or for other purposes.

Our concern for these individuals is not based on any misplaced sense of nationalism or militarism, but rather, on a universal humanitarian concern for people whose lives or safety may be seriously endangered by turmoil within another nation.

I was deeply disturbed to learn, therefore, that our NATO ally and military partner, Turkey, refused our request to station a small force of 69 marines and 6 helicopters in Turkey in case they were needed to protect the lives and safety of Americans in Iran, or to facilitate the evacuation of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this small force could not possibly be regarded as a threat to Iran or anyone else. Such a group, by its very nature, could serve only humanitarian purposes and not represent a hostile or aggressive force. One would think that Turkey would readily open its doors in friendship to this small force. Instead, we were forced to locate these marines at other stations.

Of course, no nation has an obligation to accept our Armed Forces, regardless of the size or purpose of such forces. By the same token, however, this occurrence raises the broader question of the strength of our ties with Turkey, and the good intentions of the Turkish Government toward our Nation. I also recall the intensity of the effort made last year to win congressional approval of lifting the arms embargo to Turkey, much of which was based on the essential and irreplaceable nature of our bases in Turkey.

It is deeply disturbing to me that these bases were not even available for our use in a mission that could not conceivably be regarded in any way other than humanitarian.●

TAIWAN LEGISLATION

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

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago today the President announced his decision to recognize the People's Republic of China as the Government of China, and to derecognize the Republic of China on Taiwan. He stated that the United States-People's Republic of China "normalization" would take effect January 1, 1979, that Embassies would be established March 1, 1979, and that the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China would be terminated as of the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I voiced at the time of the President's announcement my dismay at the President's failure to consult meaningfully with the Congress in advance of his decision. I also stated my concern about giving in to Peking's demands on conditions for recognition and

about the lack of strong assurance about the future security of Taiwan, our longtime friend and ally.

We in the Congress are now faced with a most difficult task. The President has asked for legislation which would implement the President's decision with respect to continuing relations with Taiwan, by carrying these forward on a non-governmental basis. We have been asked to act on this legislation promptly. The Foreign Affairs Committee accordingly has been holding hearings at the full and subcommittee level over the past 2 weeks.

It is apparent that the President's action has put us in Congress under the gun, legislatively speaking. We need to act to protect America's interests in Taiwan and to assure the Taiwanese people that we are not pulling the rug out from under them in the haste to "normalize" with Peking. We have to do this in a way which will not run against the President's understanding with the People's Republic of China, we are told; and at the same time we are pushed to get the implementing legislation to the White House by March 1 if possible so there will not be a damaging hiatus in our relations with Taiwan following the closing of our Embassy there.

It has been increasingly obvious as the committee hearings proceeded that the administration's proposed legislation was deficient in many respects. We need assurances for the future security, peace, and freedom of the 18 million people of Taiwan that the legislation does not provide. We need greater provision for the uninterrupted continuation of the multi-billion-dollar business and commerce between the United States and Taiwan which is so important to both sides. We need to have a stronger framework for carrying on the everyday dealings between the citizens of the United States and Taiwan.

Because of these shortcomings in the administration's proposed bill, draft legislation which is designed to meet the needs cited above is being prepared by the Foreign Affairs Committee staff and myself. This committee print will be offered to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for consideration in markup next week. It is my hope that such a bill will meet the approval of the Members. In my opinion it will fully provide for the authorities requested by the President, and at the same time will be a constructive embodiment of the policy we must now adopt toward our friend, Taiwan.●

□ 1150

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SAN LUIS OBISPO AREA

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

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to all of the people associated with a very important institution in my district—the San Luis Obispo General Hospital. Yesterday was the 100th anniversary of the admittance of the hospital's first patient, and in

those 100 years, the residents of the San Luis Obispo area have enjoyed superior medical care.

Of course, the anniversary coincides with Valentine's Day, and everyone likes to think of the hospital as the "Hospital With a Heart." All of the hospital's employees—doctors, nurses, technicians, aides—are responsible for this attitude, and it makes for a great source of comfort and care for people in my district.

At a time when we must look very hard at every Government program to eliminate waste, I think it is very important that we remember those public institutions that do serve the public interest. Quality health care is one of the most basic services Government can provide to people, and places like the San Luis Obispo General Hospital make a high level of health care for all a reachable goal.

Again, my congratulations to the hospital and all its employees. Let us all hope that the "Hospital With a Heart" continues to provide care to the residents of the San Luis Obispo area for yet another century.●

SUGAR STABILIZATION ACT OF 1979

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

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be joining with the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. ULLMAN, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, newly elected vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and a number of our distinguished colleagues in the House in introducing the International Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979. We do so in the very firm belief that this legislation does not recognize the needs of only one segment of our society to the detriment of others but, rather, that it will serve to the advantage of each of us in this Chamber and those not present who send us here to speak for them.

As one of the world's largest and most important sugar consuming and importing nations, the continued survival and viability of the U.S. sugar industry and the stability of the global market are clearly in our best interest. Recognizing this and the fact that efforts to date have been unsuccessful in meeting this dual objective, those of us who have been working together on this problem believe that legislation mandating a comprehensive sugar policy and program is sorely needed.

For too long, we as a nation have sat calmly by and watched our domestic production base, our safety net against future hard times and escalating world sugar prices, if you will, fall into serious jeopardy while other sugar producing countries enrich themselves at our expense.

The legislation we offer today proposes to rectify this situation by providing long-overdue authority for U.S. participation in the cooperative International Sugar Agreement as a means of fostering the stability of global sugar supplies and prices, which impact directly on U.S. consumers and producers alike; by

providing modest protection for sugar producers consistent with the International Sugar Agreement; and by insuring that those who labor in the production of sugar share equally in the benefits to be derived in terms of improved wages and working conditions.

The International Sugar Stabilization Act of 1979 builds on agreements arrived at after months of discussion in 1978 and offers some changes in the 1978 sugar bill designed to insure equitable treatment of producers and consumers of sugar as well as favorable consideration by the House. Specifically, our bill—

Provides for U.S. implementation of its rights and obligations under the International Sugar Agreement;

Establishes a complementary domestic program providing an assured return to producers of 15.75 cents per pound for 1978 crop raw sugar. This assured return is made up of two elements: A price objective of 15.25 cents per pound to be achieved by raising the price of imported sugar (and, thus, the domestic price) through import duties and, if necessary, quotas. Producers would then receive up to one-half cent per pound in supplemental payments. If for any reason a limitation were ever imposed on the direct payments program, payments would be abolished; and the market price objective would be enhanced by one-half cent to maintain the assured return.

Allows for adjustments in the price objective each year to reflect changes in the cost of production, with an absolute ceiling of 7 percent in any year, consistent with the President's anti-inflation guidelines, and a supplemental payment of up to one-half cent;

Leaves the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to operate a price support loan program; and

Mandates minimum wage levels and other protections for sugar cane and sugar beet workers.

We are pleased to note that this bill has been drafted jointly by members of both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Ways and Means in an effort to minimize any differences of approach between the two and to expedite its consideration. We sincerely believe that the situation is critical and that actions such as those we collectively recommend must be forthcoming. ●

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2155

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

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, during the past year I have become aware that the General Services Administration has interpreted the 1972 amendments to the 1959 Public Buildings Act in such a way as to allow them to exceed in certain instances the \$500,000 limit in that act without seeking congressional approval. I believe the Congress must exercise its responsibility for this program to the fullest and that GSA must be directed in the most unambiguous terms possible to submit these projects to the Congress. The legislation I am introducing today would accomplish exactly that.

There are two issues here, both involving buildings leased by the GSA. The 1972 amendments provided that leases over \$500,000 annually must be submitted to the Congress for approval (40 U.S.C. 606). The GSA interpretation has been that leases entered into at less than \$500,000 can subsequently be added to, so that they provide more space and at more than \$500,000, all without seeking prospectus approval from the Congress. We end up with a case like the one in San Francisco, where GSA is now leasing space in one building at a gross annual rent of \$1.38 million (which would put the net annual rent at about \$1 million) and yet has never sought congressional approval.

It is true that the GSA sought an opinion of the GAO in this matter, and in his response (B-176843) the Comptroller General stated that "we are aware of no legal basis on which to object to the proposed treatment of amendments to existing leases." This opinion was predicated on the additional space lease rather than as an amendment to the existing lease, and on GSA seeking such additional space on a good faith basis and taking "whatever precautions are necessary to prevent the splitting of a space requirement for purposes of evading the requirements (to submit a prospectus)." The distinction between lease amendments and separate supplemental lease agreements may have been lost in practice. But apart from the issues of lease amendments versus supplemental leases and good faith versus bad faith, the main point is that we should not have major commitments of Federal resources to one lease without some kind of congressional control and accountability. The bill I am introducing today would specify that a prospectus must be submitted for congressional approval under the 1959 act at whatever point the lease for all federally leased space in a building exceeds \$500,000.

The second issue involves the GSA interpretation of the 1972 amendments to the effect that repair and alterations projects to leased buildings do not require congressional prospectus approval no matter how much the cost. Aside from the fact that this legal interpretation has at best a tenuous connection to the statute, it is clearly absurd that we would have greater control over Federal spending for repairs and alterations in federally owned buildings than we do in privately owned buildings. In fact, it should be just the opposite. The bill I am introducing today would, therefore, require repair and alteration projects over \$250,000 in leased buildings to be submitted for congressional approval. This would be in addition to the present practice of submitting prospectuses for repair and alteration projects over \$500,000 in federally owned buildings. ●

TAX EQUITY FOR TENANTS

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

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the tenant's tax justice

bill which allows tenants to claim their share of local and State property tax payments for Federal income tax purposes.

Tenants rent single family homes, townhouses, garden apartments, and high rises and, through their rent, they pay property taxes on their dwelling units. However, unlike homeowners who may deduct their property taxes, tenants are not afforded the same opportunity. The tax laws discriminate against the taxpayer who rents and this inequity will be corrected by the passage of this bill.

Under the bill, a tenant may claim a credit of 25 percent of the proportionate share of the property taxes paid. This share is determined by multiplying the total property taxes paid on the building by the ratio of the floor space rented by the tenant to the total rental floor space in the building, excluding common areas. For example, if someone rented for 1 year an apartment with 5,000 square feet of floor space and there was a total of 50,000 square feet of floor space in the building, the proportionate share would be 10 percent of the building's property tax. If the total property tax paid by the owner was \$6,000 then the tenant's share is \$600, and the credit which the tenant can claim is 25 percent of \$600, or \$150. A tenant is allowed to claim the credit for only the portion of the year during which he actually rents the apartment. In the example above, if the tenant had only rented the apartment for 6 months then his share of the property tax is \$300 and his credit is \$75.

In past Congresses, the concept of allowing tenants to claim their property tax payments received widespread attention from the national news media and several organizations. Among those who expressed favorable interest in the concept included the National Tenants Association, the American Association of Retired Persons, Apartment Life magazine, the National Apartment Association, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and the National Federation of Retired Federal Employees. At the moment, the California State Legislature is conducting hearings on a similar proposal.

The benefits of the passage of this bill are many:

Property tax relief for tenants would make the income tax system more progressive in that it would lessen the tax burden on low income taxpayers. According to a Congressional Research Service study, over 79 percent of household rental units were occupied by families with incomes under \$15,000 in 1974;

A tax credit for tenants would encourage individuals to live in rental units and help reverse the suburban flight which is partially responsible for the deterioration of our center cities. Revitalization of our center cities is an important national priority, and the tax system should not be allowed to exacerbate the problem as it currently does;

A tax credit is both a more equitable and more progressive way of providing property tax relief than is an itemized deduction. Over 85 percent of income

tax returns filed by individuals with incomes under \$10,000 in 1974 claimed the standard deduction, hence, most would have been ineligible for an itemized deduction. The deduction ignores the non-itemizing low-income taxpayer while a credit can be claimed by nonitemizers as well as itemizers;

A tax incentive for rental housing would spur apartment unit construction and help bring down the high unemployment rates experienced in the construction industry;

The bill discourages "instant condominiums" by removing an artificial tax stimulus to apartment conversion—simply, those who rent will no longer lose the right to claim their property tax payment;

The bill makes partners of property owners and tenants in keeping local property taxes under control. Many landlords support this concept because in addition to enhancing rental markets, the bill makes the tenants realize what portion of the rent is not "rent" at all, but a property tax payment. The landlord is currently caught in the middle—the local government raises taxes, but because the landlord collects the tax in the rent, he is "blamed" for increasing rents. Under this bill, it is clear that the landlord is merely acting as a collection agent for the local government.

The opportunities and demands of American life have made us a more mobile society. At the same time escalating costs and rising mortgage rates have priced many citizens out of the "home ownership" market. This fact is documented by the National Home Builders Association's somber prediction that new housing starts will decline by approximately 20 percent in 1979. According to the Congressional Research Service, 36 percent of all American families rent their homes and there is no doubt that that figure will continue to escalate.

Public policy has discriminated against tenants for too long; genuine tax reform requires that we treat the Nation's tenants with fairness and equity. It is for that reason that I am introducing the tenant's tax justice bill.●

CONSUMERS' ENERGY HEARINGS ACT OF 1979

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

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, each day brings more frustration to Americans who are being asked to accept and pay for energy cost decisions made in Washington, many miles away from home. To begin with, it is bad enough to know that, for the most part, oil prices are being set by a foreign cartel with little concern for the American consumer. However, I think it is inexcusable when our own Government does not actively encourage the participation of citizens in making major electric and gas rate decisions over which it does have some control. I am speaking about multimillion dollar wholesale and interstate price decisions on electric power and natural gas.

