HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, February 3, 1981*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Martin A. Canavan, S.T.L., J.C.L., of the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Lord of the nations, we come before You in humility, adoring Your greatness, and praising and acknowledging Your goodness toward each and every one of us and to these United States.

As we commemorate the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence, we thank You for the freedom, independence, and strength You have bestowed on our country; and pray that You graciously and generously shower Your gifts of wisdom and courage on our President and the Congress that they may always preserve and develop this great gift of freedom and all the other blessings You have bestowed upon us as a nation.

Rejoicing in Your goodness to us as Americans, we come before You, Father, in humble prayer and petition for the freedom of Ukraine and all other nations and peoples on Earth who are unable to live freely and independently. We ask You in Your great mercy to hear our prayer and answer it swiftly and favorably. For You, Father, are the Giver of all that is good and true in our lives as individuals and as a nation—and to You and Your Son, Jesus Christ, and the most Holy Spirit, we give our praise, honor, and adoration—today, always, and forever. 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.

THE REVEREND MARTIN A. CANAVAN

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to welcome the Very Reverend Martin A. Canavan, of the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary of the city of Washington, here this morning as our guest chaplain.

This is the high point today for the celebration of the 63d anniversary of the freedom of the Ukraine. Father Canavan originally comes from Pennsylvania. He was educated at Catholic University and the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. He was a pastor for some time in Philadelphia, and now is serving as spiritual director at St. Josaphat Ukrainian Catholic Seminary.

As Members are aware, the actual anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine is on the 22d of January, but because of our preoccupation with the inaugural festivities it was thought best to defer that celebration until today. Later today, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) and I will be having a special order to commemorate this Independence Day, and we trust that the Members will all participate in expressions of sentiment on this very important occasion. I am delighted that Father Canavan could be with us, and I express our appreciation for his presence here.

ANDERSON BILL TO SAVE MONEY AND ENERGY

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, midway through the 96th Congress, I introduced legislation providing an allowance of 4 cents per mile to Federal employees who use their bicycles while on official business. I reasoned that these employees can now receive 22.5 cents per mile for using their automobiles on those same trips.

We will reimburse somebody 22.5 cents for each mile he spends in downtown stop-and-go traffic, polluting the air, using up gasoline, and adding to the urban congestion. But if this person wants to make the same trip on his bicycle, and we all know that bicycles can move just as quickly as cars in a city, he receives nothing.

It just made good sense to me that we should not discourage the use of bicycles by refusing to reimburse the employee the cost that he experiences in the wear and tear of the bike, while he is using it in the Nation's behalf. I had seen evidence that 4 cents per mile was about how much it costs to operate a bicycle, and that is the same amount the California State government reimburses its employees, so that is what I pegged the figure at.

Because this idea was a new concept, and one deserving of study and deeper thought, our colleague from California, Hon. JOHN BURTON, who chairs the Government Operations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over such matters, requested that the General Accounting Office delve into the issue.

On January 19, the Comptroller General released the GAO study, and I am pleased to say that it endorses this concept. As a matter of fact, it does so in an unusually straightforward manner—

> Federal employees should be reimbursed for official travel by bicycle.

It went on to say, referring by number to the legislation I wrote in the last Congress, and which is identical to the bill I am introducing today:

> The cost of owning and operating a bicycle, based on data provided by several sources and on rates currently being paid by several government bodies, falls between 3 and 5 cents per mile. The 4-cents-per-mile proposal introduced in the 96th Congress (H.R. 6180) would, therefore, be a reasonable rate for reimbursing Federal employees using their bicycles on official travel.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know to what extent bicycles would be utilized given enactment of this legislation. But I do know that for every mile an employee uses his bicycle rather than his car, our Nation saves a little bit of gasoline, the residents of the city will breathe air that is a little cleaner, and the American taxpayer will save 18.5 cents.

I invite our colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

STEVE LAUTERBACH DAY IN DAYTON, OHIO

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last month we as a nation celebrated the return of the 52 Americans who had been held hostage in Iran. Now, as the ex-hostages are returning to their home communities, we can honor these brave men and women in a more personal and meaningful way.

One of those ex-hostages is Steve Lauterbach, a native of Dayton, Ohio, in the Third Congressional District. Steve was serving as an administrative officer at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran before the takeover by Iranian students.

All of us in Dayton shared with Steve's parents a sense of hopelessness and anguish over the senseless and outrageous actions in Iran. While Steve was a captive, he received over 100 letters from friends and family back home in the Dayton community.

The residents of the Third Congressional District and I are proud of Steve, who has served his country at great personal sacrifice. I feel a great

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

joy for Steve and his family who are reunited after his long ordeal.

On Thursday, his fellow Daytonians will show their love and appreciation for Steve. At a small ceremony in Dayton's historic Arcade Square, the mayor of Dayton will present him with a resolution from the city commission declaring Thursday, February 5, as Steve Lauterbach Day in Dayton.

The city will place a city and Federal flag on permanent display in the arcade, in Steve's honor. Also, the Chaminade-Julienne High School band, representing Steve's alma mater, will open and close the ceremonies.

This is our way of saying, "Welcome home, Steve." It is good to have you back.

YELLOW RIBBONS IN TALLADEGA, ALA.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the Talladega County Courthouse in Talladega, Ala., stands amid the strong and protective branches of many sturdy oak trees. During hot summer days, many of our local citizens seek refuge from the heat under the tree's shade. But for the past year, the trees have also served as a reminder that some Americans were not free to walk the streets, visit family and friends, or enjoy those basic freedoms and liberties afforded all Americans. The reminder, of course, were yellow ribbons tied to each tree and they signaled Talladega's concern for our American hostages in Iran.

Mrs. Mary Dale Harrison, with the cooperation of county probate judge, W. Forrest Killough, placed the ribbons around the trees last January and her greatest joy was "taking down the ribbons and giving thanks to God Almighty that they are home safe."

All Americans have now given thanks for the hostages safe return. In cities and towns across America, our countrymen joined with the good people of Talladega to pray for our hostages and for their efforts and patriotism; I would like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute. How different the hostages return may have been had it not been for people like Mrs. Harrison to remind us of their plight.

For the reading of my colleagues I submit to the RECORD of this legislative body an article from the Talladega Daily-Home about Talladega County's celebration for the return of the hostages:

TALLADEGANS CELEBRATE HOSTAGE RELEASE

TALLADEGA.—Approximately 600 people faced the cold late Wednesday afternoon to join in a flag-waving, patriotic sing-along "Thanksgiving" ceremony staged at the Talladega County Courthouse celebrating the release of the American hostages from Iran.

The idea of the ceremony was suggested late Tuesday afternoon by Jane Dever.

Ms. Dever said, "I wanted our community to be a part of the whole nation (in celebrating)."

Local government officials and civic leaders made brief remarks filled with references to American pride, and thanks for the safe return of the Americans.

Dr. William Garcia of Talladega College led the crowd in singing "America the Beautiful," "God Bless America" and the national anthem.

But amidst the jubilation there were times of somberness.

Local attorney Ralph Gaines said, "As we are singing and rejoicing as a community the release of the hostages, we must not, we cannot forget the eight brave servicemen who volunteered and gave their lives last April in the rescue attempt.

"Everything has a price . . . those eight men knew they were going on a high risk mission, yet because they wanted their fellow Americans to be free, they gave the ultimate."

Gaines then read the names of the eight killed in the desert of Iran in that attempt when their helicopter crashed into a C-130 transport.

"We must remember those men," he added.

Talladega Mayor Larry Barton then had the Christmas lights on the trees surrounding the courthouse turned on.

"When someone is coming to visit, or coming home," he said, "you usually leave a light on for them. We're turning on the lights to let the hostages know we're proud they're coming home."

Barton said the lights will remain burning until the Americans are back in this country.

The yellow ribbons, now a national symbol for the hostages' plight, will also remain tied around the trees surrounding the courthouse until the hostages are once again back in the United States.

Mary Dale Harrison, who placed the ribbons around the trees last January, said, "I'm real glad it's over and I'll be glad when they get back to the U.S. . . . so I can take down the ribbons and give thanks to God Almighty that they're home safe.

"I never did give up because I knew someday they'd be home."

OLIN "TIGER" TEAGUE

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, the integrity and courage that "Tiger" Teague displayed in battle and in public service established his place in our Nation's history as well as in the minds and memory of all of us who served with him in this House.

He was a most extraordinary man, repeatedly wounded in World War II, elected to the Congress while still recuperating from wounds, yet always courageous and courteous as he served his Nation in uniform and then in public office. He was truly an inspiration to all who knew him—a man who could be ferocious in principles but a master of bipartisan diplomacy as he became the principal architect of our Nation's gratitude to our veterans. Even as I honored his combat record that won him decorations from our Nation and our allies, I always admired his determined diligence to reward other veterans while maintaining vigilant protection of all our citizens.

He was a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee throughout his 32 years of service in this House, was chairman for 18 years, and remained a power on that committee when he left that chairmanship to become chairman of our Science and Technology Committee to play a prominent role in sending men to the Moon and unmanned exploration vehicles farther into outer space that most men dreamed possible.

His voluntary retirement from this House in 1978 left a void that no man could hope to fill, but the inspiration of his service here shall remain for years to come. My wife, Connie, and I shall always treasure our friendship with Tiger, his beloved wife, Freddie, and their children, Jim, Jack, and Jill. We have said our last goodby to Tiger, but his qualities and character will remain with us and inspire us as he did while he was with us.

THE REMOVAL OF AMBASSADOR ROBERT WHITE

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the removal of Ambassador Robert White from his position as Ambassador to El Salvador and the manner in which he is being treated by this administration.

I am concerned for many reasons. Among them are his concern for human rights and land reform, which gained him few friends among the few ruling, wealthy families; and his insistence that there be a serious investigation concerning the brutal murders of four American missionaries, two of whom were from my city of Cleveland.

I hope, if this administration is not particularly interested in human rights, at least it be concerned with serving justice on behalf of our own citizens. What are they finding out regarding the murders of our American citizens? Or, will they go on rewarding those who murder our own people?

TEXAS WINES ARE COMING—A CHALLENGE TO CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a Washington Post article of last Sunday con-

firms what many of us have suspected for a long time: That the best of California wines are equal to or superior to their French counterparts. California wines have finally come into their own.

But I would caution the California winemakers not to become too complacent. A challenge is coming to them from an unexpected source—Texas.

The University of Texas system has been engaged in an experimental viticulture and wine project for more than 5 years now, and the results are beyond everyone's fondest dreams. Grapes grown on university lands in far west Texas—particularly at Bakersfield, Fort Stockton, and Van Horn—are producing some very outstanding wines. Now, I did not say Bakersfield, Calif.; I said Bakersfield, Tex.

I am not an expert, but the professionals tell me that the UT experimental chenin blanc, French colombard, and emerald riesling can hold their own with any comparable California wine. And we are just getting started.

Who knows where it will end? California, look out. Texas is coming on fast.

And that is not just sour grapes, either.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY INCREASE FOR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill to provide a temporary increase for the national debt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the minority?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have not spoken to the minority.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would advise that this matter has been cleared by unanimous consent by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ADOPTION EXPENSES TAX DEDUCTION BILL

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the adoption expenses tax deduction bill. This legislation will amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow individuals a deduction for certain expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child. Deductible adoption expenses include necessary adoption agency fees, court costs, attorney fees, and related expenses.

Similar bills have been introduced in past Congresses to provide for adoption expenses tax deductions but my bill differs from these in that it provides for such deductions only when the adoption has been arranged by a public welfare department or similar State or local public social service agency with the legal responsibility for child placement or by a not-for-profit voluntary adoption agency authorized or licensed by the State or local government to place children for adoption.

This stipulation on placements is an important step forward in the protection of the welfare of the child. The child's welfare should always be the primary consideration in placements. Independent adoption placements may be made by physicians, ministers, or attorneys in States which have not yet enacted authorization or licensing requirements. Yet, in these States, the child may also be placed by someone thoroughly unqualified to do so. These lax State laws allow for abuses by black-market operators. The victims of these placements are not only the children, but the birth parents and adoptive parents whose emotional and financial welfare may be traumatized.

The practices of black-market operators are not a small problem. The 96th Congress held hearings to examine the growth of this black-market business following the drastic reduction of adoptable children. To encourage States to enact legislation prohibiting nonlicensed adoptions and to prohibit deductions for those placements made without the best interests of the child in mind, I have included this clarification of adoptions eligible for deductions.

The adoption process is lengthy, time consuming, and often expensive. Technical procedures and high costs are disincentives to parents hoping to adopt a child. This bill would encourage prospective parents in the adoption process. It will also aid in the placement of foster children into permanent homes and the placement of children with special needs.

The costs of foster care under aid to families with dependent children is estimated to have exceeded $400 million this past year. These costs would be greatly reduced were children placed in adoptive homes. In addition, many special-needs children are hard to place and the search for qualified and caring adoptive parents for these children is costly and lengthy. This bill would provide an incentive for the adoption of these children whose chances for placement are less than average.

I have drafted this bill after lengthy discussions with public welfare agencies, the National Committee for Adoption, the Child Welfare League in New York, and other groups interested in the welfare of children.

I hope that the House will act quickly to pass this legislation and I urge my colleagues to join in support of these goals by cosponsoring this legislation.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a), Public Law 92-484, the Chair appoints as members of the Technology Assessment Board the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. UDALL of Arizona; Mr. BROWN of California; Mr. DINGELL of Michigan; Mr. WINN of Kansas; Mr. MILLER of Ohio; and Mr. EVANS of Iowa.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 6(e), rule X and clause 1(a) rule XLVIII, the Chair appoints as Members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence the following Members of the House: Mr. BOLAND of Massachusetts, chairman; Mr. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin; Mr. ROSE of North Carolina; Mr. MAZZOLI of Kentucky; Mr. MINETA of California; Mr. FOWLER of Georgia; Mr. GORE of Tennessee; and Mr. STUMP of Arizona.

The Republican Members will be subsequently announced.

□ 1215

INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR RELIEF OF JEFFERSON COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER, LAKEWOOD, COLO.

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

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill for the relief of the Jefferson County Mental Health Center, located in Lakewood, Colo. The center provides mental health services for a tricounty area. Unfortunately, the center has suffered a series of administrative misunderstandings with the Internal Revenue Service that can only be remedied through legislation.

The problem developed over the payment of social security taxes by the center. The Jefferson County Mental Health Center, a nonprofit organization, is exempt from employee participation in the social security pro-

gram. However, the employees at the center elected to participate in the program.

Proper forms were filed with the IRS and FICA taxes were deducted and paid beginning in 1963. However, in the course of an IRS review of the center, it was decided by the IRS that the proper form of employee withholding had not been filed.

The IRS informed the center that because of a lack of the proper forms, the center had been wrongfully withholding the FICA taxes. The IRS told the center to reimburse the employees for FICA taxes withheld and that the IRS would reimburse the center.

The Jefferson County Mental Health Center reimbursed 133 employees for a total of $74,128. Shortly thereafter, the IRS informed the center that proper forms had originally been filed and had now been located. Consequently, the IRS said it would not reimburse the center for money it had already returned to employees.

By this time it was too late to get the money back from the employees who had spent the money or were no longer employed by the center.

The IRS cannot remedy this unfortunate situation because it does not have the authority to expend funds without a legal obligation to do so or a statutory authorization. This bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury determine the amounts withheld and treat these amounts as tax overpayments which are then reimbursable to the center.

The House passed this bill late in the 2d session of the 96th Congress. Unfortunately, the Senate did not have time to consider this legislation, and thus it died in the last Congress. Having come so close to final passage last year, the bill deserves expeditious approval by the 97th Congress. A companion bill will be introduced in the Senate by my colleague, Senator HART. I hope this legislation can be enacted without delay so as to correct the inequities that have arisen as a result of administrative misunderstandings between the IRS and the Jefferson County Mental Health Center.

DAVE STOCKMAN IS RIGHT ON THE MARK

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, after less than 2 weeks at work, Budget Director Dave Stockman, has already incurred the wrath of special interest groups by attacking the runaway Federal budget. Mr. Stockman has thrown down the gauntlet by challenging this Congress to live up to its commitment to cut Federal spending immediately.

Some of Mr. Stockman's recommended budget cuts in foreign aid were made public last week, and as we might expect, this proposal was greeted unfavorably by the foreign aid lobby. But, as Mr. Stockman says, if we are serious about cutting the Federal budget, then all programs must be scrutinized. Before we begin trimming domestic programs, we had better be prepared to reduce the dollars that flow out of this country in the form of foreign aid.

As the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations for the past 4 years, I found many foreign aid programs that could and should be reduced. Mr. Stockman's suggested foreign aid cuts are an excellent starting point. I will be more specific on this in a special order later today.

Regardless, the fact remains that Mr. Stockman has taken the initiative in cutting the budget. No one said that it would be easy, but reducing runaway spending is a most important challenge facing this Congress. I intend to support Dave Stockman in his effort to stop the hemorrhaging Federal budget. Clearly, foreign aid is an appropriate beginning.

A TRIBUTE TO BRYAN ELLIS AND STEVE CROWLEY, KILLED IN DEFENSE OF AMERICAN EMBASSY IN PAKISTAN

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today Washington opened its arms to greet the returning American hostages. I shared in the overwhelming sense of joy, thanksgiving, and relief felt by all Americans.

I could not, however, help but remember two other heroic Americans struck down in the series of tragedies which befell the United States in November 1979—Army WO Bryan Ellis and Marine Cpl. Steve Crowley who gave their lives in brave defense of the American Embassy in Pakistan. These two men displayed a level of courage in keeping with the finest traditions of the U.S. armed services.

In this time of great national rejoicing, let us not forget the tremendous sacrifice these men have made. Let us commit ourselves to re-creating a foreign policy which will restore to the United States a sense of respect throughout the world. We must never again tolerate an international climate in which angry mobs dare to threaten the safety of American citizens, while host governments sit by idly, unwilling to take timely countermeasures.

Let us learn from the tragic deaths of Warrant Officer Ellis and Corporal Crowley, as we offer to their families our sincerest sympathies and deepest gratitude for the sacrifices they have been called on to make.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO U.S. AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. auto industry is at a critical juncture.

For only the second time since its founding in 1908, General Motors, the Nation's largest and most financially secure automobile company, has reported a loss of $763 million for 1980. GM sales were down 13 percent over 1979.

Together the big three U.S. automakers, GM, Ford, and Chrysler, face immediate losses in excess of $4 billion at a time when they face expenditures of nearly $70 billion in retooling expenses to produce more fuel efficient cars.

This is why I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1519, to provide emergency assistance to the auto industry. My bill would provide a limited tax credit toward the purchase, during a 6-month period, of a new American automobile, and an additional credit toward interest paid on a new car loan. The bill also allows faster depreciation and extended carryback provisions for auto manufacturers and their suppliers during a period of 5 years.

H.R. 1518 directs the President to revise and eliminate costly auto regulations, thus allowing the industry to be more competitive. My bill requires that this be done in 90 days. I urge support of the bill.

C-SPAN COMES TO THE LEHIGH VALLEY

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, today for the first time, more than 140,000 of my constituents in the Lehigh Valley area of Pennsylvania are able to view their U.S. Congress in session. At this moment, Service Electric Cable TV is inaugurating the Lehigh Valley's first official telecast of C-SPAN, the Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network.

John Walson, Sr., the company's founder, created the Nation's first cable TV system in 1948. Since then, Mr. Walson has played an important role in many of the innovations that today make public services like C-SPAN possible. Now, with the addition of C-SPAN to its Lehigh Valley system, his company is demonstrating the significant contributions that cable TV can make to the communications field.

I know the citizens of the Lehigh Valley who have access to this service join me in welcoming C-SPAN and the bringing of the proceedings of Congress into peoples' homes. This is a step toward a better-informed public and, as a result, better government.

TRIBUTE TO ART GODI

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

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, to be elected to the presidency of the California Association of Realtors is a great honor, and I am pleased to announce that that honor has been earned by my lifelong friend, Mr. Art Godi. At this time, I would like to ask that my colleagues join with me in recognizing the many accomplishments which have convinced the association's membership that Art was the very best man to fill this responsible post.

Art is uniquely qualified to serve as President of the Association. He has received numerous awards within his chosen profession, including Realtor of the Year—1969—from the Stockton Board of Realtors, and the Stewart B. Mathews Award for an outstanding real estate article in the United States in 1969. He has been extremely active within the California association, having assumed numerous chairmanships and vice-chairmanships over the years. He has also served as director of the National Association of Realtors, and has served on more than a dozen Realtors National Marketing Institute Committees. Art has twice been a U.S. delegate to International Real Estate Federation conventions, and he has been a member of the American chapter of that federation since 1962. The owner of his own real estate company, Art is thoroughly familiar with every facet of his profession. What is more, he is able and willing to share his knowledge: He teaches, writes, and otherwise educates others concerning his field of endeavor in a most effective manner.

Art Godi's contributions are hardly limited to real estate, however. He has consistently remained active in community and political affairs, and has demonstrated leadership ability since he was elected student body president of both Stockton College and Stanford University. He has been active with the chamber of commerce, the Congress of Community Progress, the Commonwealth Club of California, the board of directors of the Better Business Bureau, and the North Stockton 20-30 Club. I am convinced that no matter how thorough I attempt to be in this tribute, I will inadvertently omit at least one of Art's able contributions to his community, his profession, and to those who are privileged to know him.

Above and beyond all else, Art is dedicated to preserving and advancing the free enterprise system, and to enhancing all the qualities which have made our Nation great. He fully understands that each individual must exercise freedom of choice, and that the role of government must not be obstructive.

In short, Art Godi is an outstanding individual on every plateau. He embodies leadership, integrity, intelligence, community involvement, and the ability to utilize all his attributes effectively. I am delighted to congratulate Art and his family upon the occasion of this impressive achievement. He has more than earned the respect of his colleagues in the association, and I am certain that my colleagues will join with me in paying tribute to this outstanding individual.

MODERATE LEADERS LEND SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT DUARTE OF EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, Christian Democrat leaders from nations throughout Latin America met in Caracas last week. At the end of their meeting, they issued a document supporting the Government of El Salvador's President Duarte.

These moderate leaders from Latin America stated they support Duarte in his struggle to democratize El Salvador against elements of the oligarchy on the right and the totalitarian left.

They emphasized President Duarte's call for elections as proving that—

> The government he heads is temporary and that he is determined to create, within a short time, the conditions for the people to express themselves with absolute freedom.

This is compared to Nicaragua.

At a time when American foreign policy options are very limited in Latin America, I believe it is wise for us to follow the lead of other moderate leaders in our support of President Duarte of El Salvador and democracy and economic stability.

A PLEA FOR EXIT VISAS FOR SOVIET JEW VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY AND HIS FAMILY

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

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Members of the House that I would like to bring to their attention the case of a Soviet Jew, Viktor Brailovsky.