The way the Federal Energy Regula-

tory Commission (FERC) is set up and operates in the Department of Energy does not encourage or facilitate participation by the people at home who pay the bills, or by the local rural electric cooperatives, the power and light company and the local gas company that are forced to pass on these charges. It is unfair to ask citizens to be inconvenienced and to pay for the cost of traveling to Washington to have their voices heard, assuming they would be invited to attend the hearings.

For that reason, and to change this situation, I have introduced the Consumers' Energy Hearings Act of 1979 (H.R. 1977) to require that these Washington hearings be moved to the areas of the country affected by the increases. It calls for no new hearings where no hearings were required before. What it does say is that if FERC is going to hold hearings which could result in a significant rate increase, a person who is going to be affected by it can petition FERC to have the hearing moved to that area. It would then become an open proceeding with interested consumers being able to attend and participate and have their views heard directly by the people making the decisions.

This legislation attempts to facilitate consumer involvement in these Washington-based decisions which are then binding on the States and localities. Even the elected State public service commissions can do nothing more than accept these Federal decisions because wholesale and interstate increases are within Federal jurisdiction, and public service commissions deal only with the intrastate rates. I know of State public service commissions that simply, automatically pass on these Federal-level increases to consumers in the State. When the homeowner receives his or her utility bill, he or she will at least know what is behind the euphemisms "surcharge" or "adjustment" that appear on these bills and really mean Washington decides, you abide. This bill will give consumers a chance to be heard on these important pocketbook decisions.●

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2 (a), of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Rules of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation are submitted for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, 96TH CONGRESS (1979-80)

(Adopted February 7, 1979)

RULE NO. I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee, and is subject to the au-

thority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under Rule X of House Rules and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by Rule XI, clause 5 of House Rules) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) The committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) The committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under Rule X and XI of House Rules during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(e) The committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. II.—REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS; OPEN COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the first Tuesday of every month to transact its business unless such day is a holiday, or Congress is in recess or is adjourned, in which case the Chairman shall determine the regular meeting day of the committee for that month. The Chairman shall give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice of such meeting. If the Chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the full committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, the meeting may be cancelled, delayed or deferred until such times as, in the judgment of the Chairman, there may be such matters which require the committee's consideration. This paragraph shall not apply to meetings of any subcommittee.

(b) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) If the Chairman of the committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(e) The committee may not sit, without special leave, while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the five-minute rule.

(f) (1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however*, that no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to open committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(1) of House Rule X or by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives.

Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony.

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate clause (g) (5) of Rule VII, or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in clause (g) (5) of Rule VII.

No member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the committee or any subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the committee or a particular subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to members by the same procedure designated in this subparagraph for closing hearings to the public: *Provided, however*, that the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

RULE NO. III.—RECORDS AND ROLL CALLS

(a) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of such roll call vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present.

(b) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as Chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

RULE NO. IV.—PROXIES

(a) A vote by any member in the committee or in any subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing. Each proxy shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motion pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

(b) Proxies shall be in the following form:

Hon. _____
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear _____: Anticipating that I will be absent on official business or otherwise unable to be present, I hereby authorize you to vote in my place and stand in the consideration of _____ and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto.

Member of Congress

Executed this the _____ day of _____, 19____, at the time of _____ p.m./a.m.

RULE NO. V.—POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b) (1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such books, witnesses and the production of such records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. The Chairman of the committee, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) (1) A subpoena may be issued by the committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a) (2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. Such authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee. If a specific request for a subpoena has not been previously rejected by either the committee or a subcommittee, the Chairman of the committee, after consultation with the ranking minority members, may authorize and issue a subpoena under subparagraph (a) (2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, and such subpoena shall for all purposes be deemed a subpoena issued by the committee. Whenever a subpoena is issued under this subparagraph, as soon as practicable thereafter, the Chairman shall notify all members of the committee of such action.

(2) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a) (2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(c) Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the committee or any subcommittee, may

report to the office of counsel of the committee, may report to the office of counsel of the committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D.C., the witness may contact the counsel of the committee, or his representative, prior to leaving the hearing room.

RULE NO. VI.—QUORUMS

(a) One-third of the members of the committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than the closing of a meeting pursuant to subparagraph (f) of committee Rule II, the authorizing of a subpoena pursuant to subparagraph (b) of committee Rule V, the reporting of a measure or recommendation pursuant to subparagraph (b) (1) of committee Rule VIII, and the actions described in subparagraph (b), (c) and (d) of this Rule.

(b) A majority of the members of the committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of a measure or recommendation.

(c) A majority of the members of the committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for approval of any of the following actions:

(1) Construction, alteration, purchase or acquisition of a public building involving an expenditure in excess of \$500,000 and lease of space at an average annual rental in excess of \$50,000 (section 2 of P.L. 92-313, 40 U.S.C. 606).

(2) Survey investigation of a proposed project for navigation, flood control, and other purposes by the Corps of Engineers (section 4 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 4, 1913, 33 U.S.C. 542).

(3) Construction of a water resources development project by the Corps of Engineers with an estimated Federal cost not exceeding \$15,000,000 (section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965, as amended).

(4) Continuation of the authorization of a water resources development project to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers where such project has been recommended for deauthorization pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974.

(5) Deletion of water quality storage in a Federal reservoir project where the benefits attributable to water quality are 15 percent or more but not greater than 25 percent of the total project benefits (section 65 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974).

(6) Authorization of a Soil Conservation Service watershed project involving any single structure of more than 4,000 acre feet of total capacity (section 2 of P.L. 566, 83rd Congress, as amended).

(d) Two members of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE NO. VII.—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) The Chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 2 working days before

the day of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable the Clerk and Staff Director shall cause to be prepared a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration which shall be made available immediately to all members of the committee. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman shall make available to the members of the committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter.

(e) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearing or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(f) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witness in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority nor the members of the minority. The chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(g) The following additional rules shall apply to investigative hearings:

(1) The Chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigatory hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person,

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of clause (f) (2) of Rule No. II, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the committee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the members of the committee, a majority being present, determine that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, or incriminate any person.

In either case the committee shall afford such person an opportunity to voluntarily to appear as a witness; and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), Chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

(10) No major investigation by a subcommittee shall be initiated without approval of a majority of such subcommittee.

RULE NO. VIII.—PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) (1) It shall be the duty of the Chairman of the committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b) (1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

(2) With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such bill or resolution shall be included in the committee report.

(c) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall include

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to clause 2(b) (1) of Rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified;

(2) the statement required by section 308 (a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures;

(3) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such Act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee; and

(4) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations under clause 4(c) (2) of Rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been

submitted to the legislative committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(d) Each report of the committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(e) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the committee, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subdivisions (3) and (4) of subparagraph (c) are included as part of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude—

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this subparagraph; or

(B) the filing by any such committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that committee upon that measure or matter.

(f) (1) All committee and subcommittee prints, reports, documents, or other materials, not otherwise provided for under Rule VIII, that purport to express publicly views of the committee or any of its subcommittees or members of the committee or its subcommittees shall be approved by the committee or the subcommittee prior to printing and distribution and any member shall be given an opportunity to have views included as part of such material prior to printing, release and distribution in accordance with subparagraph (e) of this rule.

(2) No committee or subcommittee document containing views other than those of members of the committee or subcommittee shall be published without approval of the committee or subcommittee.

RULE NO. IX.—OVERSIGHT

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, there shall be in conformity with Rule XV a Subcommittee on Oversight and Review.

(b) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Review and the appropriate subcommittee with legislative authority shall cooperatively review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the

jurisdiction of the committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Review and the appropriate subcommittee with legislative authority shall cooperatively review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the committee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Review shall in no way limit the responsibility of the subcommittees from carrying out their oversight responsibilities.

(c) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Review and the appropriate subcommittee with legislative authority shall cooperatively review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

RULE NO. X.—REVIEW OF CONTINUING PROGRAMS; BUDGET ACT PROVISIONS

(a) The committees shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, insure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 7(d) of Rule XIII of House Rules.

(b) The committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such programs could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) The committee shall, on or before March 15 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE NO. XI.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) It is the purpose of this clause to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which committee hearings, or committee meetings, which are open to the public may be covered, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage—

(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body and regarding the measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution of the United States as an organ of the Federal Government.

(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause shall not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(c) It is, further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting (whether of a hearing or otherwise) covered, under authority of this clause, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, and the personal behavior of the committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations and shall not be such as to—

(1) distort the objects and purposes of the hearings or other meeting or the activities of committee members in connection with that hearing or meeting or in connection with the general work of the committee or of the House; or

(2) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the committee, or any member or bring the House, the committee, or any member into disrepute.

(d) The coverage of committee hearings and meetings by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or still photography is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(e) Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by any committee of the House is open to the public, that committee may permit, by majority vote of the committee, that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, but only under such written rules as the committee may adopt in accordance with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(f) (1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall

be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to subparagraph (g) (5) of Rule VII, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobolights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or the meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE NO. XI.—COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGETS

(a) The Chairman, in consultation with the chairman of each subcommittee, the majority members of the committee and the minority membership of the committee, shall, for each session of the Congress, prepare a consolidated committee budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the full committee and its subcommittees.

(b) Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen committee and subcommittees' expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions

processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(c) The Chairman or any chairman of a subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule XIV within the limits of the consolidated budget as approved by the House and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers thereof.

(d) Once monthly, the Chairman shall submit to the Committee on House Administration, in writing, a full and detailed accounting of all expenditures made during the period since the last such accounting from the amount budgeted to the full committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of such expenditure and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed. A copy of such monthly report shall be available in the committee office for review by members of the committee.

RULE NO. XIII.—COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes; Provided, however, that no minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(b) The professional and clerical employees of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority under the above provision shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the Chairman.

(c) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the ranking minority party member of the full committee who may delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(d) The professional and clerical staff of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(e) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the committee staff shall be available to all members of the committee.

(f) (1) The chairman of each standing subcommittee of this committee is authorized to appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman.

(2) The ranking minority member of each standing subcommittee on this committee is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking minority party member.

(3) The staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the subcommittee chairman not to exceed (A) 75 per centum of the maximum established in paragraph (c) of clause 6 of House Rule XI: Provided, however, a staff person appointed by a ranking minority member shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(4) Subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall apply to six subcommittees only, and no member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to the above provisions.

(5) The staff positions made available to the subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority party members pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be made available from the staff positions provided under clause 6 of House Rule XI unless such staff positions are made available pursuant to a primary or additional expense resolution.

(6) Except as provided by the above pro-

visions, the professional and clerical members of the subcommittee staffs shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman in consultation with and with the approval of a majority of the majority members of the subcommittee, and with the approval of the chairman.

(7) The professional and clerical staff of a subcommittee shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman of that subcommittee.

RULE NO. XIV.—TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee of any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel;
- (2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made;
- (3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made;
- (4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a) and in addition thereto setting forth that subcommittee funds are available to cover the expenses of the person or persons being authorized by the subcommittee chairman to undertake the travel and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Rule VII of the committee.

(c) (1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) the purpose of the travel;
- (B) the dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;
- (D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to

be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel, when requested by the Chairman.

(d) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

RULE NO. XV.—NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) There shall be 6 standing subcommittees. All proposed legislation and other matters related to the subcommittees listed under standing subcommittees named below shall be referred to such subcommittees, respectively:

- (1) Subcommittee on Aviation
- (2) Subcommittee on Economic Development
- (3) Subcommittee on Oversight and Review
- (4) Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds
- (5) Subcommittee on Surface Transportation
- (6) Subcommittee on Water Resources

(b) The committee may provide for such additional subcommittees as determined to be appropriate; Provided, however, that such additional subcommittees are approved by a majority of the majority members on the committee.

RULE NO. XVI.—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(b) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(c) In any event, the report of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit im-

mediately to the chairman of the subcommittee notice of the filing of that request.

(d) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members."

(e) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported and where practicable shall be considered by the full committee in the order in which they were reported unless the committee shall by majority vote otherwise direct. No bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless it has been delivered to the offices of all members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, unless the chairman determines that such bill is of such urgency that it should be given early consideration. Where practicable, such bills, resolutions, or other matters shall be accompanied by a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change.

RULE NO. XVII.—REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Each bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in Rule XV referred to or initiated by the full committee shall be referred by the Chairman to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks, unless, by majority vote of the majority members of the full committee, consideration is to be by the full committee.

(b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the Chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under his rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) In carrying out Rule XVII with respect to any matter, the Chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with Rule XV, for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee after the first), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter to a special ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the Chairman (from the members of the subcommittee having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the full committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

RULE NO. XVIII.—SIZES AND PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

(a) To the extent that the number of subcommittees and their party ratios permit,

the size of all subcommittees shall be established so that the majority party members of the committee have an equal number of subcommittee assignments; Provided, however, that a member may waive his or her right to an equal number of subcommittee assignments on the committee; and provided further, that the majority party members may limit the number of subcommittee assignments of the Chairman and the subcommittee chairman in order to equalize committee workloads.