In 1973 the Brailovsky family asked for exit visas, and then the harassment and the trouble started. In November, Mr. Brailovsky had published a little mimeographed paper asking that the Jews be allowed, if they wished, to leave the Soviet Union. He is now in prison with a very serious liver ailment.

I would like to urge strongly that all Members of the House write to the Soviet Ambassador here asking that Viktor Brailovsky get medical treatment, that his wife, Irina, be allowed to visit him, that Brailovsky and his wife, along with their son, Leonid, who is 20, and their daughter, Dalia, who is 7, be allowed exit visas to leave the Soviet Union. Viktor Brailovsky's only crime is to have published this paper concerning the Jews, and I think it is outrageous that he is being treated in this fashion.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF RALPH G. HAYS

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

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege today to give this tribute to the life of Ralph G. Hays, a dear friend of mine from Henderson, Ky., who died Saturday, January 24, 1981, at his home following a long struggle with cancer.

Ralph Hays was a strong, proud American, dedicated to the principles that have made our country great.

Prior to his death, Ralph Hays was serving his fourth term in Henderson as a city commissioner. He was long instrumental in city and county planning and zoning regulations. One of Ralph G. Hays' most cherished desires was to "move in quiet ways" to help the youth of his beloved city. He was a distinguished citizen who worked for many new recreational facilities for the young people of Henderson. He was honored last year by the local chamber of commerce as the Distinguished Citizen of the Year.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Buena Hays; three daughters, Becky Hays of Henderson, Yvonne H. Cross of Denver, Colo., and Donna Jean Hays of Henderson; and one son, Jere Hays of Henderson.

Other survivors include his mother, Mrs. Emma Hays of Henderson; one sister, Betty Warren of Louisville, Ky.; and one brother, Bill Hays of Henderson.

Obviously, this Member of Congress was very much a friend and admirer of Ralph G. Hays. However, I speak for thousands in Kentucky who were also friends and admirers of this fine gentleman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER) laid before the House the

following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 2, 1981.*

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in the Rules of the House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope from The White House received in the Clerk's Office at 3:57 p.m. on Monday, February 2, 1981 and said to contain a message from the President dated January 30, 1981, wherein he transmits the Budget of the District of Columbia for Fiscal Year 1982.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

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

BUDGET OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1982—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 97-17)

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 District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the 1982 Budget of the District of Columbia.

I am informed that the proposals for Federal payments to the District of Columbia reflected in this document are consistent with those shown in the 1982 Budget of the United States submitted to Congress by President Carter on January 15, 1981.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1981.*

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within 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 Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

FREE VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission for this very special order to bring to the attention of the Congress and the public the serious condition of a jailed leader of the Soviet refusenik movement, Dr. Viktor Brailovsky.

Dr. Brailovsky was arrested last November 13 on trumped-up charges of "slandering the Soviet state." After 8 years of continuous harassment and persecution by Soviet authorities, including numerous imprisonments, interrogations, unannounced searches of his home, and the failure of officials to allow the family to emigrate, Dr. Brailovsky's health has been dangerously deteriorating. When he was arrested and jailed last November, he was suffering from a liver ailment that required close medical attention. According to official letters received by his wife as late as December 31, 1980, Dr. Brailovsky was receiving proper treatment. However, his wife has subsequently learned that his prison interrogation has been suspended due to his serious medical condition. He must receive immediate care or his condition will worsen.

Dr. Brailovsky has been a leader in the Soviet Jewish emigration movement. Despite being under investigation for publishing an unofficial Jewish cultural journal, Dr. Brailovsky bravely led a group of 237 other refuseniks in signing a letter to President Brezhnev last November protesting the refusal to grant exit visas to these individuals. Written on the eve of the Madrid Conference, the appeal had the unexpected effect of leading to Dr. Brailovsky's arrest. It is an affront to the free world and the principles of the Helsinki accords that such an outrageous action could occur.

Dr. Brailovsky is a brilliant scientist. A leader in the field of cybernetics, Dr. Brailovsky has published over 30 documents and been granted 4 patents. As a teacher and researcher at the Institute of Electrical Control Machines until he requested an exit visa and lost his job in 1972, Dr. Brailovsky is widely respected in his field. His wife, also a distinguished doctor of computer science, lost her job as well at that time.

Dr. Brailovsky continued his work by organizing the Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists. Every Sunday, prominent Soviet and Western scientists would gather at the Brailovsky home to discuss recent advances in their respective fields. At age 45, Dr. Brailovsky is looked upon as a father figure to many of the younger Soviet refusenik scientists. Without his leadership, the seminar has not met since November 9, and the group has become frightened by the authorities. Recent attempts to hold the seminar have led to threats by the KGB that those remaining will join Dr. Brailovsky in jail.

Aside from his scientific contributions, Dr. Brailovsky was the key to the publication of the unofficial Jewish cultural journal, "Jews in the U.S.S.R." As the only remaining of the five original editors, Dr. Brailovsky became solely responsible for the dissemination of translated excerpts from Western Jewish books and articles, Soviet Jewish history, and Jewish poetry and studies. Others have attempted to carry on this work, but Dr. Brailovsky's leadership is sorely missed.

Dr. Brailovsky has suffered unduly over the past 8 years. In early 1973, Dr. Brailovsky joined eight of his colleagues in a hunger strike to protest the lack of free emigration by Soviet Jews. He was imprisoned for 15 days in 1974 after an attempt to hold an international session of his Moscow seminar. He was also arrested in 1976 for participating in a sit-in demonstration.

In 1976, Dr. Brailovsky was granted permission to leave the Soviet Union. A devoted husband and father, he would not leave without his wife and their two children. In December of that year his home was searched by the KGB. Books on Jewish culture in the U.S.S.R., Jewish and Israeli music tapes, and valuable historical documents were confiscated. Again, in December 1978 the KGB seized material, this time invaluable scientific papers relating to the Moscow seminars. The work of many important Moscow scientists was lost.

In April 1980, Dr. Brailovsky was again arrested, in connection with his publication of "Jews in the U.S.S.R." Kept under investigation and continually harassed, he nonetheless felt compelled to join the November appeal to the conscience of the Soviet leadership to allow him and his family to emigrate. For his wish of freedom, Dr. Brailovsky now may face the same dark fate that others such as Anatoly Shcharansky have suffered.

After several years of apparent conciliation and cooperation in the emigration of Soviet Jews, the Soviet authorities have begun to shut the doors to freedom for many Soviet Jews who simply wish to join the rest of their families outside the Soviet Union. I believe we must take strong action to indicate our displeasure at this latest plan to prevent emigration. The case of Dr. Brailovsky presents an excellent opportunity for the new Reagan administration to indicate its support of

the Soviet Jewish movement and to initiate contacts with Soviet authorities to urge renewed positive action on requests for exit visas.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to help lead the fight against oppression in the Soviet Union. Soviet Jews such as Dr. Brailovsky and his family cannot endure their present circumstances forever. These people continue to demonstrate extraordinary courage in the face of overwhelming difficulties. The current Madrid Conference present the United States with a firsthand opportunity to let the world know of our concern for Viktor Brailovsky. We must also show our compassion for the thousands of others who suffer in Soviet prision camps, face job reprisals, and professional disgrace, and are forced to live away from their promised, cherished land of Israel.

I thank my colleagues for joining in this special order and for their cosponsorship of a concurrent resolution I will introduce today urging that Dr. Brailovsky receive proper medical attention and that he and his family be permitted to leave the Soviet Union.

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

Mr. FISH. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) for his efforts on behalf of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky. I believe it is the responsibility of every Member of Congress to continue to bring to the attention of the Soviet Government the concern we in America have for Soviet refuseniks. These lovers of freedom in a closed society are a thorn in the side of the Communist regime and we must make sure to continue the irritation.

The story of Dr. Brailovsky's attempts to emigrate to Israel is not a new one; he is one of many scientists who has been ostracized from his work and community because of his request. But this gentleman is now in prison and being denied necessary medical attention because of his repeated attempts to publicize the situation of Jews in the Soviet Union.

We must use our influence in the world arena to shine a bright light on the cruel treatment of Soviet citizens by their Government. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this effort and the resolution on behalf of Dr. Brailovsky.

Mr. FISH. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) very much for his comments.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me join my distinguished colleagues in the House in protesting the treatment of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky by the Soviet authorities.

There is no reason at all for this treatment of Dr. Brailovsky. What was his crime? He asked to leave the Soviet Union, together with his wife and children. He was refused permission to go by the Soviet authorities. Since this refusal, Dr. Brailovsky has been active in the work of the Jewish emigration movement. He is the editor of the unofficial journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R. In the eyes of Soviet authorities this compounded his crime. Now Dr. Viktor Brailovsky is under arrest for "slandering the Soviet state," a crime that carries 3 years imprisonment in the labor camps. Dr. Brailovsky has a liver condition, which has not been properly treated during his imprisonment. His wife Irina has no official word on him.

Viktor Brailovsky is the most recent victim of Soviet persecution. His case epitomizes the antisemitism that is official state policy in the Soviet Union today. The Jews of the Soviet Union are persecuted, harassed, imprisoned, their day-to-day existence made miserable, their rights ignored—all because of their race and religion. Not since the infamy of Hitler's Germany has there been such a record.

Viktor Brailovsky was finally given his chance to leave the Soviet Union in 1976—provided he left his wife and children behind. This was the cruel and heartless gesture of the Soviet authorities.

No more tyrannical regime exists in the world today, among the major powers, than that of the Soviet Union. Moscow encourages unlimited terror throughout the world, and is the mainstay of such despots as Kim Il-Sung in North Korea, of Idi Amin in Uganda, of Colonel Qaddafi in Libya. At home Moscow wages unrelenting war against its own people, a war launched by Stalin, and carried on by the successors trained under him.

Anyone who doubts that the Soviet Union is carrying on a program of rampant antisemitism need only look at official Soviet publications. Here is what the newspaper of the Young Pioneers, the Journal of the official Soviet Youth Organization, wrote on October 10, 1981:

> Most of the largest monopolies in the sale of arms are controlled by Jewish Bankers. Business based on blood brings their enormous profits, bombs and missiles explode in Lebanon—The bankers Lazar and Lievs are making money. Thugs in Afghanistan torment schoolchildren with gases—bundles of dollars are multiplying in the safes of the Lehmans and Guggenheims.

I might say the only thugs in Afghanistan using poison gas are Soviet occupation forces.

Soviet communism is the nazism of today. The kind of ravings found in Soviet publications are worthy of the disordered minds of Dr. Goebbels and Julius Streicher. Cartoons carried by Soviet magazines are so vile and revolting some are unprintable in our country.

The plight of Viktor and Irina Brailovsky and their children should remind us poignantly of the plight of Soviet Jews. In 1979, 50,000 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union. In 1980 this figure had fallen to 21,000.

In 1974 the Congress wisely adopted the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which refused the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status until free emigration was allowed. The Soviet Union has not fulfilled that clause. There is little likelihood we will grant the Soviets the most-favored-nation status they so badly want, but we certainly ought not to do so.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that antisemitism is growing in virulence in the Soviet Union.

I believe all who respect and honor human rights have an obligation and duty to protest all antisemitism, whenever and wherever it exists.

Indeed the 20th century is forever stained and darkened by the memory of the holocaust. We must not allow this to happen again—nor can we allow any government or regime to promulgate policies that can lead to such a thing happening again.

Today's special order concerns Dr. Brailovsky, but many others are suffering persecution. We must raise our voices on behalf of all who want freedom.