(b) On each subcommittee there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included all *ex officio* voting members of the subcommittees.

(c) Following shall be the sizes and majority/minority ratios for subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Aviation: (26 members) (17 majority; 9 minority).

(2) Subcommittee on Economic Development: (23 members) (15 majority; 8 minority).

(3) Subcommittee on Oversight and Review: (23 members) (15 majority; 8 minority).

(4) Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds: (23 members) (15 majority; 8 minority).

(5) Subcommittee on Surface Transportation: (27 members) (18 majority; 9 minority).

(6) Subcommittee on Water Resources: (27 members) (18 majority; 9 minority).

(d) The full committee Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members (1) selected by the majority party members of the committee in a manner determined by them, and (2) selected by the minority. Provided, however, that recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full committee.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the rules of the House, and at the request of the chairman, I submit the rules of the Committee on Education and Labor for printing in the Record:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, 96TH CONGRESS, RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

INTRODUCTION

The rules of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives have been promulgated and adopted in conformity with House Resolution 5 of the Ninety-sixth Congress, and are consistent with the rules adopted by the Democratic Caucus of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives for the Ninety-fifth Congress and in other respects preserve those provisions of the rules and reforms governing the Committee for the previous Congress.

Paragraph (k) (2) of clause 2 of rule XI, Rules of the House of Representatives, provides that a copy of the committee rules and clause 2 of rule XI shall be made available to witnesses before the committee.

This print is furnished in accordance with that requirement.

RULE 1. REGULAR AND SPECIAL MEETINGS.—

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month at 9:45 a.m., while the Congress is in session. When the Chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, he will give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect and no committee meeting shall be held on that day.

(b) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) All legislative meetings of the committee and its subcommittees shall be open. No business meeting of the committee, other than regularly scheduled meetings, may be held without each member being given reasonable notice. Such meeting shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the ranking majority party member of the committee present.

RULE 2. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES.—Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority party. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority party members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to place the members of the majority party in a disadvantageous position. The Chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority party members for each minority party member recognized.

RULE 3. RECORDS AND ROLLCALLS.—Written records shall be kept of the proceedings of

the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee or subcommittee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee or subcommittee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member.

RULE 4. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES, SIZE, RATIO AND JURISDICTION.—(a) There shall be eight standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

(1) Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education.—Education from preschool through the high school level and vocational education.

Including, but not limited to: Elementary and secondary education generally, vocational education, school lunch and child nutrition, adult basic education, migrant and agricultural labor education, and overseas dependent schools.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education shall consist of 15 Members, 10 from the Majority and five from the Minority.

(2) Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations.—Relationship between employer and employee and their representatives.

Including, but not limited to: Labor-management relations generally, Bureau of Labor Statistics, pension reform (ERISA), and Service Contract Act.

The Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations shall consist of 18 Members, 12 from the Majority and six from the Minority.

(3) Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities.—Comprehensive employment and training, work incentive and equal employment opportunities.

Including, but not limited to: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, equal employment opportunities, Humphrey-Hawkins, displaced homemakers, Wagner-Peyser (employment services), Youth Conservation Corps, Young Adult Conservation Corps, import trade impact, plant relocation impact, Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act, and WIN.

The Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities shall consist of 10 Members, seven from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(4) Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education.—Education beyond the high school level.

Including, but not limited to: Higher education generally, education professions development, postsecondary student assistance, arts and humanities, museums, and library services and construction.

The Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education shall consist of 16 Members, 11 from the Majority and five from the Minority.

(5) Subcommittee on Health and Safety.—Workers' health and safety.

Including, but not limited to: Occupational safety and health, mine health and safety, youth camp safety, and migrant and agricultural labor health and safety.

The Subcommittee on Health and Safety shall consist of nine Members, six from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(6) Subcommittee on Select Education.—Special education programs.

Including, but not limited to: Alcohol and drug abuse, education of the handicapped, rehabilitation, environmental education, National Institute of Education, migrant and

agricultural labor day care, child adoption, child abuse, domestic violence, domestic volunteers, ACTION (excluding volunteer older Americans programs).

The Subcommittee on Select Education shall consist of 12 Members, eight from the Majority and four from the Minority.

(7) Subcommittee on Labor Standards.—Wages and hours of labor.

Including, but not limited to: Davis-Bacon Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Fair Labor Standards Act (including child labor), workers' compensation generally, Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, Federal employees compensation.

The Subcommittee on Labor Standards shall consist of nine Members, six from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(8) Subcommittee on Human Resources.—All matters dealing with programs and services for the elderly, for the elimination of poverty and for the care and treatment of children, exclusive of education programs.

Including, but not limited to: Economic Opportunity and Community Services Acts (Headstart, Community Services, etc.), Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Runaway Youth Act, early childhood services, nutrition programs for the elderly, and older Americans.

The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of eight Members, five from the Majority and three from the Minority.

(b) The Majority party Members of the Committee may provide for such special and select subcommittees as determined to be appropriate.

RULE 5. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP.—The Chairman of the Committee and the ranking Minority party Member of the Committee shall be ex officio members of each Subcommittee established pursuant to Rule 4.

RULE 6. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS.—To facilitate the oversight and other legislative and investigative activities of the committee, the Chairman of the committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chairman, make a temporary assignment of any member of the committee to such subcommittee for the purpose of enabling such member to participate in any public hearing, investigation, or study by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington. Any member of the committee may attend public hearings of any subcommittee and shall be afforded an opportunity by the subcommittee chairman to question witnesses.

RULE 7. SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIP.—The majority party members of the committee shall have the right, in order of full committee seniority, to bid for subcommittee chairmanships. Any such request shall be subject to approval by a majority of those present and voting in the majority party caucus of the committee. Members so elected shall be chairman of their respective subcommittees.

RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULING.—Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible. Available dates for subcommittee meetings during the session shall be assigned by the Chairman to the subcommittees as nearly as practicable in rotation and in accordance with their workloads.

RULE 9. SUBCOMMITTEE RULES.—The rules of the committee shall be the rules of its subcommittees.

RULE 10. COMMITTEE STAFFS.—Except as provided in Rule XI, clause 5(d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff of the House Committee on Education and Labor shall be appointed as follows:

A. The subcommittee staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman in consultation with and with the

approval of the majority party members of the subcommittee within the budget approved for the subcommittee by the full committee;

B. The staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority party members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee;

C. The employees of the committee not assigned to a standing subcommittee or to the minority under the above provisions shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the Chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority party members of the committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

RULE 11. SUPERVISION, DUTIES OF COMMITTEE STAFFS.—The staff of a subcommittee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman of that subcommittee. The staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority party members of the committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate. The staff of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate authority as he determines appropriate.

Staff members shall be assigned to committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

RULE 12. HEARINGS PROCEDURE.—(a) The Chairman in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee or subcommittee determines that there is a good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the Chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 24 hours in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority party members before the completion of such hearing, to all witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 13. MEETINGS—HEARINGS—QUORUMS.—(a) Subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings, receive exhibits, hear witnesses, and report to the committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be agreed upon by the subcommittee. No such meetings or hearings, however, shall be held outside of Washington or during a recess or adjournment of the House without the prior authorization of the committee Chairman or a majority of a quorum of the subcommittee: *Provided*, That where feasible and practicable, 14 days notice will be given of such meeting or hearing.

(b) One-third of the members of the com-

mittee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than amending committee rules, closing a meeting from the public, reporting a measure or recommendations, or in the case of the committee authorizing a subpoena. For the enumerated actions a majority of the committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. Any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(c) In the absence of the chairman of the committee or a subcommittee, the ranking majority party member present shall preside.

RULE 14. SUBPOENAS.—A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the Members of the full Committee voting, a majority being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any Member designated by the Committee.

RULE 15. REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—(a) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(b) In any event, the report, described in the proviso in paragraph (d) of this rule, of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the subcommittee notice of the filing of that request.

(c) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members."

(d) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported and shall be considered by the full committee in the order in which they were reported unless the committee shall by majority vote otherwise direct: *Provided*, That no bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless it has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, together with a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change.

RULE 16. PROXIES.—(a) A vote by any member in the committee or in any subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing and in the hands of the chief clerk of the committee or the clerk of the subcommittee, as the case may be, during each rollcall in which they are to be voted. Each proxy shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to

recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the members assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

(b) Proxies shall be in the following form:

Hon. _____
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR _____: Anticipating that I will be absent on official business/or otherwise unable to be present, I hereby authorize you to vote in my place and stand in the consideration of _____ and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto.

Member of Congress.

Executed this the _____ day of _____, 19____, at the time of _____ p.m./a.m.

RULE 17. AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL.—(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be paid from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee.

Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel;
- (2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made;
- (3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made;
- (4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the appropriate chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), and (4) of paragraph (a) and in addition thereto setting forth that subcommittee funds are available to cover the expenses of the person or persons being authorized by the subcommittee chairman to undertake the travel and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Rule 12 of the committee.

(c) (1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittees prior authorization must be obtained from the Chairman, or, in the case of a subcommittee, from the subcommittee chairman and the Chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) The purpose of the travel;
- (B) The dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) The names of the countries to be

visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) An agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) The names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) The Chairman shall not approve a request involving travel outside the United States while the House is in session (except in the case of attendance at meetings and conferences or where circumstances warrant an exception).

(4) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the Chairman covering the activities of the subcommittee and containing the results of these activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(d) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, including rules, procedures and limitations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration with respect to domestic and foreign expense allowance.

(e) Prior to the Chairman's authorization for any travel the ranking minority party member shall be given a copy of the written request therefor.

RULE 18. OVERSIGHT.—(a) In order to enable the Committee to carry out its responsibilities under Rule X, clause (2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, each such subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee.

(b) The Chairman of the committee, consistent with Rule 4, from time to time in order to fulfill the committee's responsibility under Rule X, clause (3)(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, shall assign matters to subcommittees for reviewing, studying, and coordinating, on a continuing basis, all laws, programs, and Government activities dealing with or involving domestic educational programs and institutions, and programs of student assistance, which are within the jurisdiction of other committees.

(c) The Chairman of the committee, consistent with Rule X, clause (2)(d) of the

Rules of the House of Representatives, shall from time to time assign matters to subcommittees for reviewing and studying on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

RULE 19. REFERRAL OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS.—(a) Each bill, resolution, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in Rule 4 referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks, unless, by majority vote of the majority party members of the committee, consideration is to be by the full committee.

(b) In carrying out paragraph (a) with respect to any matter, the Chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with Rule 4, for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter, pursuant to Rule 4, to a special ad hoc subcommittee, appointed by the Chairman (from the members of the subcommittees having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

(c) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

RULE 20. COMMITTEE REPORTS.—(a) All committee reports on bills or resolutions shall comply with the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) No such report shall be filed until copies of the proposed report have been available to all members at least 36 hours prior. No material change shall be made in the report distributed to members unless agreed to by majority vote: *Provided*, That any member or members of the committee may file, as part of the printed report, individual, minority, or dissenting views, without reference to the preceding provisions of this rule.

RULE 12. BUDGET AND EXPENSES.—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority party members of the committee shall, for each session of the Congress, prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the committee and after consultation with the minority party membership, the Chairman shall include amounts budgeted to the minority party members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority party, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority party office expenses. All travel expenses of minority party members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set aside and budgeted. The chairman of each

standing subcommittee, in consultation with the majority party members thereof, shall prepare a supplemental budget to include funds for each additional staff, and for such travel, investigations, etc., as may be required for the work of such subcommittee. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated committee budget, and shall present the same to the committee for its approval or other action. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the committee duly authorized by the House. After said budget shall have been adopted, no change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the committee. The Chairman or the chairman of any standing subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule 16 within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the Chairman may execute necessary vouchers therefor.

Once monthly, the Chairman shall notify the committee, in writing, that a full and detailed accounting of all expenditures made during the period since the last such accounting from the amount budgeted to the committee is available to every Member in the office of the Clerk of the Committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of each expenditure and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed.

RULE 22. RECOMMENDATION OF RULE FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members of the subcommittee which handled the legislation in the order of their seniority upon such subcommittee and such other committee members as the Chairman may designate with the approval of the majority party members. Recommendations of the Chairman to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority members to minority party members on the full committee. In making assignments of minority party members as conferees the Chairman shall consult with the ranking minority party member of the committee.

RULE 23. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS.—(a) When any hearing or meeting of the committee or a subcommittee is open to the public, that hearing or meeting may be covered in whole or in part by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by other such methods of coverage. Such coverage of hearings and meetings is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions and requirements of clause 3 of Rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) The general conduct of each hearing or meeting covered under authority of this clause and the personal behavior of committee members, staff, other government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House.

(c) Persons undertaking to cover committee hearings or meetings under authority of this rule shall be governed by the following limitations:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or

television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE 24. CHANGES IN COMMITTEE RULES.—A proposed change in these Rules shall not be considered by the committee unless the text of such change has been in the hands of all Members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting in which the matter is considered.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of rule XI, clause 2(a) of the rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the 96th Congress and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point. These rules were adopted by the committee in open session on February 8, 1979:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, RULES OF PROCEDURE, 96TH CONGRESS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule I—General Provisions

The Rules of the House are the rules of the committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

Rule II—Meetings

(a) The regular meeting day for the full committee shall be at 10 a.m. on the second Tuesday of each month, and at such other times and in such places as the chairman may designate; however, a regular Tuesday meeting of the committee may be dispensed with by the chairman.