In the last century, Russia cherished its great writers, cherished them even when they opposed the government. Russia rang with the praises of Tolstoy, Chekhov, Dostoevsky, Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev. But now, when the greatest writer of our age, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, dares criticize the Government of the Soviet Union, he is harassed, arrested, exiled. So much for the glory of Russian literature. The Soviet regime respects nothing but its own power.

But Solzhenitsyn is not silent. His brilliant speech at Harvard in 1978 reminds us in the West how precious our freedom is, how menacing communism is to the very soul of the West. We should heed his warning, now, and those who scoffed and sneered at Solzhenitsyn should be silenced by the triumph of his prophecies.

Mr. Speaker, the Jews of the Soviet Union are not alone in their sufferings. The Baptists are persecuted, the Catholic Lithuanians are persecuted, the Uniates of the Ukraine are persecuted, the Jehovah's Witnesses are persecuted, the Moslems of Central Asia are persecuted, the Buddhists are persecuted in Siberia. Soviet Russia is truly what Lenin called tsarist Russia, "A prisonhouse of nations."

Mr. Speaker, John Donne said:

> No Man Is An Island . . . Whatever Touches Mankind Touches Me.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad we had this special order. I am proud to take part in it. We must continue our vigil on behalf of Jews, Christians, and others who are persecuted for seeking freedom and liberty.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) very much for his eloquent statement.

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

Mr. FISH. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NELLIGAN. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) for yielding. It is with pride and pleasure that I add my name to the concurrent resolution which the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) will introduce today.

Mr. Speaker, the treatment of the 2 million Jews in the Soviet Union—and especially of the thousands of "refuseniks"—continues to be a matter of concern for me.

This sense of apprehension has been heightened in recent weeks because of the case of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, a leading Russian refusenik who is editor of a Jewish cultural publication.

Dr. Brailovsky and his family have been trying to get out of the Soviet Union since 1972. In a typical Soviet ploy, he was granted a visa in 1976, but his wife and children were denied it. So he remained.

Brailovsky was jailed late last year, apparently for signing a document drafted by 200 refuseniks concerned about abuses of human rights in the Soviet Union.

The official Soviet investigation into his case has been halted after nearly 3 months—with no indication when it will be completed.

According to his wife, Brailovsky has contacted a serious liver ailment that may be the cause of the delays. It is unclear whether he is receiving proper medical attention.

I am hopeful that action on the concurrent resolution will insure that Brailovsky receives the proper attention, and that he will ultimately be allowed to leave the country with his family.

At the same time, quick passage will also make it clear that there has been no lessening of Congress, and the American peoples' concern for the treatment of Soviet Jews.

Mr. FISH. I thank my colleague for his contribution. I express my gratitude to the many Members of the Congress who joined in this special order in an expression of our very deep concern over this matter.

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in an expression of mutual concern on behalf of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, a prominent Soviet scientist and leader of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement.

Since 1972, when Viktor Brailovsky and his wife, Irina, first sought permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union, they have been subject to continuous harassment. Last November, after yet another appeal requesting the free emigration of Soviet Jews, Viktor Brailovsky was imprisoned. While in prison, his physical condition has deteriorated drastically. Now, because of his failing health, our appeal on behalf of Dr. Brailovsky is all the more urgent.

According to the Helsinki agreement in 1975, the Soviet Union agreed to accelerate the processing of exit visas for all minorities, especially in those cases where family reunification is an issue. In 1980, the number of Soviet Jews granted permission to emigrate sharply declined from previous years. Freedom of religion is guaranteed in point 7 of the so-called third basket of the accord, yet Viktor Brailovsky and others continue to be mistreated in violation of the agreement. Not only do the actions of the authorities violate humane considerations, but they also violate Soviet internal law.

Along with many others, I believe that only world opinion can force the Soviet Union to abide by the Helsinki Agreement that it has signed, and live up to the responsibilities of all signatory nations. The lives of Viktor and Irina Brailovsky and thousands of men and women like them depend on our efforts, whether these take the form of letters to the "Prisoners of Conscience," messages to Soviet officials, phone calls, or other actions. Remembering that no one's rights are truly secure unless everyone's rights are protected, we owe it not only to the Brailovskys and others who suffer like them, but to ourselves. It is important to let Soviet officials know that the preservation of individual rights and freedoms, as spelled out at Helsinki, remains vital to all Americans.●

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the plight of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, an internationally known scientist who now resides in a Soviet jail for a yet to be specified charge. It is clear, however, that his "crime" is his active, unwavering support for Soviet Jews and their right to emigrate.

Dr. Brailovsky has been an eminent leader in the Soviet Jewry movement. He has been editor of the unofficial journal Jews in the U.S.S.R., and was once arrested because of his connection to it. In 1972, he and his wife attempted to emigrate, but their efforts were thwarted. In fact, Viktor Brailovsky lost his job as a result of his desire to emigrate. Dr. Brailovsky has held the prestigious Moscow Sunday Seminar at his home for the last 4 years. And, last November, he and 200 other refuseniks wrote a letter to Soviet President Brehnev requesting the free emigration of Soviet Jews.

It is my firm belief that we cannot idly stand by and permit this abdication of human rights to continue. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support Viktor Brailovsky's case, as only a strong protest will convince the Soviet Union of our concern over their emigration and human rights policies, particularly as they apply to Soviet Jews.●

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, although President Reagan has hailed America as on the road to "a New Beginning," unfortunately, the Soviet Union is continuing its persecution of individuals whose sole desire is to practice their Jewish heritage. Yet another victim caught in the cruel web of Soviet domination and denigration is Dr. Viktor Brailovsky.

Viktor Brailovsky has been trying to emigrate with his family since 1972. As usual, as soon as he requested permission to leave, the harassment, investigations, and proclamations that he was privy to state secrets resulted in firm denial of his request. The pattern of treatment that Dr. Brailovsky has received at the hands of the Soviet bureaucracy and the KGB has now become typical, and I suggest to my colleagues that we take a close look at what has happened to Viktor Brailovsky and his family since the decision to request permission to emigrate to Israel was reached.

After the denial to their request came in January 1973, 4 months after application had been made, both Viktor and his wife, Irina, became involved in the Jewish emigration movement, and soon after Viktor organized the "Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists." Those Jewish scientists who had been refused permission to emigrate, and unemployed because of this, met together on Sunday afternoons, in the Brailovsky home, in order to discuss the various advances being made in their respective scientific area. Since none could do this alone, having limited access to scientific studies and journals, together they were able to maintain some kind of tie with the scientific community. Western scientists who were in the Soviet Union soon learned of these meetings, and the two groups were able to meet and discuss together. This input by foreign scientists is what probably kept these men and women as up to date in their respective fields as possible. However, since Dr. Brailovsky's arrest, these meetings no longer take place, thanks to the KGB.

Viktor Brailovsky also participated in a 17-day hunger strike that year, to give attention to the denial of emigration to Jews who wished to do so. The following year, 1974, found Viktor imprisoned for over 2 weeks, for having tried to conduct an international session of the seminar.

Finally, in 1976, the exit visa that had been eagerly awaited was approved. But, Mr. Speaker, it was valid only for Dr. Brailovsky, and he refused to leave the Soviet Union without his wife and two children. Soon after this refusal to leave, Viktor was arrested at a demonstration, but soon released. His home was searched by the KGB, and books dealing with Jewish history and culture, along with Hebrew language music tapes, were confiscated. Harassment continued, and during Anatoly Shcharansky's detainment before trial, Viktor was detained and interrogated for 12 hours. In 1978, Viktor and Irina's home was again searched by the KGB, and scientific materials were taken. By this time, Irina too was denied an exist visa.

In April 1980, Viktor Brailovsky was arrested again, and was told that this time, the investigation was aimed at his participation in the cultural publication, "Jews in the U.S.S.R." Along with several others, all of whom now live in Israel, Viktor was an editor of this journal, which contained articles on Jewish history and traditions. But again, he was released, if only for a short time, since it was in November 1980 that the signatories to the Helsinki accords were going to meet in Madrid. On the eve of that meeting, Viktor signed a letter, along with 237 others, demanding that Leonid Brezhnev issue them exit visas. Two days later, he was arrested, and he has not yet been released.

Viktor Brailovsky has been arrested for "defaming the Soviet state." Under Soviet law, Mr. Speaker, a person cannot be held for more than 2 months without going to trial, yet Viktor remains in Butyrskaya Prison to this day. What aggravates this situation is Viktor's poor health. He suffers from a liver ailment, and his wife believes that he has not been receiving his medicine.

As a matter of fact, the investigation into Viktor's alleged crimes has been dropped for the time being, and we believe that this is because his health has deteriorated so rapidly that were the Soviets to bring him to trial now, all the world would see the mistreatment of Viktor Brailovsky at the hands of the Soviet Union.

It is for these reasons that we in Congress have gathered here today, proclaiming to the Soviet Union that we are aware of their inhumanity to Viktor Brailovsky and his family. I assure them that we, as Members of Congress, will not let up in our efforts to free those whose inherent right it is to be free, as well as continue to monitor the Soviet Union's actions in various other arenas. I strongly urge the Soviet Union to allow Viktor Brailovsky to emigrate to Israel with his family.●

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, civilized countries treat their men and women of science with respect, honoring them for their contributions and dedication to broadening knowledge in their fields. Civilized countries recognize the importance of intellectual freedom and the disastrous ramifications of repression for everyone involved. Civilized countries do not abuse the very men and women who constitute the finest minds in the land. A civilized country would not have arrested Dr. Viktor Brailovsky as the Soviet Government 3 months ago.

But why not arrest him? He was spreading the disease of valor among those Soviet Jews who dread and fear their state, and this germinating freedom of spirit must be quashed at any cost. The notion that there is something to be gained by protestation is one to be swiftly and terribly denied in the Soviet Union, and Dr. Brailovsky's abusive treatment is meant to demonstrate the refusal of the Soviet Government to validate any of these efforts. Against such odds, who will or can do anything to break the cycle constituted by the denial of exit visas for Soviet Jews and their resulting activism and arrest for what was once a quiet and lawful effort? Will not the Soviets finally discourage all emigration attempts and carry out their systematic program of discrimination against Jews and other minority and religious groups in the Soviet Union?

The answer is an emphatic "no." The people of the Soviet Union have shown enormous strength and determination in fighting this repression and with our help and support, they can prevail. We need to utilize all the tools we have available to fight the abuse of human rights in the Soviet Union and to free the innocent victims of Soviet retribution.

President Reagan has set the stage for a new foreign policy, a policy of strength which recognizes the importance of linkage. The Soviet Government must realize that they cannot abuse the people of that country with impunity, and that the free countries of the world will call them to account for their inhumanity not just with words but with deeds as well. Much has been speculated about the interest in human rights in the Reagan administration, but I submit that President Reagan's policies will further the cause of human rights in the Soviet Union more so than in any previous administration. We will see a rededication to the cause of freedom throughout the world, along with increased esteem for the United States and its leadership role in encouraging freedom and human rights.

I want to express my gratitude to Congressman FISH for coordinating this special order in behalf of Dr. Brailovsky and want to join him in this rededication to the cause of free emigration for Soviet Jews. I urge my colleagues to each make a contribution toward this effort and let your voices be heard in defense of the basic human rights of all peoples.●

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, we cannot protest strongly enough to the Soviet Government our concern about their own citizens who are badly treated and harassed. It is the responsibility of everyone who enjoys the benefits of freedom to let their voice be heard when an injustice is committed. This is clearly the case with the Soviet Government's treatment of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, a prominent scientist and leader to the Soviet Jewish emigration movement.

Dr. Brailovsky has been imprisoned since November, but his harassment by the Soviet Government began 8 years ago. In that time, he has lost his job, been arrested and jailed many times, and his home has been searched and valuable papers of his were confiscated. Until he lost his position, Dr. Brailovsky was considered a leading authority in the area of cybernetics.

Through his wife, it has been discovered that Dr. Brailovsky's health is deteriorating and that he needs immediate medical care. It is tragic that other countries must appeal to the Soviet Government to provide humane treatment to one of their citizens. I am hopeful that all the Members of Congress will join in asking the Soviet leadership to grant proper medical treatment to Dr. Brailovsky and to permit both he and his wife to emigrate to Israel.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in urging Soviet authorities to release Viktor Brailovsky from prison and allow him and his wife and children to emigrate to Israel.

Mr. Brailovsky and his wife, Irina, sought to leave the Soviet Empire in 1972, but were refused permission because Mrs. Brailovsky had access to "secret" information as peculiarly defined by the Communist overlords. In 1974, Viktor Brailovsky was imprisoned for 15 days because he wanted to hold an international session of the Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists.

In 1976, Mr. Brailovsky finally received the needed permission to leave oppressive Soviet territory, but was cruelly denied the opportunity to take his family along with him, so he rejected the offer. Later that same year, he was arrested in Moscow, his home was subsequently searched, and much of his property relating to Jewish history and culture was stolen by authorities.

In 1977, Mr. Brailovsky was interrogated for 12 hours at a prison; in 1978, his wife was again cruelly denied permission to emigrate, and, later that year, more of his property was stolen by Government officials acting in the

name of the law. Late last year, he was placed in prison. He remains isolated from his family, his wife is not allowed to visit him, and his brutal captors refuse him proper medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker, every possible step should be taken by our Government to see that officials of the Soviet Communist Empire begin to show some respect for human dignity and allow the Brailovsky family, and thousands of others like them to live in the country of their choice.●

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, just 1 week ago, America welcomed home 52 hostages after a seemingly endless 444-day ordeal. But the release of the 52 from Iran did not signal the end of political repression nor the dawn of religious freedom throughout the world. We need look only to the north of Iran for ample evidence of officially sanctioned physical and mental mistreatment. Today in the Soviet Union, close to 200,000 Jews are hostages in a sense, persecuted because of their religious beliefs and forbidden to emigrate to freedom in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the plight of one such refusenik, Dr. Viktor Brailovsky. On the eve of the Madrid Conference, the Soviet Union jailed Dr. Brailovsky, a prominent scientist and leader of the Soviet Jewry emigration movement. While Dr. Brailovsky was ostensibly arrested for "slandering the Soviet State," in actuality, his true crime was simply his wish to live in freedom in Israel.

A noted cyberneticist, Dr. Brailovsky lost his job and faced continual harassment and frequent arrests by Soviet officials from the moment in 1972 that he first made clear his desire to emigrate to Israel. Although stripped of his professional status, Dr. Brailovsky refused to allow Soviet suppression to interfere with his dedication to science and his intellectual fervor. He proved that while the authorities could attempt to restrain his professional actions they could never suppress his ideas nor his determination. Undaunted, he continued to blaze paths in other scientific fields, such as mathematical statistics, publishing frequently in American journals. He also organized the Moscow Seminar for Jewish Scientists—a group of Soviet scientist refuseniks who met every Sunday at Dr. Brailovsky's home to discuss the latest advancements and achievements in their fields.

Determined that other Soviet Jews should not lose their self-identity nor forget their Jewish culture, Brailovsky also edited an unofficial journal called Jews in the U.S.S.R. The magazine, which contains articles on Jewish history, Jewish poetry and prose, and excerpts from Western books and articles has long been a target of suppression for the Kremlin. Last April, Dr. Brailovsky and his wife were arrested in connection with the publication, and while they were eventually released, both remained under investigation. On November 13, Viktor Brailovsky was again arrested for leading 230 other refuseniks in an appeal to President Brezhnev requesting the free emigration of Soviet Jews. Since his apprehension, Dr. Brailovsky's health has considerably worsened. His wife has been denied permission to visit him and her inquiries as to his physical condition remain unanswered. Despite his rapidly deteriorating health, Dr. Brailovsky still faces the possibility of up to 3 years in a labor camp for his crimes.

How ironic that his arrest should occur on the eve of the Madrid Conference whose very purpose it was to review the Helsinki accords. How ironic that a government which signed these provisions respecting human rights merely 5 years ago, should take a major step backward with the arrest of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky. How disheartening that a man should be incarcerated and punished—denied every right of human decency, merely for his desire to leave for his promised land and for his refusal to be silenced.

Viktor Brailovsky's pain is ours as well. As his health deteriorates, we must give him the quality of emotional support that can only come from a country which itself has been held hostage. We must join together and demand that he receive the proper medical attention. We must join together to see that he is granted his freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as America rejoices in the homecoming of our brave 52, I hope that we will not forget those men and women whose political imprisonment continues. Viktor Brailovsky's case stands out for his courage and dedication, yet throughout the Soviet Union, there are thousands of Jews, who, like our 52 Americans are held hostage—persecuted and forced to live away from their promised and cherished land of Israel. We must not let the Brailovskys of the Soviet Union be silenced. We must see to it that they are freed.●

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker. I wish to join with many of my colleagues in calling attention to the plight of the Soviet scientist Viktor Brailovsky and urging that he and his family be permitted to emigrate to Israel.

The story of the harassment of Viktor Brailovsky and his family by Soviet authorities began in 1973, when he and his wife Irina were refused permission to emigrate from Russia. The latest development in this story was his arrest on November 13, 1980. Ironically, this arrest was 2 days after the opening of the Madrid Conference on the Helsinki accords, at which the United States has repeatedly called upon the Soviet Union to protect the human rights of its citizens, including the right to emigrate as guaranteed under the Helsinki agreement.

For the Brailovskys, the years since 1973 have been a record of repeated arrests for expressing their support of liberalized emigration policies, confiscation of scientific papers as well as materials relating to Jewish culture and religion, inability to receive permission to teach, and arbitrary and repeated denials of their right to emigrate. And it is particularly distressing to realize that although the case of Viktor Brailovsky has received considerable publicity, the Brailovsky family is just one of many Soviet refusenik families that must endure injustice of this type.

The Brailovskys are being forced to suffer as an example to others in the Soviet Union—especially Jews—who wish to exercise basic human rights. Those of us in Congress who support the cause of human rights for all people must let the Soviet Union know that we strongly oppose the persecution of the Brailovskys and the repression that it represents. We must renew our call upon the Soviet Union to honor the commitment it made at Helsinki and assure that Soviet Government that we will be monitoring their efforts in this area closely. At this time, therefore, I strongly urge that the Soviet Union begin a reform of its policies by freeing Viktor Brailovsky and permitting him and his family to emigrate to Israel.●

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, Congressman HAMILTON FISH, JR., for requesting the special order to bring to the attention of our Nation the plight of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, a political prisoner, and prominent Soviet scientist and leader of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement. Dr. Brailovsky was incarcerated last November and is suffering from poor health. He is in need of immediate medical attention for a critical liver ailment and I urge the Soviet authorities to comply with basic humanitarian requirements and provide the needed medical treatment.

Dr. Brailovsky is like many others around the world, a victim of state terrorism consisting of human rights violations directed against those, who, speak out with and on behalf of the poor and the oppressed.

Dr. Brailovsky has been the victim of years of persecution. His crime has been writing on the true plight of Soviet Jewry and seeking to exercise his human right to emigrate from the Soviet Union. For this he has been subject to numerous jailings and his home has been violated on two occasions by the KGB.

Most recently he was arrested and then released in April 1980 for his publication of a cultural journal, Jews

in the U.S.S.R. Since April he has been kept under constant investigation. In November, he joined a group of over 200 other refusniks in a formal appeal to President Brezhnev requesting the free emigration of Soviet Jews in compliance with the requirements of the Helsinki Final Pact.

It is an honor to join in cosponsoring Congressman FISH's resolution stating concern for Dr. Brailovsky's health and urging the Soviet leadership to provide proper treatment. Dr. Brailovsky should also in accord with article 13, paragraph 2, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Final Act—Helsinki Final Act—be permitted to emigrate with his family and join his brother in Israel.●

● Mr. LEBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the U.S. House of Representatives to the plight of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, a prominent Soviet scientist and leader of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement.

On November 13 of the last year, Dr. Brailovsky was arrested and incarcerated in Moscow's dreaded Ubtyrakaya Prison, a prison notorious for its role in the political purge of the 1930's and the postwar period. Since that time Viktor's health has dangerously deteriorated. His wife, Dr. Irina Brailovsky, who is also a distinguished doctor of computer science, states that Viktor is not being provided with adequate medical care for treatment of a liver ailment. Moreover, she has been denied permission to visit him and her inquiries regarding his health remain unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Brailovsky, his wife and family have all been subjected to continuous harassment by Soviet authorities from the time they first submitted their application to emigrate to Israel in October 1972. From the very outset, Viktor lost his job and shortly thereafter was informed that his request to emigrate was denied on grounds that he had access to "secret information" as a computer scientist at Moscow University.

Arrested and jailed several times since, the Brailovskys' home has been searched twice with valuable scientific studies, Jewish cultural papers, and tapes of Jewish and Israeli music confiscated by the KGB. Last April Viktor was arrested in connection with his publication of the unofficial Jewish cultural journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R., and although released, he remained under constant surveillance. Finally, on November 11, 1980, Brailovsky joined 237 other "refuseniks" in signing an appeal to President Brezhnev demanding exit permits to go to Isreal. Just 2 days later, he was arrested for allegedly "slandering the Soviet state"—a crime punishable by up to 3 years imprisonment—and placed in prison where he is currently detained.

Mr. Speaker, this tragedy is yet another example of what occurs on a regular basis in the Soviet Union. While we in the United States often take many of our freedoms for granted, nothing can be assumed there.

One freedom in particular we tend to assume is the freedom to emigrate. So close is this to our national spirit that when Emma Lazarus wrote her inscription for the Statue of Liberty she called upon the nations of the world to send "your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free" and "the wretched refuse of your teeming shore."

The spirit of openness contained in these passages says much about us as Americans. It says first of all that we are a land of immigrants. And it says that we naturally expect that those who desire to come to our shores will be allowed to come. What is not recognized in these lines, however, is that the Soviet Union has intertwined the freedom to emigrate into one of the most perverse political systems ever to darken the human record. What we in the United States assume as a natural inalienable right is flagrantly disregarded in the Soviet Union.

On August 1, 1975, in Helsinki, Finland, the heads of 32 European nations, the Soviet Union, the United States, and Canada, signed a document which declared their mutual "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms." This document declared that "in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the participating states will act in conformity with the purpose and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They will also fulfill their obligations as set forth in the international declarations and agreements in this field including inter alia the International Covenants on Human Rights, by which they may be bound."

One of the many principles laid in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own * * *."

Mr. Speaker, no one was more pleased with the Helsinki agreement than Leonid Brezhnev. Addressing the audience, the Soviet Communist Party leader solemnly urged that the principles of Helsinki be "put to practical use and made a law of international life not to be breached by anyone." He also said that:

> We note with deep satisfaction that * * * these principles are imbued with respect and care for man, so that he can live in peace and look forward to the future with confidence.

Since that time, Mr. Brezhnev's own words and actions have made it quite clear that the Soviet Union does not intend to comply with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki accords. In a major address to a national trade union congress on March 21, 1977, Mr. Brezhnev bitterly assailed U.S. support for Soviet dissidents as unwarranted "interference in our internal affairs." He warned that—

> Normal development of relations on such a basis is unthinkable * * *. We will not tolerate interference in our internal affairs by anyone and under any pretext.