(b) The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the chairman.

(c) (1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or each subcommittee thereto shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however:* That no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however:* That the committee or subcommittee may be the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

Rule III—Records and Roll Calls

There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each such roll call vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each

member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to each record vote by the committee to report any bill or resolution, the total number of votes cast for and the total number of votes cast against the reporting of such bill or such resolution shall be included in the committee report.

Rule IV—Quorums

A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum of the committee for business and a majority of the members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business: *Provided,* That any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

Rule V—Hearing Procedures

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the chairman or the subcommittee chairman, whichever the case may be, shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of the statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman of a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call such witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(e) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

Rule VI—Oversight

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) Its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) Its formulation, consideration and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, the various subcommittees, consistent with their jurisdiction as set forth in Rule VIII, shall have oversight responsibilities as provided in paragraph (b).

(b) Each subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated.

In addition, each such subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee.

(c) Each subcommittee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdictions.

Rule VII—Broadcasting of Committee Hearings

Broadcasting, either by radio or TV of all open committee hearings and meetings shall be permitted when, in the judgment of the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, such action is warranted. Photographs shall be permitted during hearings of the full committee and subcommittees as the chairman decides.

All coverage shall be subject to the following provisions:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed

in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Rule VIII—Number and Jurisdiction of Subcommittees

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees as follows: Compensation, Pension, Insurance, and Memorial Affairs; Education, Training and Employment; Medical Facilities and Benefits; Housing; and Special Investigations. All proposed legislation and other matters related to the subcommittees listed under standing subcommittees named below shall be referred to such subcommittees, respectively:

Compensation, Pension, Insurance and Memorial Affairs: Compensation, pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special, and life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces; cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and burial benefits.

Education, Training and Employment: Education of veterans, vocational rehabilitation, and readjustment of servicemen to civilian life.

Medical Facilities and Benefits: Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

Housing: Veterans' housing programs. Special Investigations: Investigative authority over matters that come within the jurisdiction of more than one legislative subcommittee, and that are referred to the subcommittee by the chairman for investigation and appropriate recommendations.

(b) The chairman and the ranking minor-

ity member shall serve as ex-officio members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittee.

Rule IX—Powers and Duties of Subcommittees

(a) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(b) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(c) In any event, the report of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the subcommittee notice of the filing of that request.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, I submit herewith for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, which were adopted on January 31, 1979, in accordance with clause 2(a) of House rule XI: COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE RULES, 96TH CONGRESS, 1979-80

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Rule No. 1.—General provisions

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the committees and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committee and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under rule X of House Rules and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by rule XI, clause 5 of the House Rules) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection herewith.

(c) The committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the com-

mittee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) The committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under rules X and XI of House Rules during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(e) The committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

Rule No. 11.—Regular and special meetings: Open committee meetings

(a) Regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the first Tuesday of each month while the Congress is in session. When the chairman believes that the committee will not be considering any bill or resolution before the full committee and that there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, he will give each member of the committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as the circumstances make practicable, a written notice to that effect and no committee meeting shall be held on that day.

(b) The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the chairman.

(c) If at least three members of the committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) If the chairman of the committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(e) The committee may not sit, without special leave, while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

(f) (1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day be closed to the public: *Provided, however*, That no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed

to the public. This paragraph does not apply to open committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(3) of House Rule X or by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll-call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(g) No person other than a Member of Congress, committee staff, or a person from a Member's staff when that Member has an amendment under consideration, may walk in or be seated at the rostrum area of the committee unless the chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, or a majority of the committee determines otherwise.

Rule No. III.—Records and rollcalls

(a) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by any three of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to each record vote by the committee to report any bill or resolution, the name of each member voting for and voting against the motion to report, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting, and the names of those members absent, shall be included in the committee report.

(b) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

Rule No. IV.—Proxies

(a) No vote by any member of the committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy unless a proxy authorization is given in writing by the member desiring to cast a proxy, which authorization shall assert that the member is absent on official business or is absent due to personal illness and is thus unable to be present at the meeting of the committee or subcommittee and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his/her vote and shall contain the date and time of the day that the proxy is signed. No proxy shall be voted on a motion to adjourn or shall be counted to make a quorum or be voted unless a quorum is present.

(b) Proxies shall be in the following form:

Hon. _____,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear _____: I will be absent on official business/due to personal illness and thus unable to be present at the meeting of the committee or subcommittee. I hereby authorize you to vote in my place and stand in the consideration of _____ and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto. The official business that necessitates my absence is _____.

Member of Congress.

Executed this the _____ day of _____, 19____, at the time of _____ p.m./a.m.

Rule No. V.—Power to sit and act; subpoena power

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings.

(2) In the case of such hearings which are to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary, such hearings must be authorized by a vote of a majority of the members of the full committee, a majority being present. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by the chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the committee under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (a)(2) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee pursuant to such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee.

(2) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the committee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(c) Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his testimony before the committee or any subcommittee, may report to the office of counsel of the committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington, D.C., the witness may contact the counsel of the committee, or his representatives prior to leaving the hearing room.

Rule No. VI.—Quorums

A majority of the members of the full committee or subcommittees shall constitute a quorum of the full committee or subcommittees for the reporting of a measure or recommendation: *Provided*, that the number of members constituting a quorum for the taking of any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation shall be one-third of the members of the committee or subcommittee, and any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

Rule No. VII.—Hearing procedures

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event

the chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify all members of the committee and the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 24 hours in advance of his appearance, 100 copies of his proposed testimony and may be required to limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) Upon announcement of a hearing, the Clerk and Staff Director shall cause to be prepared a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration which shall be made available immediately to all members of the committee. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the chairman shall make available to the members of the committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter.

(e) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations after members of the subcommittee have been given an opportunity to participate, but no such member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(f) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(g) The following additional rules shall apply to investigative hearings:

(1) The chairman at any investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hear-

ing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person it shall—

(A) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session;

(B) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and

(C) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may review and photostat a copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

Rule No. VIII.—Procedures for reporting bills and resolutions

(a) (1) It shall be the duty of the chairman of the committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b) (1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

(2) With respect to each record vote by the committee to report any bill or resolution, the name of each member voting for and voting against the motion to report, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting, and the names of those members absent, shall be included in the committee report.

(c) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall include—

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to the last sentence of clause 2(b) (1) of rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified;

(2) the statement required by section 308 (a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures;

(3) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee;

(4) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations under clause 2(b) (2) of rule X of the House separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the legislative committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(d) Each report of the committee on each

bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(e) If, at the time of approval of any measure, matter or any report or submission to be made to the House or to the Committee on the Budget under subclauses (g), (h), and (i) of clause 4 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by the committee, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. No report shall be filed until the chairman has consulted with the ranking minority member of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee from which the legislation emanated or would have emanated. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subdivisions (3) and (4) of subparagraph (c)) are included as part of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude—

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this subparagraph; or

(B) the filing by any such committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that committee upon that measure or matter.

(f) If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House. This subparagraph shall not apply to—

(1) any measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by the Congress; or

(2) any executive decision, determination, or action which would become, or continue to be, effective unless disapproved or otherwise invalidated by one or both Houses of Congress.

Rule No. IX.—Oversight Subcommittee

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of such modification or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, there shall be established in conformity with rule XV an Oversight Subcommittee.

(b) The Oversight Subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws,

the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities which have responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Oversight Subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the committee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. The Oversight Subcommittee shall in no way limit the responsibility of the subcommittees from carrying out their oversight responsibilities.

(c) The Oversight Subcommittee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Rule No. X.—Review of continuing programs; Budget Act provisions

(a) The committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, insure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 7(d) of Rule XIII of the House Rules.

(b) The committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) The committee shall, on or before March 15 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amount of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocations made to it in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Rule No. XI.—Broadcasting of committee hearings

Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part

by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House of Representatives. At all such meetings or proceedings, coverage by radio, television or still photography will be allowed unless specifically forbidden by a record vote of the committee or subcommittee. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chairman of the committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and, for good cause, may be terminated by him/her.

Rule No. XII.—Committee and subcommittee budgets

(a) The chairman, in consultation with the majority members of the committee shall, for each session of the Congress, prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the full committee, and after consultation with the minority membership, the chairman shall include amounts budgeted to the minority members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All travel expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set aside and budgeted.

(b) (1) The chairman of each subcommittee, in consultation with the majority members thereof, shall prepare a budget to include funds for staff, travel, investigations, and miscellaneous expenses as may be required for the work of the subcommittee.

(2) The chairman of each subcommittee shall control the funds provided for in the subcommittee budget.

(c) The chairman shall combine the proposals of each subcommittee with the preliminary budget of the full committee into a consolidated committee budget, and shall present the same to the committee for its approval. The chairman shall then take all action necessary to bring about its approval by the Committee on House Administration and by the House.

(d) Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen committee and subcommittees' expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(e) The chairman, the ranking minority member of the full committee, or any chairman of a subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Rule XIV within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the chairman may execute necessary vouchers thereof.

Rule No. XIII.—Committee and subcommittee staff

(a) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee; provided, however, that no minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(b) The professional and clerical employees of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority under the above provision shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority members of the committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

(c) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the

general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

(d) The professional and clerical staff of the committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate.

(e) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the committee staff be available to all members of the committee.

(f) (1) The chairman of each standing subcommittee of this committee is authorized to appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman.

(2) The ranking minority member of each standing subcommittee on this committee is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking minority party member.

(3) The staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the subcommittee chairman not to exceed (A) 75 per centum of the maximum established in paragraph (c) of clause G of the House Rule XI; provided, however, a staff person appointed by a ranking minority member shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed that paid his or her majority party staff counterpart.

(4) Subparagraphs (7) and (2) and (3) shall apply to six subcommittees only, and no member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to the above provisions.

(5) The staff positions made available to the subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority party members pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be made available from the staff positions provided under clause 6 of House Rule XI unless such staff positions are made available pursuant to a primary or additional expense resolution.

(6) Except as provided by the above provisions, the professional and clerical members of the subcommittee staffs shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman in consultation with and with the approval of a majority of the majority members of the subcommittee, and with the approval of a majority of the majority members of the full committee, within the budget approved for the subcommittee.

(7) The professional and clerical staff of a subcommittee shall be under the supervision and direction of the chairman of that subcommittee.

Rule No. XIV.—Travel of members and staff

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee of any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel;
- (2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the events for which the travel is being made;
- (3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made;

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) In the case of travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman, the ranking minority member of the full committee whenever minority staff is involved, and the chairman of the full committee. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chairman only upon the representation by the applicable chairman of the subcommittee in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a) and in addition thereto setting forth that subcommittee funds are available to cover the expenses of the person or persons being authorized by the subcommittee chairman to undertake the travel and that there has been a compliance where applicable with Rule VII of the committee.

(c) (1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the chairman or, in the case of a subcommittee from the subcommittee chairman and the chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) the purpose of the travel;
- (B) the dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;
- (D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and
- (E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee may be initiated by the chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the chairman for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting).

(3) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(d) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

Rule No. XV.—Number and jurisdiction of subcommittees

(a) There shall be nine standing subcommittees as follows: Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy; Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development; Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization; Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs; Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance; Subcommittee on Financial In-

stitutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance; Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy; Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation; and Subcommittee on the City. All proposed legislation and other matters related to the subcommittees listed under standing subcommittees named below shall be referred to such subcommittees respectively.

Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy extends to all matters relating to monetary policy and agencies which directly or indirectly affect monetary policy, including the effect of such policy and other financial actions on interest rates, allocation of credit, and the structure and functioning of domestic and foreign financial institutions.

Further, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy extends to all private foundations and charitable trusts.

Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development extends to all matters relating to housing and mortgage credit (except programs administered by the Veterans' Administration), including mortgage and loan insurance pursuant to the National Housing Act; FHA mortgage interest rates; rural housing; housing assistance programs, secondary mortgage market programs and all other activities of FNMA, GNMA, and FHLBC; private mortgage insurance; housing construction and design standards; housing-related energy conservation; housing research and demonstration programs; financial and technical assistance for nonprofit housing sponsors; counseling and technical assistance; regulation of the housing industry (including landlord-tenant relations); real estate lending powers of financial institutions (including regulation of settlement costs); and interest charges for members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee further extends to matters relating to community development and community planning, training and research, including community development block grants; urban renewal; model cities; rehabilitation loans and grants; neighborhood facilities grants; open space land and urban beautification grants; water and sewer facilities grants; public facilities loans; national, urban or community development banks; advance acquisition of land programs; new communities assistance programs; national urban growth policies; comprehensive planning (including land use and areawide programs); community development training and fellowships; and urban research and technologies.

Further, jurisdiction of the subcommittee extends to flood insurance and related land use controls, urban property protection and reinsurance, crime insurance, and regulation of interstate land sales.

Also, the jurisdiction of the subcommittee includes FHA property improvement loans under title I of the National Housing Act which can be used to finance the preservation of historic structures; community development block grant funds authorized under title I of the 1974 Housing Act which can be used to finance the acquisition and preservation of historic properties; and section 701 comprehensive planning grants to public bodies which can be used to finance surveys of historic sites and structures.

Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization shall extend to all matters relating to financial aid to all sectors and elements within the economy, all mat-

ters relating to economic stabilization, and all defense production matters as contained in the Defense Production Act of 1959, as amended, and all related matters thereto.

Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs shall include all matters relating to consumer credit, including those matters in the Consumer Credit Protection Act dealing with truth-in-lending, extortionate credit transactions, restrictions on garnishments, reports of the National Commission on Consumer Finance, and fair credit reporting. The jurisdiction shall further include collection practices, discrimination in the extension of consumer credit, creditor remedies and debtor defenses, Federal aspects of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, and credit cards.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee shall further extend to matters relating to the price of consumer goods, services, and commodities; the rationing of consumer products; and hoarding.

Further, the subcommittee's jurisdiction extends to all matters relating to coins, coinage, currency and medals, including commemorative coins, commemorative medals, proof and mint sets and other special coins, Coinage Act of 1965, gold and silver, including coinage thereof (but not the par value of gold), gold medals, counterfeiting, and currency denominations and designs.

Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance extends to all matters relating to all multilateral development lending institutions, including activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies as related thereto; and monetary and financial developments as they relate to the activities and objectives of such institutions.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance extends to all agencies which directly or indirectly exercise supervisory or regulatory authority in connection with, or provide deposit or other insurance for financial or other institutions, the establishment of interest rate ceilings on deposits, and all auxiliary matters affecting or arising in connection with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Reserve Board and System, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Comptroller of the Currency, together with those activities and operations of any other agency or department which relate to both domestic or foreign financial institutions.

Further, jurisdiction extends to and includes, with respect to financial institutions and the department and agencies which regulate or supervise them, all activities relating to and arising in connection with the matters of chartering, branching, mergers and acquisitions, consolidations, and conversions.

Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy shall have jurisdiction over all matters within the jurisdiction of the committee relating to international trade, including but not limited to the activities of the Export-Import Bank.

Further, the jurisdiction of the subcommittee shall extend to international investment policies, both as they relate to U.S. investments for trade purposes by citizens

of the United States and investments made by all foreign entities in the United States.

Further, the subcommittee shall have jurisdiction over the International Monetary Fund, its permanent and temporary agencies, and all matters related thereto.

Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation

The Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation shall assist the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in appraising the administration of the laws and regulations under the jurisdiction of the committee and present such recommendations as deemed necessary to the appropriate subcommittee(s) of the committee.

Further, the subcommittee shall exercise continuing oversight of the execution by the administrative agencies concerning any of the laws the subject matter of which reside within the jurisdiction of the committee and shall study all pertinent reports, documents and data pertinent to the jurisdiction of the committee and make the necessary recommendations or reports thereon to the appropriate subcommittee(s) of the committee.

Further, the subcommittee shall have full jurisdiction over the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended.

Subcommittee on the City

The Subcommittee on the City shall be a non-legislative subcommittee to study, investigate, report on and make recommendations concerning the problems of the cities.

(b) The committee may provide for such additional subcommittees as determined to be appropriate; Provided, however, that such additional subcommittees are approved by a majority of the majority members on the committee.

(c) A member serving as chairman of any subcommittee on this committee shall not also serve as the chairman of a subcommittee on any other standing committee; Provided, however, that this provision shall not apply to members serving as subcommittee chairman on the Budget Committee; House Administration Committee; Joint Committees; or on the Small Business Committee who served as a subcommittee chairman on the Select Committee on Small Business as of October 8, 1974.

Rule No. XVI—Powers and duties of subcommittees

(a) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen and with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(b) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(c) No bill or joint resolution approved by a subcommittee shall be considered by the committee unless such measure, as approved, has been made available to all members at least two calendar days prior to the meeting, accompanied by a section-by-section analysis of such measure. The provisions of this

paragraph may be suspended by the committee by a two-thirds vote or by the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the full committee.

(d) All committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report.

"This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its members."

(e) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the committee as of the time they are reported and shall be considered by the full committee in the order in which they were reported unless the chairman, after consultation with the ranking minority member and appropriate subcommittee chairman, otherwise directs: Provided, that no bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full committee unless each member has been provided with reasonable time prior to the meeting to analyze such bill, together with a comparison with present law and section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, and a section-by-section justification.

Rule No. XVII.—Referral of legislation to subcommittees

(a) Each bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter which relates to a subject listed under the jurisdiction of any subcommittee named in Rule XV referred to or initiated by the full committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks unless, by majority vote of the majority members of the full committee, consideration is to be by the full committee.

(b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until 3 days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the chairman of the full committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee, or at a special meeting of the committee called for that purpose at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) Committee reports shall be filed at such time as the committee shall determine with reasonable time allowed for members to file supplemental, individual, dissenting or other views.

(d) In carrying out Rule XVII with respect to any matter, the chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with Rule XV, for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any subcommittee after the first), or divide the matter into two or more parts (reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter pursuant to Rule X to a special ad hoc committee appointed by the chairman (from the members of the subcommittee having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and report-

ing to the full committee thereon, or make such other provisions as may be considered appropriate.

Rule No. XVIII.—Sizes and party ratios on subcommittees and conference committees

(a) To the extent that the number of subcommittees and their party ratios permit, the size of all subcommittees shall be established so that the majority party members of the committee have an equal number of subcommittee assignments: Provided, however, that a member may waive his or her right to an equal number of subcommittee assignments on the committee: and provided further, that the majority party members may limit the number of subcommittee assignments of the chairman and the subcommittee chairmen and the minority party members may limit the number of subcommittee assignments of ranking minority party members in order to equalize committee workloads.

(b) On each subcommittee there shall be a ratio of at least two majority party members for each minority party member. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included all ex officio voting members of the subcommittees.

(c) Following shall be the sizes and majority/minority ratios for subcommittees:

(1) Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy: total—9. Majority—6. Minority—3.

(2) Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development: total—27. Majority—18. Minority—9.

(3) Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization: total—18. Majority—12. Minority—6.

(4) Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs: total—9. Majority—6. Minority—3.

(5) Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance: total—15. Majority—10. Minority—5.

(6) Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance: total—18. Majority—12. Minority—6.

(7) Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy: total—18. Majority—12. Minority—6.

(8) Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation: Total—12. Majority—8. Minority—4.

(9) Subcommittee on the City: Total—9. Majority—6. Minority—3.

(d) The full committee chairman, or a member designated by a majority of the majority members on the committee, shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members (1) selected by the majority party members of the committee in a manner determined by them, and (2) selected by the minority party members of the committee in a manner determined by them. Provided, however, that recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of at least two majority party members for each minority party member.

SALES REPRESENTATIVES PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Sales Representatives Protection Act together with Congressman CHARLES ROSE and Congressman BILL BRODHEAD. The bill is designed to protect sales representatives from unjustifiable termination by the business firms they represent. Sales representatives are an independent businessmen and women who do not have the benefits of workman's compensation, unemployment compensation, company

sponsored retirement or pension plans, and are not eligible to bargain collectively.

The vast majority of salesmen and women work long, hard hours attracting and maintaining customers for the business firms they represent. However, they are not protected from wrongful termination from their accounts by their principals, nor are they protected from a reduction in their sales territories, which cuts their income. Finally, they are not protected from such other inequities as the conversion of their accounts to accounts serviced directly by the principal.

The bill establishes certain minimum standards to protect sales representatives from unfair conduct by their principals. The bill does not establish any regulations of any kind, nor does it interfere with the right of principal and sales representative to enter into a mutually agreeable contract. Rather, the bill permits sales representatives to bring an action in court to obtain an indemnity when they are terminated unfairly, or when they have their territories or commission rates cut without good cause.

The commissioned sales representatives serve as important assets to the American economy. They fulfill the American competitive spirit, bringing lower prices for the consumer, and adding strength and substance to our economy. It is clear that many businesses derive their profits from the hard work, and sacrifices of their commissioned representatives. We think fair and equitable public policy requires that these men and women be protected from arbitrary and unfair termination of their accounts, reductions in their sales territories without compensation, or reductions in their commission rates.●

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE TRADE FAIR ACT

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Trade Fair Act. This act allows the Secretary of Commerce to request the Secretary of the Treasury to waive duties and import taxes on goods coming into this country, if those goods are for display at fairs that the Secretary of Commerce deems to be "in the public interest." Trade fairs are excellent forums for merchants from this country and other countries to show off their expertise, display their technical prowess and foster an increase in trade. The Trade Fair Act was enacted to encourage such activities and I support that purpose.

I am troubled, however, that this act embraces a kind of trade fair that I do not support and that I do not believe, in any way, serves "the public interest." That is a trade fair to promote the sale of arms. We ought not allow this act to provide an incentive for the arms trade. We ought to rewrite the act to demonstrate our commitment to arms reduction. Therefore, the amendment I offer today would disallow the Secretary of

Commerce to request a waiver for any military goods or other related hardware.

I am troubled also, that such an arms fair is planned for Rosemont, Ill., on February 18-22. Its name, "Defense Technology '79," disguises its purpose. Its sole purpose is to promote and encourage the sale of military goods and other related hardware. This is totally antithetical to the stated goal of the administration for arms reduction. It is totally contrary to the views of a majority of Americans. And it is totally contrary to the moral imperative that arms reduction, not arms sales, is the philosophy that the Congress should encourage.

Let me emphasize that this legislation is not parochial in its nature. Certainly part of my intention is to discourage the fair in Rosemont, Ill., but this legislation would discourage such a fair anywhere else in this country. We can ill afford to provide incentive for arms proliferation. We must, instead, provide incentives for arms reduction. We must make it clear that trade fairs that seek to promote arms sales do not have the blessing of this or any other Congress. ●

THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION PROTECTION ACT OF 1979 H.R. 1068

(Mr. McCLORY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is today suffering from a problem which seriously affects our Nation's security. The disclosure of sensitive, classified information—be it through espionage or the so-called leak—is undermining the vitally important mission of the departments and agencies of our government engaged in foreign intelligence and counterintelligence activities.

The state of the law allows those who steal or leak classified information to believe that their crime cannot be prosecuted—that they will go unpunished. Unfortunately, in many cases this is the all too real, sad truth. In most cases the law requires that sensitive intelligence information—in addition to that which the defendant is charged with disclosing—be disclosed in open court. As more and more culprits get away with their underhandedness, others feel safe to pursue the same course. The law is actually engendering abuse of our national security classification system.

Mr. Speaker, in order to help solve this problem, I have introduced the Foreign Intelligence Information Protection Act of 1979, H.R. 1068.

My bill would simplify the prosecution of those who commit espionage—that is, clandestine communication of classified information to a foreign power. No longer would sensitive national security information have to be publicly disclosed in order to bring a foreign spy to justice.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would also establish a new system for handling classified information dealing with our most sensitive secrets involving so-called intelligence "sources and methods". Any un-

authorized disclosure of this information by a person with lawful access would likewise be punishable without necessitating further public disclosure of classified information.

Finally, the bill would establish special protection for those brave men and women who work for the United States covertly in foreign countries, often at great risk to their personal safety. Any disclosure of information which could lead to the identity of such a person—when the disclosure could prejudice that person's life or physical safety—would be subject to criminal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, this is essential legislation which I hope will be favorably acted upon during the 96th Congress. The Subcommittee on Legislation of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, of which I am a member, has already held seven hearings to generally inquire into the problems in prosecuting espionage and "leaks". After listening to the testimony of those both within and without the government, I strongly believe that we must act to provide statutory solutions. Therefore, I am hopeful that the Intelligence Committee will schedule early hearings on H.R. 1068 and that it may be promptly enacted into law for the protection of our Nation and for the strengthening of our intelligence capabilities.

A section-by-section analysis of this bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE "FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION PROTECTION ACT OF 1979"

INTRODUCTION

This bill is designed to simplify existing law regarding disclosure of classified information, and, in specific, highly sensitive areas, expand existing law. The bill covers classic espionage (i.e. covert transmission of classified information to a foreign power), unauthorized disclosure of so-called "sources and methods" information by a person with authorized access to the information, and disclosure of information which could lead to the identity of an individual who has a secret relationship with one of our intelligence agencies where such disclosure could put the individual's life in danger.

Section 1

This section sets out the short title of the bill—the "Foreign Intelligence Information Protection Act of 1979".

Section 2

Statement of findings.—This section sets out the need for the legislation. While recognizing the public's interest in access to government information, new laws must be enacted to better protect from disclosure to foreign powers extremely sensitive information which directly relates to our national security.

Section 3

Title V—Protection of foreign intelligence information.—This section amends the National Security Act of 1947 by adding to it an additional title. The title contains eight sections.

Definitions.—Section 508 includes eight definitions: "Authority" means at the direction of the President or pursuant to a statute or an Executive order, or pursuant to a lawful demand of a congressional committee.

"Classified information" means information that is designated and clearly marked or represented pursuant to statute or Executive order as requiring a specific degree of protection against unauthorized disclosure

for reasons of national security, or information derived therefrom.

"Communicate" means to impart, transfer, convey or otherwise make available to another.

"Disclose" means to communicate (as defined above) or to release by publication.

"Foreign power" includes foreign governments, factions of foreign nations, international terrorist groups, foreign based political organizations, entities directed and controlled by foreign governments, and anyone acting on behalf of the above.

"Knowingly acts" means to act with knowledge or reason to know of all of the elements of the criminal offense involved.