Rhetoric aside, there can be little doubt what atheistic Soviet communism thinks about human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned about the plight of Viktor Brailovsky. We in this Chamber would be false to our own political values and traditions if we were to stand silent in the face of this kind of political oppression. For in the long hard march of mankind, America has been fortunate to occupy a special place in history. We have traditionally stood against the forces of tyranny, injustice, and vice. And we have been honored to offer the world a shining symbol of human freedom. Let us continue that tradition and let out with one voice a cry of protest against this yet another example of tyranny against the spirit of man. In conscience we can do no less.●

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago scientist Viktor Brailovsky was arrested on a charge of "defamation of the Soviet State and public order." His alleged crime was editing a magazine, Jews in the U.S.S.R.

Viktor Brailovsky, a doctor of computer science, along with his wife Irina, simply decided to emigrate to Israel 8 years ago. At that time the Soviet authorities denied their application for an exit visa on grounds that Viktor was privy to secret scientific information. This denial would deter many individuals but the Brailovskys waited, renewing the request to emigrate from time to time. According to Irina, "secrecy in science cannot be eternal."

In 1979 Viktor's ban for a visa was lifted but his wife was informed that she could not leave for the same reason that her husband had been denied the opportunity to go to Israel: Purported knowledge of State secrets. It was after this latest development that the family decided that Viktor and his son would emigrate, leaving Irina, her daughter and aged mother in the Soviet Union. They would join Viktor as soon as possible. Just as this most difficult decision was made, the Soviet officials once again denied all members of the Brailovsky family exit visas. Unable to leave, yet determined not to be silenced, Viktor actively urged his fellow Soviet Jews to develop a religious and cultural identity.

In the U.S.S.R. a man who declares his wish to emigrate loses the right to continue his profession. Consequently, Dr. Brailovsky was fired from his job and was termed a "refusenik."

During his years as a refusenik he wrote many theoretical scientific works, four of which were published in American scientific journals. He also joined with other Soviet Jewish physicists, chemists, and mathematicians, who were also denied permission to leave the Soviet Union, and conducted weekly scientific seminars which were held in the Brailovsky's Moscow apartment.

In addition to these seminars Viktor also served as an editor of the journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R. This journal did not pursue political aims but, simply, devoted its pages to Jewish history, culture, and religion. It was clear that Soviet authorities tried to suppress the publication of this magazine as evidenced by a repeated series of searches conducted in the homes of Jewish activists in Moscow, Leningrad, and Riga. Materials intended for publication in the journal were confiscated and Viktor and Irina were summoned for interrogation by the KGB.

On November 11, 1980, the opening day of the Madrid Conference, Mr. Brailovsky, along with 237 other refuseniks, signed an appeal to President Leonid Brezhnev requesting exit visas. It is interesting to note that he was arrested on November 13.

Since the time of his arrest, Viktor's health has deteriorated drastically and, if officially charged, he could remain in labor camp for 3 years.

The arrest of Viktor Brailovsky shows the world that the Soviet Government is trying desperately to dismantle the entire Soviet Jewish culture movement. Moreover, according to the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, the Soviet Jewish emigration rate declined sharply in 1980, by as much as 90 percent in some areas of the U.S.S.R. This further emphasizes the Soviet Union's complete disregard for basic human rights.

As a signatory of the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights and as a party to the Helsinki Final Act, the Soviet Union had indicated its commitment to internationally recognized human rights. It is up to us as Members of Congress to raise our voices and to fight for the freedom of all oppressed citizens of the Soviet Union. Let us not forget Viktor and Irina Brailovsky. May they be allowed to join their loved ones in freedom.●

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague, Congressman HAMILTON FISH, for giving us this opportunity to discuss the urgent situation of Viktor Brailovsky. Brailovsky, a prominent scientist, was arrested on charges of slandering the Soviet state—a crime punishable by up to 3 years imprisonment. He is at this moment in a Soviet prison.

Since his arrest 2 months ago, Viktor Brailovsky's health has worsened. According to his wife, Dr. Irina Brailovsky, Viktor is not receiving adequate medical care for treatment of a liver ailment. In fact, Mrs. Brailovsky has recently discovered that her husband's condition has deteriorated drastically, and in addition she has been denied visiting rights. It is imperative that Dr. Brailovsky receive immediate and adequate treatment before his condition worsens still further.

In October 1972, Viktor and Irina Brailovsky, both doctors of computer science, first applied for permission to leave the U.S.S.R. In January 1973, their request was denied because Irina had had access to secret information as a computer scientist at Moscow University. Since their refusal, Viktor and Irina have been involved with the Jewish emigration movement and Viktor was an organizer of the Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists. To protest the absence of free emigration of Jews, in 1973 the Brailovskys, along with eight other scientists, held a 17-day hunger strike. The following year, in 1974, Viktor and other activists were imprisoned for 15 days for attempting to hold an international session of the seminar.

In 1974, Viktor was granted permission to emigrate, but he refused to leave without his wife, son Leonid, and daughter Dalia. October of the same year, Viktor was arrested at a Moscow sit-in demonstration and later released. In December, the Brailovsky home was searched in connection with the start of the Moscow Cultural Symposium. Many books on Jewish culture were confiscated along with tapes of Jewish and Israeli music.

Two years later, in October of 1978, the rector of Moscow University stated that the university had no objection to Irina's emigration and would inform the officials. Despite this, she was once again denied an exit visa. The following month, Viktor was refused a teacher's certificate by the local Ministry of Education. On December 21, 1978, the KGB conducted an 8-hour search at the Brailovsky home confiscating scientific papers and materials relating to the Sunday seminars.

On April 10, 1980, Viktor was arrested and told he was being investigated in regard to the unofficial magazine Jews in the U.S.S.R. On November 11, 1980, the opening day of the Madrid Conference, Brailovsky, along with 237 other refuseniks, signed an appeal to President Brezhnev demanding exit permits. And lastly, on November 13, he was arrested for allegedly slandering the Soviet state, and is now imprisoned awaiting trial which if convicted, would mean a 3-year term in a labor camp.

We must strongly reaffirm to the Soviets our determination to speak out against continued human rights violations and the perversion of the Helsinki commitments which the Soviets have so blatantly disregarded. I hereby reassert my commitment and will urge the Reagan administration to help Soviet Jews whose human rights are violated and who wish nothing more than to live with their families in the place of their choice.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the case of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky reminds us once again of the cruelties practiced by the Soviet totalitarian state. What were the offenses for which he has been imprisoned?

He was active in Jewish cultural affairs, organized the Moscow Seminar for Jewish Scientists, published a journal called "Jews in the U.S.S.R.," and led an appeal to Chairman Brezhnev for free emigration of Soviet Jews.

It is difficult for us to comprehend a system in which such activities are deemed to be criminal, but it is important for us to understand the nature of totalitarian rule. In the Soviet Union, any activity not sanctioned by the Communist Party is discouraged and subject to severe penalty.

The case of Dr. Brailovsky is but one among many. He has been subjected to 8 years of harassment, losing his job, arrested and jailed a number of times, having his papers confiscated by the KGB.

Now he is imprisoned, and we learn that he is not receiving proper medical treatment for a serious liver ailment. I am honored this day to pay tribute to this brave man and join the call for proper medical treatment and for his right to emigrate with his family.●

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the concurrent resolution offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Fish) which urges the Soviet Union to honor its commitment to international law and to its own Constitution by allowing Dr. Viktor Brailovsky to receive proper medical care and permitting his family and him to emigrate to Israel.

Article 42 of the Soviet Constitution of 1977 guarantees that "citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to health protection" and cites that nation's commitment to "reduce the incidence of diseases and insure citizens of a long and active life." I call upon the Soviet Government to give meaning to these words by providing Dr. Brailovsky with the medical treatment he critically needs.

I further call on the Soviet Government to recognize the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. As a signator to this document, the Soviet Union has agreed to respect individual rights and fundamental freedoms, and its commitment to these principles can be demonstrated by allowing the Brailovsky's to emigrate.

The imprisonment and treatment of Dr. Brailovsky contravenes the basic tenets of universal human rights, and

I am privileged to join in supporting this resolution.●

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jews is one which should concern not only the Jewish community, but all of humanity because it involves the denial of a basic freedom. When a man such as Dr. Viktor Brailovsky is forbidden to leave a country which has never accepted him or his people because of their religious beliefs, there is a gross injustice.

Dr. Brailovsky is a Jewish computer scientist living in the Soviet Union. When he first applied for permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel in October 1972, permission was denied. The Soviet Government claimed that his wife, Irina, also a computer scientist, may have obtained "secret information" while working at Moscow University. Since then, Dr. Brailovsky, and his family have suffered 8 years of continuous harassment by Soviet authorities because of his role as editor of the journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R., and his involvement with the Jewish emigration movement and Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists, which Dr. Brailovsky organized.

During this period of harrassment, Dr. Brailovsky lost his job, was arrested and jailed numerous times, and his home was searched twice resulting in the confiscation of valuable scientific and Jewish cultural papers. Dr. Brailovsky continued his work in science despite the Government's harassment.

In a recent newspaper article by Mrs. Brailovsky entitled "Let My Husband Go," she wrote:

In our country, a man who has declared his wish to emigrate loses the right to continue with his normal professional pursuits.

According to Mrs. Brailovsky, after "the authorities failed in their attempts to frighten him, to crush him morally and to entangle him in the sticky cobweb of the KGB," they imprisoned Dr. Brailovsky as a final resort.

Dr. Brailovsky now suffers from a serious liver ailment putting him in dire need of immediate and adequate medical treatment. Though Soviet authorities have assured Mrs. Brailovsky that her husband has received medical attention, she has learned that his condition has seriously deteriorated. Could this mean that Soviet doctors cannot sufficiently treat a liver ailment? Obviously not.

Officially, Dr. Brailovsky was arrested for "slandering the Soviet State." However, the only crime committed was Dr. Brailovsky's effort to keep his national heritage alive after being denied permission to emigrate to the land of this heritage. I now ask, "Is this a crime?"

For centuries Jews all over the world have been hoping, "Next year in Jerusalem." For Dr. Brailovsky and the many Soviet Jews like him, it should be, "This year in Jerusalem." No man should be sentenced to death for this dream. This may be Dr. Brailovsky's sentence if he is not given proper medical treatment while he suffers in a Soviet prison.

Therefore, I join my colleagues in cosponsoring a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Dr. Viktor Brailovsky should be provided proper medical care and granted permission to emigrate to Israel, and urging the President to protest the continued suppression of human rights in the Soviet Union.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, there are literally hundreds of thousands of people who wish to leave the Soviet Union. Through blatant repression, and in violation of the Helsinki accords, these dissidents are forced to stay in the Soviet Union. One such dissident, who is an outstanding individual, is Viktor Brailovsky.

In 1972 Dr. Brailovsky sought to emigrate. He was turned down and since that time has been constantly harrassed by Soviet officials. Dr. Brailovsky is recognized as an outstanding scientist, yet to punish him for his desired freedom he lost his job. He has been arrested and jailed on many occasions. His home has been searched and ransacked at the will of the Soviet Government.

Now, Dr. Brailovsky's condition has grown even worse. He sits in a jail in the Soviet Union with a very serious liver condition. Without immediate medical attention the life of this courageous man is endangered.