"Lawful access" means to have access to classified information as a result of a contractual arrangement with the government (e.g. as an employee) or otherwise pursuant to a statute or an Executive order.

"Sensitive intelligence information" means classified information which is designated and clearly marked or represented as sensitive intelligence information because it relates to: particularly sensitive or sophisticated methods of collecting foreign intelligence; a source of foreign intelligence; a particularly sensitive or sophisticated method of analysis of foreign intelligence; a method of defense against the intelligence activities of foreign powers; or the identity of an individual or entity which has a secret relationship with a government intelligence agency.

Designation of sensitive intelligence information.—Section 501 empowers the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) to designate certain information as "sensitive intelligence information" (see definition above) and, as appropriate, remove such designation. Further, the DCI shall delegate this authority to other appropriate officials, and, in consultation with interested government agencies, develop and issue regulations for the implementation of the authority. This section also provides that the designation of "sensitive intelligence information" may only be removed by the DCI, by those to whom the DCI has delegated such authority, or by action taken pursuant to the Rules of the Senate or the House.

Espionage.—Section 502 establishes as an offense: (1) communication of classified information to a foreign power; and (2) collection of classified information on behalf of a foreign power. The government is not required to prove that the classification was proper, but section 506 requires that the Attorney General and the Director of Central Intelligence certify that the information was properly classified. This offense is punishable by a fine up to \$20,000 or imprisonment for up to the defendant's life, or both.

Unauthorized disclosure of sensitive intelligence information.—Section 503 establishes as an offense the unauthorized disclosure of "sensitive intelligence information" by a person having or having had lawful access to the information. The government must prove that the defendant had lawful access to the information, that the information was designated as "sensitive intelligence information"—without going behind the designation—and that the defendant knowingly disclosed the information without authority. Section 506 requires that before prosecution, the Attorney General and the Director of Central Intelligence must certify to the correctness of the designation. Punishment for the offense ranges up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for 20 years, or both.

Unauthorized disclosure of classified information.—Section 504 establishes as an offense disclosure of information which has been properly designated as classified information by a person having or having had lawful access to it. The government must prove that the individual had lawful access, that the information was, in fact, subject to classification and was properly designated

as classified information, and that the defendant knowingly disclosed such information without authority. The penalty for this offense ranges up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years, or both.

Unauthorized disclosure of the identities of certain individuals.—Section 505 establishes as an offense the unauthorized disclosure of the identity of any individual or entity as being or having been secretly associated with a U.S. intelligence agency where such disclosure could prejudice the life or physical safety of the individual or entity identified. The penalty for such an offense ranges up to \$5,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

Prosecution.—Section 506 requires in a prosecution brought under section 502 that both the Attorney General and the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) certify in writing to the court that at the time of the commission of the offense the information the defendant is charged with disclosing was properly designated as "classified information". Likewise, in a prosecution brought under section 503, the Attorney General and the DCI must both certify in writing to the court that at the time of the commission of the offense the information the defendant is charged with disclosing was properly designated as "sensitive intelligence information".

Jurisdiction.—Section 507 establishes federal jurisdiction over an offense established by this title if the offense is committed in the United States or if the person who committed the offense is a citizen or a permanent resident alien.●

FEDERAL SENTENCING LAWS REQUIRE MODERNIZATION

(Mr. McCLODY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, much has been written on the subject of sentencing. We have been told over the years that judges are often too lenient, that they give probation or short-term confinement too easily. We have been told that Federal and State correctional facilities are too often inadequate to cope with the problems of today's criminal community, that rehabilitation has become a joke. We have also been told that wealth and influence play too great a role in creating a different brand of justice for those who have ready access to it. In the end, we are told that, whatever we do, the crime rate continues to escalate with no end in sight.

I do not presume to be an expert on sentencing, but I have read a good deal about it. One problem constantly surfaces: there rarely seems to be any consistency to sentencing. For example, in 1974 an interesting experiment was conducted in New York's Second Judicial Circuit, one of the most respected in the country. Fifty different judges were given specific facts from actual cases and asked to recommend sentences applying the discretionary ranges available under current Federal law. As a result, the recommendations of these 50 Federal judges varied widely for the same crime. In fact, they ranged from 20 years imprisonment and a \$65,000 fine to 3 years imprisonment with no fine. I find this situation intolerable, but unavoidable if current discretionary ranges continue to exist.

As many of you know, "judge-shop-

ping" has become a fine art in the Federal and State courthouses around the country. Lawyers hope against hope that they will get Judge A, the reasonable or lenient judge, rather than Judge B, the "hangin' judge." Some judges have a bias against drug offenders and, therefore, apply harsh sentences while, in the case of white collar offenders, their anger turns to forgiveness if only partial restitution is made. Please understand that my comments are not meant as criticism of the judiciary. On the contrary, judges are simply human beings operating within the wide range of discretion we in the Congress have seen fit to give them. In the final analysis, we have made it inevitable that society has once again become the victim of our inclination to farm out our decisions to others. I cannot understand how society can be expected to maintain its faith in the criminal justice system when the punishment it metes out often defies logic and reason. It is our responsibility to remedy that disparity.

The bill I will introduce today takes a giant step in that direction. Its principal purpose would be to set up a U.S. Commission on Sentencing within the judicial branch. Its membership would include not only judges but practicing attorneys and other criminal justice personnel. Its purpose would be to promulgate and distribute very specific sentencing guidelines for use by the sentencing court in determining its sentence, including probation. My bill requires that, in setting these guidelines, the Commission consider a defendant's age, mental and emotional condition, physical condition, role in the offense, prior criminal history and the degree of his dependence upon criminal activity for a livelihood. My bill also contains a sunset provision which would result in the abolition of the Commission within 6 years of its creation.

Once the Commission's recommendations are generated, the other portions of my legislation would apply. A Federal court, in deciding to impose a term of imprisonment within the range determined as fair by the Commission, must consider not only the Commission's guidelines but also such factors as the community's need to be protected from any future criminal offenses committed by the accused and his need for educational or recreational training. In any case in which the court imposes a penalty, whether it is a term of imprisonment or a fine, it must state, in open court and on the record, the reasons and rationale underlying its decision. Under current law no reasons need be stated; a defendant can be sentenced to prison for a month or the rest of his life and never know precisely why.

My bill, for the first time, also provides for appellate review of sentences issued by the trial court. Under current law sentences are virtually nonreviewable because of the level of discretion practiced by the trial court. My bill would provide for potential review by the Court of Appeals with harsher standards applied for sentences issued outside the Commission's guidelines. In time, case law will develop which will assist

judges in giving similar sentences for similar crimes.

My hope is that we in the Congress make the sentencing procedures utilized by the Federal courts more uniform and therefore more fair. I believe it is imperative that those who must face punishment under our criminal justice system be treated fairly and predictably. They should know what penalties they will face for what offense. Their future freedom and, conversely, society's safety, should not depend upon the luck of the draw.●

BILL TO REVERSE THE ILLINOIS BRICK SUPREME COURT DECISION

(Mr. McCLODY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to reverse the Supreme Court decision in Illinois Brick Co. against Illinois, a decision which greatly impaired the ability of consumers, businesses and governments to collect damages resulting from antitrust violations.

I am offering this measure so that it will be before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law for consideration by members and witnesses at the hearing expected later this month. Representative PETER RODINO, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee on which I serve as ranking member, has already introduced an Illinois Brick bill, H.R. 2060, which differs in significant respects from the bill which I am introducing today. H.R. 2060 is identical with S. 300, introduced in the other body by the chairman of its Judiciary Committee, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY.

With one exception my bill is precisely the same as H.R. 11942, the Illinois Brick bill which was ordered reported by a 21 to 12 vote of the Judiciary Committee on June 20, 1978, but which was not considered by the House before the end of the 95th Congress. I have deleted the so-called Pfizer amendment, because it deals with a subject significantly different from the issues raised by the Illinois Brick decision.

A most important difference between last year's committee bill and this year's Rodino-Kennedy bill is in the provision on assessment of aggregate damages, and I believe that the former deals with this critical matter with much greater precision and in a more responsible manner.

In the committee bill it is stated that, except as provided for *parens patriae* actions, "damages shall not be assessed in the aggregate against the defendant but shall be assessed only on behalf of any person who makes a valid damage claim." This is squarely in accord with the rationale and justification for the reversal of the Illinois Brick decision—the need to compensate victims of antitrust violations for their injuries. The intent and clear meaning of the committee bill is to provide that damages may be assessed only to satisfy real claims of real victims (and then only to the extent that

the purchases are satisfactorily proven to the court or a master). While this language expressly repudiates the concept of aggregate assessment, the language in the Rodino-Kennedy bill is much more obscure and deficient on this subject. The Rodino-Kennedy bill states that, except as provided in *parens patriae* cases, "a defendant shall not be required to pay damages except to persons on whose behalf a valid claim is presented to the court." Not only does this provision lack the express repudiation of aggregate damage assessment, but it conceivably could be read to authorize precisely such action. In the committee bill, it is clear that the individual valid damage claim precipitates the assessment; in the Rodino-Kennedy bill the assessment is precipitated by the presentation of valid claims which arguably could be aggregated.

Two other significant provisions which were in the committee bill but which were deleted in the Rodino-Kennedy bills are sections providing for the discretionary award of a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing defendant upon a finding by the court that the plaintiff purchaser or seller or his attorney acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons and providing that the court, before approving a settlement in a Clayton section 4 class action, shall determine attorneys fees acting as a fiduciary for those persons on whose behalf action was brought.

Both of these provisions are important to deter suits brought by irresponsible plaintiffs or attorneys attracted by the "deep pocket" of the defendant.

Another deletion in the Rodino-Kennedy bill is of the "cap" provision which specified that an indirect purchaser may recover damages only with respect to the amount of initial overcharge proved to be passed on to him. Changing this admits the unwelcome possibility that an indirect purchaser could recover from the defendant for the additions to the initial overcharge which were added by intermediate purchasers after the price-fixed product was sold by the defendant and passed from its control. Little can be said for being ambiguous on this point to the possible detriment of the defendant.

In addition to the above deletions of important provisions in the committee bill, the Rodino-Kennedy bill advances some mischief on its own. Whereas the committee bill conferred on defendants the right to prove that the plaintiff did not himself absorb the injury but instead passed it on to others in the chain of manufacture, production, or distribution, the Rodino-Kennedy bill limits this right significantly yet incomprehensibly. Under this new provision, defendants are allowed to speak the truth about plaintiff's injury only "in the discretion of the court, in order to avoid duplicative liability."

This is such a sharp departure from the committee's approach last year that I must confess some puzzlement. I am troubled by the necessary implied result that plaintiffs can recover for injuries they did not suffer. Was it not to overturn that principle that the committee

reported its bill last year? I am also troubled by the idea that the decision to allow the defense—which in some cases may dictate where millions of dollars will flow—is expressly laid to the "discretion" of a judge. One might ask what it would mean to limit the defense to cases where it is needed to avoid duplicative liability without injecting judicial discretion and then ask what change is effectuated by the grant of such discretion. According to canons of construction, the addition of "discretion" must give some new meaning to the provision. While many possibilities abound, none appear salutary to me.

Last year, the committee position was quite clear. It opposed aggregation of damages both horizontally and vertically. Horizontal aggregation occurs when a plaintiff collects the damages that ought to be paid to another at the same level in the chain. Vertical aggregation occurs when a plaintiff collects the damages that ought to be paid to another below the plaintiff in the chain. Vertical aggregation was mandated by the Supreme Court in *Illinois Brick* as a simplifying device. Horizontal aggregation has been espoused by consumer groups for similar reasons. The business community has generally denounced horizontal aggregation while vigorously defending vertical aggregation.

The committee bill rejected aggregation in either mode. Conceivably, the Rodino-Kennedy bill accepts aggregation both horizontally and vertically.

I look forward to the comments of scholars and antitrust practitioners when the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law begins its hearings at the end of this month.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. JEFFORDS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. ROUSSELOT, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. ASHBROOK, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. FENWICK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STACK) to revise and extend

their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BINGHAM, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. CORMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HUGHES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CAVANAUGH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WEAVER, on February 21, 22, 26, and 27 for 10 minutes each.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STACK), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOLEY, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. MINETA, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. HARRIS, today, for 5 minutes.
Mr. LEVITAS, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. FORSYTHE.
Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. CLAUSEN.
Mr. LEWIS.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. RINALDO.
Mr. WYDLER in two instances.
Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.
Mr. BOB WILSON.
Mr. PAUL in two instances.
Mr. RUDD.
Mr. MICHEL in three instances.
Mr. McCLOSKEY.
Mr. CARTER in four instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. FRENZEL in three instances.
Mr. SYMMS.

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

Mr. PEPPER.
Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. IRELAND.
Mr. BEDELL.
Mr. PEASE.
Mr. PEYSER.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. VOLKMER.
Mr. BAILEY.
Mr. FARY.

Mr. ROE in three instances.

Mr. NOWAK in five instances.

Mr. ERTLE.

Mr. DRINAN in 10 instances.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. AUCOIN.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. CONYERS in two instances.

Mr. SIMON.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. GRAY.