Clearly, this treatment violates the Helsinki accords. Dr. Brailovsky would like to leave the Soviet Union to join his family in Israel. Thus, the Soviet Union is expressly ignoring those aspects of the Helsinki accords that deal with family reunification.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. As a brilliant, courageous, and dignified man, Dr. Brailovsky deserves to be treated as such. To think that the Soviet Union will not allow him to leave is distressing. To think that the Soviet Union will not allow him medical treatment is intolerable.

I am pleased to cosponsor legislation calling for the emigration of Dr. Brailovsky. This dissident, like all others, has a basic human right to freedom.●

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the case of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky should concern us all. In a pattern all too familiar Dr. Brailovsky has been subjected to 8 years of continued harassment by Soviet authorities leading up to his imprisonment on November 13, 1980. What is Viktor Brailovsky's crime? In 1972 Dr. Brailovsky, his wife, and their two children, applied to emigrate to Israel. For that crime, the Brailovskys have faced every kind of harassment.

Dr. Brailovsky is a remarkable man. He organized the Moscow Seminar for Jewish Scientists, a group which met weekly to discuss advances in the sciences. In the area of cybernetics, Dr. Brailovsky had received international recognition. Perhaps most important, Dr. Brailovsky was an editor of Jews in the U.S.S.R., a journal devoted to Jewish culture in the Soviet Union and abroad. It was a nonpolitical journal, only concerned with Jewish culture in all its aspects. Nevertheless the journal has been ruthlessly suppressed by the Soviet authorities. Material intended for publication has been confiscated. All editors of the journal, except Brailovsky, have been permitted to emigrate to Israel. Brailovsky waits in prison. I urge the Soviet authorities to permit Brailovsky and his family to emigrate to Israel immediately. Attached is a piece from the Los Angeles Times of December 5, 1980, which testifies to the courage of Viktor Brailovsky:

LET MY HUSBAND GO

(By Irina Brailovsky)

Moscow.—On Nov. 13 my husband, Viktor Brailovsky, was arrested on a charge of "defamation of the Soviet state and public order." Today he is confined in Moscow's Butyrskaya Prison, notorious for its role in the political purge of the 1930s and the post-war period.

Why?

My husband is 45 years old. I am the same age. We are both Muscovites born and bred. Viktor was graduated from the Energetics Institute, chose a career in science and worked in an academic institute. His specialities are in mathematical statistics and cybernetics. He is the author of 40 scientific works. In 1978 my husband was elected a member of the New York Academy of Sciences. He is also a member of American and British mathematical societies.

We have two children—a 19-year-old son and a 6-year-old daughter.

Eight years ago we reached a decision that many Jews in our country are making these days. We decided to emigrate to Israel.

That same year, 1972, the authorities denied our application for an exit visa. The reason given was that my husband supposedly was privy to secret scientific information. We waited, renewing our request from time to time. After all, secrecy in science cannot be eternal.

The years passed. In the spring of 1976, we learned that the ban on my husband's departure had been lifted. But we were simultaneously informed that now I could not be allowed to leave. The reason was the same: purported knowledge of state secrets. (I had been graduated from the mechanics-mathematics department of Moscow State University, and had stayed on to work for the university in applied mathematics.)

After long and painful indecision, we decided that Viktor would leave with our son while I remained behind with my daughter and my aged mother. With this decision, we went to the visa office. But no visa was forthcoming. We wrote a new declaration; once again we obtained all the necessary papers, but these only seemed to disappear in the bureaucratic maze.

Finally, I was able to find out from the rector of my university, Anatoly Logunov, and from two deputy rectors that a special committee had considered my case and had

concluded that I had never been involved in secret work. That was two years ago.

Logunov, as a highly placed Soviet bureaucrat—a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee, a deputy to the Supreme Soviet, a vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences—knew perfectly well that he was duty-bound to send the commission's report, which he himself had signed, to the visa office or the Committee for State Security (KGB). He knew very well that our fate and the fate of our children depended on it. Yet he did not forward this report, nor has he to this day.

It became clear that all the claims of safeguarding state secrets were an empty pretext. They just did not want to let us go.

In our country, a man who has declared his wish to emigrate loses the right to continue with his normal professional pursuits. This applies with particular force to an intellectual. If he is a writer, his work is no longer published. If he is a scientist, he is removed from science. My husband lost his position as soon as he breathed his first word about wishing to leave the Soviet Union.

But Viktor Brailovsky would not reconcile himself to the lot of a renegade. He continued with his creative work. Cut off from computer technology, he turned to another field of mathematical statistics and, working with pencil and paper, was able to strike out productively in an underexplored direction.

During his years as a refusenik, he wrote a series of theoretical scientific works, four of which have already been published in American scientific journals.

A scientist cannot exist without a scientific atmosphere or contact with his colleagues. With a group of comrades in misfortune—physicists, mathematicians and chemists who also had been denied the right to emigrate—Viktor Brailovsky took part in the work of the Moscow Sunday Seminar. He became the moving spirit of this seminar, which, since 1977, took place regularly in our apartment.

That, apparently, was my husband's crime. On Nov. 23, for the first time in the eight years of the seminar's existence, a scheduled Sunday session was barred by the authorities. Police and KGB agents blocked the entrance to the building and prevented seminar members from entering.

Viktor Brailovsky was arrested because he wanted to remain true to himself; he did not want to deteriorate spiritually or to submit to the order that he abandon his scientific calling. He was arrested because he hung on and helped others to hang on—dozens of our friends. He was arrested because he remained a pure and honorable man.

My husband is in prison for a reason simple enough to be understood by a child: The authorities failed in their attempts to frighten him, to crush him morally and to entangle him in the sticky cobweb of the KGB.●

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing my dismay over the plight of Viktor Brailovsky.

This case is just one more example of the wanton disdain which the Government of the Soviet Union holds for the basic rights of individuals and international agreements respecting those rights. Soviet actions, including persecution of those who wish to emigrate and imprisonment of such individuals on fabricated charges, are an outrage. Such activities are carried on in complete disregard of the fact that the Soviet Union is a party to the Helsinki accords and many other international documents upholding human rights.

As Members of this representative body of the leader of the free world, we must continue to speak out against the conduct of the Soviet Government. The particular case of Viktor Brailovsky should be brought to the attention of the entire international community.

I sincerely hope that every Member of this House will join in forwarding a strong protest to officials in the U.S.S.R. over the treatment of Brailovsky who has not been permitted to receive visits from family members and is in need of immediate medical attention. The leadership in the Kremlin must be aware that the eyes of many concerned individuals abroad are focused on their activities.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to join in this special order in behalf of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky. I commend my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) for introducing the concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that proper medical care be provided this unfortunate target of the Soviet Government's cruel persecution of its Jewish citizens. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution. I strongly urge every one of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join in cosponsoring this resolution. I trust it will get quick approval in both the House and the Senate. The need for swift action is urgent. Word from Dr. Brailovsky's wife, Irina, is that the noted scientist's physical condition has deteriorated since his arrest last November because he has not been receiving proper treatment for a serious liver ailment.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Dr. Brailovsky's persecution at the hands of Soviet authorities is a tragic one. Here is a brilliant scientist whose work in cybernetics and mathematics has received worldwide attention. He is a member of a number of British and American mathematical societies, and was elected as a member of the New York Academy of Sciences. He is the author of 40 scientific works.

Yet today this widely known scientist is confined in a Moscow prison made notorious for its role in the political purges of the Stalin era. His arrest last November—ironically just as the Madrid Conference on Human Rights got underway—was the culmination of years of persecution. Dr. Brailovsky seeks only the freedom to practice his religion in the country of his choice—Israel. Yet, from 1972, when he and his wife applied for permission to emigrate, he has undergone continual harassment and ever increasing persecution.

As always with those who apply to leave the Soviet Union, Dr. Brailovsky and his wife—who holds a doctorate in computer science herself—were denied the right to continue their professional careers. However, while they continued to seek permission to emigrate, Dr. Brailovsky also did everything he could to continue his creative efforts in mathematics. Although cut off from computer technology by the Soviet authorities, Dr. Brailovsky went to work with pencil and paper exploring new directions in another field of mathematics. In the 9 years since his formal career was severed, Dr. Brailovsky has, nonetheless, continued to enhance his reputation by writing a series of theoretical scientific works, some of which have been published in American journals.

Nor was this all. Dr. Brailovsky joined a group of fellow scientists who had been denied the right to emigrate and who were barred from pursuing their professional careers. They organized the Moscow Sunday Seminar, discussing latest developments in various fields of science. Noted scientists from other nations who were visiting in Moscow were invited to lecture on new developments. Dr. Brailovsky became a moving spirit in these seminars, and from 1977 they were held in the Brailovsky's Moscow apartment.

And Dr. Brailovsky did still more, though he knew well the terrible risks he was running. He helped edit and publish an underground journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R., devoted to compiling and publishing information about the status of Soviet Jews, as well as articles on Jewish history, culture, and religion.

These activities brought the full force of the Soviet persecution and harassment down upon the Brailovskys. There have been arrests and interrogations by the KGB, the Soviet secret police. Their apartment has been entered and searched. Finally, on November 11, 1980, the opening day of the Madrid Conference on Human Rights, Dr. Brailovsky joined 237 other refuseniks in signing an appeal to Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev, demanding exit permits. Dr. Brailovsky was seized and thrown into prison 2 days later, charged with "slandering the Soviet State." And there this courageous man is confined today, in desperate need of proper medical treatment.

My colleagues, we must make every effort to get help to Dr. Brailovsky. I call upon you to join in supporting this resolution, so the leaders of the Kremlin will feel the full weight of congressional protest, and will understand that persecution of Soviet Jews is an abomination to us all, as well as a violation of the human rights provi-

sion of the Helsinki accords, which the Soviet Union agreed to in 1975. We who enjoy freedom must help those who have sacrificed so much to win it.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, world opinion is clearly on the side of prominent Soviet scientist Viktor Brailovsky and his wife, Irina, an equally distinguished computer scientist, both of whom have sought for more than 8 years to leave their homeland and be reunited with family in Haifa, Israel.

But as is so tragically true in this and other similar cases, the Soviets refuse to respond in a positive manner to international expressions of outrage and injustice. Instead, as the Madrid Conference convened in November 1980 to review both human rights adherence to and violations of the Helsinki Accords of 1975, the U.S.S.R. jails a formidable citizen and accomplished author, lecturer, researcher, and inventor on the charge of "defamation of the Soviet State and public order."

Following Dr. Brailovsky's confinement in Moscow's Butyrskaya Prison, I joined some 60 Members of Congress last fall who protested this action to Soviet Chairman Leonid Brezhnev and who asked for his immediate release and the family's right to emigrate. The Soviet reaction to this congressional petition was classic: the letter was ignored.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Brailovsky was obviously jailed because he was a leader of the Soviet Jewry emigration movement, publisher of the magazine, Jews in the U.S.S.R., and because as a brilliant, though renegade, scientist he organized the Moscow Sunday Seminar with other unemployed physicists, mathematicians, and chemists to regenerate a scientific atmosphere in which to explore new ideas.

Despite several arrests, jailings, hunger strikes, sit ins, and KGB searches since 1972, Dr. Brailovsky managed to continue his creative work, his wife says, producing theoretical scientific works that have been published in American journals. In 1978, Dr. Brailovsky was elected a member of the New York Academy of Scientists. And the Committee of Concerned Scientists, Inc., has aided his attempts to leave the Soviet Union.