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

Mr. HARRIS.
Mr. GEPHARDT.
Mr. LEVITAS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 37. An act to repeal a section of Public Law 95-630; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1979, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

632. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting selected acquisition reports and SAR summary tables for the quarter ended December 31, 1978, pursuant to section 811(a) of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

633. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), transmitting a final environmental impact statement for the disposal of surplus Federal military properties at the Quonset Point Naval Air Station, Davisville Construction Battalion Center and Newport Naval Base, Rhode Island, pursuant to section 610 of Public Law 94-431; to the Committee on Armed Services.

634. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting the Base Structure Annex to the Defense manpower requirements report for fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 302 of Public Law 94-361; to the Committee on Armed Services.

635. A letter from the Associate Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the semiannual report covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1978, on Air Force experimental, developmental and research contracts of \$50,000 or more, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

636. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/International Monetary Fund Joint Committee on Staff Compensation Issues, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 95-435; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

637. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the first annual report on the review of export control country policy, pursuant to section 4(b)(2)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1969, as amended (91 Stat. 235); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

638. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; transmitting the 20th annual report of the Commission, pursuant to section 5(3) of Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

639. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on appropriate Federal actions to mitigate the economic impacts of expansion of the Redwood National Park, and the annual report on the management of additions to the park, pursuant to sections 102(a) and 104(a), respectively, of Public Law 95-250; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

640. A letter from the Chairman and members, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report on the status of school desegregation across the Nation, pursuant to section 104(c) of Public Law 85-315, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

641. A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the U.S.A., transmitting the annual audit report of the Society for calendar year 1978, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

642. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1978 on the Coast Guard's use of authority to designate and rent inadequate quarters, lease housing and hire quarters, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 475(e); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

643. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a Corps of Engineers report on Potomac River streams draining the Alexandria area, Virginia, in response to a resolution of the House Committee on Public Works adopted October 5, 1968; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

644. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting an amendment to the approved prospectus for the Post Office and Courthouse, New Haven, Conn., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

645. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the Interstate Commerce Commission, Customs, and Connecting Wing, Washington, D.C., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

646. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the Everett McKinley Dirksen Federal Building, Chicago, Ill., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

647. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, Scranton, Pa., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

648. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the Post Office and Courthouse, 5th Avenue and 9th Street, Huntington, W. Va., pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

649. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual 5-year plan for research, development, and demonstration, pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 94-475; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

650. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the work of the President's Commission on Pension Policy to develop a national retirement income policy in the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, Post Office and Civil Service, and Ways and Means.

651. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the sale of unfit and misbranded food to the public by the food salvage industry (HRD-79-32, February 14, 1979); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Agriculture, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

652. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Navy's Surveillance Towed Array Sensor program (PSAD-79-35, February 14, 1979); jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

653. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Army's Roland Missile program (PSAD-79-28, February 14, 1979); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

654. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Office of Education's program for strengthening developing institutions of higher education (HRD-78-170, February 13, 1979); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Education and Labor.

655. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report on domestic safeguards for fiscal year 1978, pursuant to section 209(d) of Public Law 93-438, as amended (92 Stat. 2949); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

656. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.

657. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the fourth annual report on activities under the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, pursuant to section 20 of the act; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 35. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 45. To provide for the further expenses of the investigations and studies of the Committee on Small Business with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-4). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 60. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 85. To provide for the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 87. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on

House Administration with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 88. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 91. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 92. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 96. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADEMAs: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 98. To provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-12). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AuCOIN:

H.R. 2152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a charitable deduction for certain crops furnished by farmers to certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEDELL:

H.R. 2153. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to guarantee loans for the construction and operation of fuel alcohol plants, to provide for a secure supply of feedstocks for the operation of such plants, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the set-aside program for feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. EMERY, Mr. TRIBLE, and Mr. DOUGHERTY):

H.R. 2154. A bill to revise the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, to require that appropriations for the acquisition of strategic and critical materials be authorized by law, to establish a national defense stockpile transaction fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 relating to leased space; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 2156. A bill to provide that all petroleum imported into the United States after September 1, 1979, shall not be available for purchase other than by the Government of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINKLEY (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GINN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. SKELTON):

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to allow Federal

civil defense funds to be used by local civil defense agencies for natural disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to allow supplies under the control of departments and agencies within the Department of Defense to be transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency as if it were within the Department of Defense and to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to loan to State and local governments property transferred to such agency from other Federal agencies as excess property; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2159. A bill to strengthen and improve the early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YATRON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEDEBER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. THOMPSON):

H.R. 2160. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a clearinghouse for information respecting digestive diseases, to authorize grants to strengthen educational programs in digestive diseases in medical schools, and to establish the National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that payments of aid to families with dependent children which are made to an individual during any period while he is awaiting a determination of disability for social security purposes shall be recovered from the amount of any disability benefits subsequently awarded to the extent that such benefits are paid on a retroactive basis for months in that period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain employees' trusts organized to invest in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COTTER:

H.R. 2163. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a grant program designed to develop methods of prevention and treatment relating to domestic violence, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.:

H.R. 2164. A bill to terminate the authorization for a portion of the Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia, improvement project; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 2165. A bill to repeal the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 and to amend the declaration of purposes of the Metric Education Act of 1978; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 2166. A bill to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to extend relocation assistance to persons displaced as

the result of real property acquisitions by private persons for federally assisted programs or projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ERDAHL:

H.R. 2168. A bill to modify the project for flood protection at Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, to subject imported tomatoes to restrictions comparable to those applicable to domestic tomatoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2170. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of legal expenses incurred by the city of Fairfax with respect to a 1971 entry and search by employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITHIAN:

H.R. 2171. A bill to deauthorize the Lafayette Dam and Reservoir, Wabash River, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAFALIS, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HEFTTEL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOORE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 2172. A bill to implement the International Sugar Agreement, 1977, between the United States and foreign countries, to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar industry, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2173. A bill to extend for an additional period the existing tax treatment of certain activities of certain private foundations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 2174. A bill to establish a program of drug benefits for the aged; to establish a Drug Benefits Council and other appropriate management controls to provide for the efficient administration of such program; and to require the conducting of certain studies and experiments, to enhance the capability of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2175. A bill to provide property tax relief to low-income elderly homeowners through direct reimbursements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2177. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, and hearing aids among the items and services for which payment may be made under the supplementary medical insurance program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2178. A bill to provide medicare coverage for orthopedic shoes or other supportive devices prescribed by a physician for correction or treatment of abnormalities of the feet or legs which cause serious detrimental medical effects; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H.R. 2179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat as public charities certain organizations which operate libraries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 2180. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2181. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2182. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2183. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2184. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2185. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2186. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2187. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2188. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2189. A bill to rescind certain budget authority contained in the message of the President of January 31, 1979 (House Document 96-46) transmitted pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2190. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of positions of U.S. Border Patrol agents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FASCELL, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGUIRE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of

California, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ZEPERETTI, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals a refundable tax credit for a portion of the rent which they pay on their principal residences and which is attributable to real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER:

H.R. 2192. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to authorize grants for the purchase, construction, and modification of certain drinking water treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the changes made by the Tax Reform Act of 1976 in the sick pay exclusion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2194. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a clearinghouse for information respecting digestive diseases, to authorize grants to strengthen educational programs in digestive diseases in medical schools, and to establish the National Digestive Diseases Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 2195. A bill to provide for the reform of the administrative and reimbursement procedures currently employed under the medicare and medicaid programs, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GUYER, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GINN, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. COELHO, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. PREYER, Mr. ZEPERETTI, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. ADDABBO):

H.R. 2196. A bill to establish a congressional award program for the purpose of recognizing excellence and leadership among young people; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize assistance to States for purposes of reducing asbestos levels in the interior of school buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 2198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the adjusted gross income limitation on the credit for the elderly, to increase the amount of such credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUCKABY:

H.R. 2199. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Alaska as units of the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, Wild and Scenic Rivers and National Wilderness Preservation Systems and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. BINGHAM):

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to allow recovery by U.S. nationals for losses incurred in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to make clear that State or Federal prisoners who are otherwise eligible for Federal habeas corpus relief may not be denied such relief on the ground that such State or Federal Government provided an opportunity for a full and fair litigation of a constitutional claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. SAWYER):

H.R. 2202. A bill to abolish diversity of citizenship as a basis of jurisdiction of Federal district courts, to abolish the amount in controversy requirement in Federal question cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER (for himself, Mr. LUNDINE, and Mr. McHUGH):

H.R. 2203. A bill to preserve jobs and stabilize communities by facilitating employee, or employee-community, ownership of concerns that would otherwise close down or move out of the community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 2204. A bill to restore effective enforcement of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2205. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to establish certain guidelines for sentencing, establish a U.S. Commission on Sentencing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. SIMON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. COELHO):

H.R. 2206. A bill to establish a National Service System under which the young people of the United States shall have the choice of either entering voluntary military or civilian service or being subject to induction into military service by random selection; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (by request):

H.R. 2207. A bill to improve the protections afforded the public against risks associated with the transportation of hazardous commodities by pipeline; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 2208. A bill to exempt certain defense-related articles from the preferential tariff treatment accorded to articles imported for exhibition at trade fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. BRODHEAD):

H.R. 2209. A bill to correct inequities in certain sales representatives practices, to provide protection for certain sales representatives terminated from their accounts without justification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2210. A bill to revise the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 2211. A bill to establish an Interagency Committee on Arson Control to coordinate Federal antiarson programs, to amend various provisions of the law relating to programs for arson investigation, prevention, and detection, and for other purposes;

jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 2212. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend title XII of that act relating to emergency medical services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of California:

H.R. 2213. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prevent the illegal entry and employment of aliens in the United States, to facilitate the admission of aliens for temporary employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent tax deductions for the salary of aliens illegally employed in the United States and to amend the Social Security Act to limit benefits under the aid to families with dependent children program and under the medical program to citizens and lawfully admitted aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT:

H.R. 2215. A bill to eliminate the reduction in social security benefits for spouses and surviving spouses receiving certain Government pensions, as recently added to title II of the Social Security Act by section 334 of the Social Security Amendments of 1977; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 2216. A bill to amend section 1625 of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants under that section to be made to nonprofit private hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 2217. A bill to revise and reform the Federal law applicable to drugs for human use and to establish a National Center for Clinical Pharmacology within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. EMERY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. DORNAN):

H.R. 2218. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Endangered Species Act of 1973 during fiscal year 1980, 1981, and 1982; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. EMERY):

H.R. 2219. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Alaska as units of the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Wilderness Preservation Systems, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 2220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for political contributions to candidates for Congress which is more limited than the existing tax credit for such contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2221. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for financing of general election campaigns for the House of Representatives, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for political contributions to candidates for Congress which is more limited than the existing tax credit for such contributions; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.R. 2222. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to clarify the scope of its coverage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 with respect to annuities for widows and widows of certain railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. BOB WILSON) (by request):

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to provide greater flexibility for the Armed Forces in training Reserve officers ordered to active duty for training for not more than 6 months by removing requirement that they be ordered to active duty for not less than 3 months; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS (by request):

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to make benefits under chapter 41 of such title (relating to job counseling, training, and placement services) available, in the case of veterans, only to those who served during a period of war, the Korean conflict or the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 2227. A bill to establish the Veterans' Administration as an executive department to be known as the "Department of Veterans' Affairs"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 2228. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to waive the limitation on the amount of the excess shelter expense deduction for households which are composed entirely of persons who are age 65 or older or who receive benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2229. A bill to amend the National Bank Act, to refund to the Comptroller of the Currency funds held as successor to closed national bank receiverships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (by request):

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for medical care benefits under the Veterans' Administration CHAMPVA program to dependents and survivors of any veteran having a permanent service-connected disability rated at 80 per centum or 90 per centum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2231. A bill to amend section 612(b) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize outpatient dental treatment for those veterans otherwise eligible for medical services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 2232. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for the furnishing of private health care to veterans when such health care is authorized by a Veterans' Administration physician as necessary for the treatment of medical emergency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide outpatient medical services for any disability of a veteran of World War I as if such disability were service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2234. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization for certain expiring health care program of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) (by request):

H.R. 2235. A bill to amend section 612(e) of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide that any disability of a veteran of World War I shall be, for the purposes of medical treatment, considered a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2236. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, so as to provide that the term "veteran" as used in section 613 shall include a person who died in the active military, naval, or air service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to eliminate a disincentive to certain disabled veterans to continue their educations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2238. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide medical services and hospital care abroad for certain catastrophically disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2239. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide medical services to any veteran with a service-connected disability who is 80 years old or older; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2240. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide medical care for parents of a deceased veteran who are in receipt of dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2241. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to extend eligibility for medical care benefits for survivors and dependents of veterans under the Veterans' Administration CHAMPVA program to survivors and dependents who are eligible for hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2242. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide outpatient dental treatment for veterans with permanent and total service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide for an increase in the benefits payable for certain home improvements and structural alterations which are necessary or appropriate for the home health care of certain veterans with service-connected disabilities, and for an addition to the types of improvements and alterations for which those benefits are payable; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2244. A bill to amend title 38, U.S. Code, to provide dental services in Veterans' Administration facilities to any veterans who was a prisoner of war for more than 180 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAWYER:

H.R. 2245. A bill to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to classify the offense of arson as a part I offense for purposes of the uniform crime reporting program and the uniform crime reports for the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2246. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, relating to local governments mailing matters of public interest at reduced rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMON:

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, for the purpose of reorganizing the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DER-

RICK, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. PREYER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. LUKE, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 2248. A bill to authorize funds for the Robert A. Taft Institute of Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SNOWE:

H.R. 2249. A bill to terminate the authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. TRAXLER (for himself, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CARR):

H.R. 2250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent certain rules relating to travel expenses of State legislators; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2251. A bill establishing a National Domestic Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 2252. A bill to amend title 38 of the U.S. Code to allow eligible veterans to receive certain educational assistance during the 6-year period following their last discharge or release from active duty even if such period extends beyond December 31, 1989; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WINN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 2253. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Social Security Act to require that specific alien and citizenship information be provided prior to the issuance of a social security card, to require that social security cards which cannot be duplicated be issued, to require that these cards be presented to employers by prospective employees before obtaining employment, to provide penalties against employers for violating the provisions of the act and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY (for himself and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 2255. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to limit the property and casualty and life insurance activities of bank holding companies and their subsidiaries; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to title I of the Agriculture Act of 1949, as amended, to raise the price support levels for milk, wheat, corn, soybeans, and cotton to 90 percent of the respective parity prices therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITHIAN:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution designating the week of May 14 through May 20, 1979, as "National Diabetes Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. GREEN):

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to proceed with the construction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RUSSO:

H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself and Mr. OTTINGER):

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to renounce the first use of all nuclear weapons and to conclude treaties with all nations renouncing the first use of all nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (for himself, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GINN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANCE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. WYATT):

H.J. Res. 213. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the level of total outlays of the United States for any fiscal year shall not exceed the level of total receipts of the United States for such fiscal year and for the disposition of unanticipated deficits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure that due process and equal protection are afforded to an individual with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to seek the resurrection of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. WAMPLER):

H. Res. 117. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and

studies to be conducted by the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. MIKVA):

H. Res. 118. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Res. 119. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to uranium enrichment services (deferral numbered D79-48) which was proposed by the President in his special message of January 31, 1979, transmitted to the Congress under section 1013 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. Res. 120. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to summer youth employment assistance (deferral numbered D79-50) which was proposed by the President in his special message of January 31, 1979, transmitted to the Congress under section 1013 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. Res. 121. Resolution disapproving the deferral of budget authority relating to interstate transfer grants (deferral numbered D79-51) which was proposed by the President in his special message of January 31, 1979, transmitted to the Congress under section 1013 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H. Res. 122. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to establish the Committee on Internal Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H. Res. 123. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 124. Resolution requesting the President not to propose to the Congress the exemption of motor gasoline from petroleum price control regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 125. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the nationalization of the oil industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H. Res. 126. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the major television networks should take such steps as may be necessary to use line 21 of the television vertical blanking interval to provide captioning of programs for hearing impaired individuals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

30. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to full funding of all programs under the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

31. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, relative to the public service of the Hon. Jamie L. Whitten; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H.R. 2256. A bill for the relief of the Jewish Employment Vocational Service, St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Ebinger Electronics, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Gaudiosa M. Etulle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Jean Pierre Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios Pistentis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 29: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 42: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 43: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LELAND, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. LONG of Maryland.

H.R. 44: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. LELAND, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. LONG of Maryland.

H.R. 45: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. (PHILLIP) BURTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LELAND, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. ANDERSON of California.

H.R. 46: Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. ANDERSON of California.

H.R. 54: Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ASHBROOK, and Mr. RUDD.

H.R. 81: Mr. NELSON.

H.R. 85: Mr. STACK, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HOWARD, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 120: Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 596: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 622: Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SABO, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 628: Mr. ARCHER, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 656: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. RODINO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr.

PERKINS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 953: Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. WINN.

H.R. 1008: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1040: Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1071: Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HANCE, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. D'AMOURS.

H.R. 1104: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1114: Mr. APPELATE, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. WINN, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. ZEFERETTI.

H.R. 1297: Mr. VAN DERLIN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. STARK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WINN, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 1460: Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1481: Mr. SEIBERLING and Mr. LONG of Maryland.

H.R. 1516: Mr. DRINAN; Mr. BUCHANAN; Mr. AUCCOIN; Mr. COLLINS of Texas; Mr. LAFALCE; Mr. FASCELL; Mr. McCLOSKEY; Mr. WHITEHURST; Mr. FORSYTHE; Mr. ERTLE; Mr. GUYER; Mr. WEAVER; Mr. HOLLENBECK; Mr. KOGOVSEK; Mr. MICA; Mr. SEIBERLING; Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GRISHAM.

H.R. 1522: Mr. AKAKA; Mr. BRODHEAD; Mr. DOWNEY; Mr. HUGHES; Mr. ICHORD; Mr. JEFFORDS; Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland; Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania; Mr. RANGEL; Mr. SOLARZ; Mr. STARK, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 1523: Mr. AKAKA; Mr. BEDELL; Mr. BRODHEAD; Mr. BURGNER; Mr. JOHN L. BURTON; Mr. CARR; Mr. CORRADA; Mr. DIXON; Mr. DOWNEY; Mr. DRINAN; Mr. EDWARDS of California; Mr. FORSYTHE; Mr. GORE; Mr. GUARINI; Ms. HOLTZMAN; Mr. HUGHES; Mr. HYDE; Mr. JACOBS; Mr. MCHUGH; Ms. MIKULSKI; Mr. MIKVA; Mr. MINETA; Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland; Mr. MOAKLEY; Mr. MOFFETT; Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania; Mr. OTTINGER; Mr. RANGEL; Mr. RICHMOND; Mr. SEIBERLING; Mr. SOLARZ; Mr. STARK; Mr. STUDDS; Mr. VENTO; Mr. WEISS, and Mr. ZEFERETTI.

H.R. 1524: Mr. BARNES; Mr. BONIOR of Michigan; Mr. DORNAN; Mr. DOWNEY; Mr.

EDWARDS of California; Mr. FORD of Michigan; Mr. GEPHARDT; Mr. GUYER; Mr. HOLLENBECK; Ms. HOLTZMAN; Mr. HOWARD; Mr. HUGHES; Mr. MARKEY; Mr. MINETA; Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland; Mr. OTTINGER; Mr. RANGEL; Mr. RODINO; Mr. SCHEUER; Mr. SEIBERLING; Mr. STARK; Mr. STUDDS; Mr. VENTO; Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ZEFERETTI.

H.R. 1597: Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. GRASSLEY.

H.R. 1598: Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. TRIBLE, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1605: Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUYER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WEISS, and Ms. FERRARO.

H.R. 1612: Mr. AMBRO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1613: Mr. AMBRO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1643: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. DAVIS of Michigan.

H.R. 1644: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana.

H.R. 1711: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1741: Mr. BEILSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. FERRARO, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. PEYSEY, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1852: Mr. MATHIS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. BURGNER.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. STARK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.J. Res. 122: Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FROST, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. LEE, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEISS.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. HEFTTEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LEE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ROE, Ms. MIKULSKI,

Mr. STOKES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. RUDD.

H. Res. 84: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARR, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOWNEY,

Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LUKE, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHIS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WAXMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

54. The SPEAKER presented a Petition of the City Council, New Bedford, Mass., relative to the ban on catching yellowtail flounder west of 69 degrees west; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NORTHERN TIER PIPELINE MAY HARM WILDLIFE REFUGE

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1979

• Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge in Washington State is the latest entry on a long list of key natural resource areas that may be adversely affected by the proposed Northern Tier crude oil pipeline.

"May" be affected could seem scant cause for alarm. However, the Northern Tier consortium has not been noted for firmness of plans or precision of detail since it first made public plans to construct a supertanker oil port at Port Angeles, Wash., to serve a major new pipeline to Clearbrook, Minn.

Members of the House may recall, for example, the sense of urgency that Northern Tier proclaimed in 1977 and 1978 to justify expedited Federal review of its plans. Members may not know that shortly thereafter the pipeline sponsors revised 60 percent of the project's 1,557-mile route, thereby throwing the ongoing review process into shambles. Those who have closely followed the development of the Northern Tier proposal have come to expect the unexpected and to suspect each aspect of the project that is not defined and assessed in firm and specific terms.

The Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge protects a fragile, narrow sandspit that supports 246 bird species and provides outstanding recreation opportunities for many people. The Northern Tier project includes a tank farm that would require stabilization of the base of a nearby shoreline bluff. Recent studies suggest that the erosion of the bluff may be a major source of sand and gravel that replenishes and sustains the spit as wave and tidal action continually remove material from it.

Nearby Port Angeles demonstrates the folly of idle tampering with the dynamics of such a sandspit. The excellent deep-water harbor that attracted Northern Tier to Port Angeles is protected by Ediz Hook, a natural spit created and formerly maintained by adjacent river and shoreline erosion. River dams and a shoreline bulkhead disrupted this process, forcing the Corps of Engineers to assume nature's role and stabilize the Hook at a recent cost of \$6 million.

Eric Pryne, a staff reporter for the

Seattle Times, discussed the threat to Dungeness Spit in a series of articles, which follow:

A SPAT OVER DUNGENESS SPIT

(By Eric Pryne)

SEQUIM, CLALLAM COUNTY.—When Polly Ball and her husband, Claude, retired in 1965, they chose this area because it reminded her of the Northern California Coast where she grew up.

Mrs. Ball soon discovered a feature on the Olympic Peninsula that the California Coast doesn't offer—Dungeness Spit.

"What a bonus," she said. "I fell in love with the place."

Dungeness Spit has become important to others who have retired in Clallam County. Homer Frazier lives on the bluff overlooking it.

"At night when it's quiet, I can hear the waves hitting the shore," he said. "It's probably as loud as a freeway, but I tell people it's not the same at all."

Every month Karl Greubel walks the spit, keeping track of the kinds of ducks, gulls, geese, songbirds, loons, herons, eagles, falcons—246 species in all—that frequent Dungeness.

Others fish, or dig clams, or just sit on a log and watch the surf thunder ashore. And, when they aren't on the spit, they fight what they perceive to be threats to its geological and biological balance.

First a housing development, then a resort, then a marina. Now they're fighting the Northern Tier Pipeline Co.

Northern Tier wants to build a 1,500-mile oil pipeline from Washington to Minnesota, using crude oil which would be unloaded and stored at Port Angeles, 15 miles west of Sequim.

Local environmentalists have been asking questions about oil spills and air pollution since the proposal first surfaced three years ago. Lately they've started to ask questions about Dungeness Spit, too.

Some government officials share their concern. The issue is a complicated one, which focuses on the geological process that shaped the spit, and how Northern Tier's plans might affect that process.

Dungeness Spit owes its existence to erosion of the high, steep cliffs along the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the west. Waves slap into the cliffs, tear away tiny particles of dirt and eventually wash them ashore at Dungeness.

The Spit took thousands of years to form. Vern Wray, resident supervisor of the wildlife refuge at Dungeness, said it's still growing. And the continuous flow of sediment from the west helps the spit "heal" itself when it is breached by a storm.

The bluffs that provide that sediment haven't been disturbed much by man. The Northern Tier project would be the first major alteration.

The company plans to unload incoming oil tankers at Ediz Hook in Port Angeles, then pump the crude oil through two parallel pipelines, under the floor of the strait, six miles east to a tank farm on a promontory called Green Point.

To get from the beach to the tanks at Green Point, the pipelines must climb a 120-foot cliff.

To accomplish that, Northern Tier's plans call for excavating 120,000 cubic yards of dirt from the cliff face. This would form a sloping "notch"—40 feet wide at the bottom, 325 feet wide on top—for the pipes. The cut would be filled later.

(A Northern Tier engineer, Ken Berryman, said a consultant is examining whether a narrower notch is feasible.)

The notch is what most concerns environmentalists and some federal officials.

"We're concerned that it could destroy Dungeness Spit," said Rex van Wormer of the Fish and Wildlife Service. "They're going to have to stabilize that bluff to keep it from eroding. And if they keep material from the cliff from getting into the water, it's going to alter the natural patterns."

Van Wormer, the federal Geological Survey and environmentalists like Polly Ball contend there simply isn't enough data to predict exactly what's likely to happen to Dungeness Spit if Northern Tier's project goes ahead.

"We've been studying this a long time," Berryman said. "We can't foresee any adverse impacts."

In its application to the State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council last year, Northern Tier conceded its project could have some effect. But the company, using consultant studies, made these points:

A comparison of maps drawn in 1863 and 1961 indicates the cliff the notch would cut through is regressing only about 3 inches a year.

Because the erosion rate is so slow, a 400-foot barrier of boulders at the base of the cliff will be the only erosion protection needed.

The Green Point bluff doesn't contribute much material to Dungeness Spit anyway. Aerial photographs show the spit gets most of its sediment from cliffs farther east.

But Ralph Keuler, shorelines specialist for the Geological Survey, said bluffs as far west as Morse Creek, west of Green Point, contribute material to Dungeness. No one is certain exactly which segments of cliff contribute how much sediment to Dungeness, he said.

Keuler also said he would be "very surprised" if the Green Point cliff erodes only 3 inches a year. The average for bluffs in the area is 20 to 40 inches, he said.

The Bureau of Land Management's draft environmental-impact statement on the Northern Tier proposal, published last month, doesn't say much about Dungeness Spit.

But it does note that Northern Tier's statement that the bluff is "relatively stable" conflicts with State Department of Ecology reports that geologic deposits in the bluff are "unstable and susceptible to slumping or sliding."

More studies are needed, the impact statement adds. That theme is echoed by others. "They (Northern Tier) damn well better know what's going to happen before they do something that drastic," said Bruce Fox-