I commend my colleague, Representative HAMILTON FISH, JR., for this special order on behalf of the Brailovskys and their two children: Leonid, age 19, and Dalia, age 6. I am also honored to be among the cosponsors of his resolution that asks for proper medical care for Dr. Brailovsky, who suffers from a severe liver disease, as well as for freedom for the family. And I sincerely hope that this 97th Congress will seek new ways to convince the Soviets to expand the emigration movement and to urge our President to continue to repudiate the suppression of human rights.●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn the arrest and imprisonment of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, an eminent Soviet scientist and the leader of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement. I also rise to strongly support the resolution introduced by our distinguished colleague and my good friend, Representative HAMILTON FISH, which calls on the Soviet Government to allow Dr. Brailovsky and his family to emigrate to Israel.

Dr. Brailovsky was arrested last November because of his leadership in the emigration movement and because he would not allow the Soviet system to shackle his commitment to freedom of scientific expression. According to his wife Irina, Dr. Brailovsky has a serious liver condition which has drastically deteriorated during his confinement. He requires immediate medical treatment. Unfortunately, the Soviet authorities have denied Dr. Brailovsky adequate treatment, and have gone so far as to deny Mrs. Brailovsky permission to visit her husband and information on his health.

Dr. Brailovsky has been prosecuted for 8 years for his active work, not only on Soviet emigration but also in behalf of the entire scientific community. He is the author of 40 scientific works, and in 1978 was elected a member of the New York Academy of Science. He is also a member of American and British mathematical societies. Dr. Brailovsky has applied his research to various fields including medical diagnosis, oil chemistry, and solar activity. Following the loss of his job after he and his wife requested permission to emigrate in 1972, Dr. Brailovsky organized the Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists. Each Sunday, at his home, eminent Soviet refuseniks and Western scientists congregated to discuss recent advances in their respective fields. Since his arrest, the KGB has been active in preventing further seminars.

Clearly, the arrest of this prominent scientist is the only way Soviet authorities can control his commitment to the plight of his colleagues and thousands of people who wish to leave the U.S.S.R. In an article for the Los Angeles Times, Irina Brailovsky concluded that:

> Viktor Brailovsky was arrested because he wanted to remain true to himself; he did not want to deteriorate spiritually or to submit to the order that he abandon his scientific calling. He was arrested because he hung on and helped others to hang on—dozens of our friends. He was arrested because he remained a pure and honorable man. Mrs. Brailovsky went on to write that, My husband is in prison for a reason simple enough to be understood by a child: the authorities failed in their attempts to frighten him, to crush him morally, and to entangle him in the sticky web of the KGB.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Brailovsky has made invaluable contributions to international science. The Soviet authorities are attempting to quash the indomitable spirit that made those contributions possible. I deplore the arrest of Viktor Brailovsky, and I demand he receive the medical attention he so urgently needs. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution, calling on the Soviets to allow Dr. Brailovsky to emigrate to Israel with his family.●

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, Viktor Brailovsky is a Soviet Jew who, like so many thousands of other Jews in the Soviet Union, has committed no crime other than to have asked permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union and join his brother in Israel.

Viktor, Irina, his wife, and his two children have been seeking permission to emigrate since 1972. However, their requests have been refused on the grounds that Irina Brailovsky, a computer expert, had access to state secrets.

Viktor Brailovsky and his family have been subjected to repeated government harassment ever since their first emigration request was denied. The Brailovskys have lost their jobs, and Viktor has repeatedly been subject to arrest.

In November, Viktor Brailovsky was once again arrested, and charged with slandering the Soviet state. His slander consisted of signing an appeal to President Leonid Brezhnev for an exit visa, in accordance with the Helsinki agreement which was being reviewed at the Madrid Conference. If convicted, he could be sentenced to up to 3 years in a Soviet labor camp, even though his health is already poor.

I urge the leaders of the Soviet Union to release Viktor Brailovsky, so that he may obtain proper medical treatment for his serious liver ailment. I also remind them of the Soviet Union's delegation to live up to its half of the Helsinki agreement, and permit the Viktor Brailovsky family, and all others who wish to do so, to emigrate to Israel.●

● Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking out on behalf of Soviet dissident scientist, Viktor Brailovsky for over 4 years now. Today, I do so with even greater urgency. Viktor is being held in jail and is being denied medical treatment he desperately needs for a serious liver ailment. His arrest stemmed from his participation in the editing of a journal of Jewish life in Russia which was not officially sanctioned.

Brailovsky, a noted Soviet physicist, has been continuously harassed since he and his family first applied for an exit visa to Israel 9 years ago. In spite of this cruelty, Viktor has courageously maintained an active role in the refusenik community. He sponsored

weekly scientific seminars for dissident scientists like himself until his arrest in addition to his work on the journal which led to his present incarceration.

I call on the Soviet Government once again to stop its inhumane treatment of Viktor Brailovsky and permit him the medical attention he requires. I also urge, in the strongest terms possible, that the Soviets release Viktor and allow him to join his family. Continuation of such action by the Soviets against Viktor and others like him only adds to the barriers to improvement in East-West relations.●

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to state my strong support for Viktor Brailovsky, his wife, and their children in their attempt to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel. Their plight exemplifies the persecution of Soviet Jews and the problems they encounter in obtaining emigration visas from Israel.

In October 1972, Viktor and Irina Brailovsky, both doctors of computer science, first applied for permission to leave the Soviet Union. In January 1973, their request was denied because the Government felt that Mrs. Brailovsky had had access to secret information as a computer scientist at Moscow University. After this refusal, the Brailovskys became involved with the Jewish emigration movement, and Dr. Brailovsky was an organizer of the Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists. In 1974, Dr. Brailovsky and other activists were imprisoned for 15 days for attempting to hold an international session of the seminar. In 1976, Dr. Brailovsky was granted permission to emigrate alone, but he refused to leave without his wife and children.

Since that time, Dr. Brailovsky has repeatedly been arrested and harassed by the Soviet Government. In 1976, he was arrested at a Moscow sit-in demonstration; in 1980, he was arrested in regard to the unofficial magazine Jews in the U.S.S.R. In both 1976 and 1978, his home was searched; and books on Jewish history and culture and Jewish and Israeli music tapes were confiscated, as well as some scientific materials.

Most recently, Dr. Brailovsky was arrested after he, along with 237 other refuseniks, signed an appeal to President Brezhnev demanding exit permits on November 11, 1980, the opening day of the Madrid Conference. On November 13 he was arrested for allegedly slandering the Soviet state; and if officially charged, this could mean up to 3 years of labor camp. Dr. Brailovsky suffers from a serious liver ailment, and since his imprisonment, his health has deteriorated rapidly. He is in need of immediate treatment. He should be released and allowed to leave with his family for Israel.

It is evident that the Soviets' handling of the Brailovskys' case is not in accord with the international conventions they have signed. The Helsinki agreement clearly states that nations are to make it their aim to facilitate freer movement and contacts among persons.

I am outraged and disturbed by the Soviets' arbitrary and inequitable system which denies basic human rights to its Jewish citizens who wish to emigrate. The situation in the past year has worsened greatly—in 1980, emigration dropped 58 percent from what it was in 1979.

I urge all of my colleagues to continue to fight here in Congress and to speak out against the continued oppression experienced by the Soviet Jews. Soviet Jews should be accorded the full range of human rights the Helsinki Agreement recognized, and particularly the right to free emigration.●

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the House concurrent resolution expressing congressional concern for Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, I rise to join my colleagues in urging the Soviet authorities to comply with previously agreed international accords and provide Dr. Brailovsky with the medical attention his condition demands before allowing him to emigrate to Israel.

It is my understanding, through timely information updates provided to me by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, that since his arrest 2 months ago Viktor Brailovsky's health has deteriorated. He is not receiving adequate treatment for his liver ailment. He has not been permitted any visitors and his wife has yet to receive any answers to her inquiries concerning his health. Needless to say, all of these denials are in direct violation of the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Once again, I call upon the Soviet authorities to fulfill their obligations under these accords.

Much to my personal dismay, we all realize that Dr. Brailovsky's predicament is far from unique. Arrested on trumped up charges of slandering the Soviet State, Brailovsky, a prominent refusenik scientist, could receive up to 3 years imprisonment. In actuality, his crime revolved around his role as editor of the unofficial journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R., and as a leading Jewish emigration activist.

While I realize that the Soviets detest interference in what they consider their own internal affairs, they must be made to realize that certain truths transcend mere territorial boundaries and demand an international outcry. I know that I will not relent in my efforts to ease the plight of those, like Dr. Brailovsky, who have been denied their fundamental rights as human beings, and I am sure that a majority of my colleagues in this distinguished Chamber share this same commitment.●

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in protesting the illegal imprisonment of Viktor Brailovsky, a leading Jewish activist in the U.S.S.R. and a world-renowned mathematician.

His story, like those of so many other refuseniks, illustrates the brutality of the Soviet regime which continually tramples on basic human rights.

Viktor and his wife, Irina, first applied for permission to leave the U.S.S.R. in 1972. They were refused permission the next year, and Viktor was dismissed from his position at Moscow University. Viktor then joined an informal scientific seminar for unemployed Jewish scientists waiting to emigrate. From 1978 until his arrest 2 months ago, Viktor and Irina hosted these seminars in their apartment.

In 1976, the authorities granted him a visa; however, his wife and children were denied permission. Unwilling to leave his family, Brailovsky continued his activities in the Jewish emigration movement. He edited the samizdat—unofficial—journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R. until its publication was stopped in 1979. Throughout this time, he was repeatedly arrested and his home searched. The KGB confiscated his scientific materials, as well as his books on Jewish culture and history.

His latest arrest came just 2 days after the opening of the Madrid Conference to review the Helsinki agreement. He is being held on alleged charges of slandering the Soviet state, which carries a term of 3 years in a labor camp. His wife reports that he is seriously ill and not receiving medical treatment.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, his only real crime is his desire to join his family. His arrest, in flagrant violation of all standards of international law, is evidence of the total disregard of the Soviets for the Helsinki agreement.

I am today sending a letter to the chief medical officer at the Butyrki prison demanding that Brailovsky be given proper medical treatment. We must not let the Brailovskys of the Soviet Union be silenced. I urge my colleagues to join with me in insisting that the Soviets grant him his freedom and his rights.●

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the worldwide outcry on behalf of Soviet dissidents at the Madrid Conference this fall. We have begun seriously to express our concerns to the Soviet Union about their complete disregard for human rights. Unfortunately, civil liberties remain scarce, particularly for those who wish to leave the Soviet Union.

This special order today focuses attention on the plight of the Brailovsky family, which was brought to my attention by a Philadelphia area synagogue committed to their safety. For 8 years he, his wife Irina, and their two children have bravely endured harassment by Soviet authorities. Dr. Brailovsky's work in science and in the Soviet Jewish emigration movement has earned him only imprisonment since last November. Currently he suffers from a serious liver ailment which has been aggravated by his being jailed and for which he is not receiving adequate medical attention.

Like so many others in the Soviet scientific community, Dr. Brailovsky symbolizes the state of abuse endured by thousands of Jews who wish to emigrate. Let me take this opportunity to express my concern for Dr. Brailovsky's health and for the safety of his family. We have learned the value of freedom through the triumphant return of our hostages. Now let us hope that other oppressed people throughout the world may also soon share this joy.

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, today I joined my distinguished colleague, Congressman HAMILTON FISH, JR., in a special order on behalf of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky of the U.S.S.R.

The human rights violations being perpetrated against Dr. Brailovsky are, unfortunately, being carried out against other individuals in other parts of our world. In this regard, I want to call my colleagues' attention to a similiar situation which exists in the country of Haiti.

In late November the Haitian regime of president for life, Jean Claude Duvalier, instituted a reign of terror against agronomists, journalists, teachers, and others working with and on behalf of the poor in Haiti. Hundreds have been jailed, many are in hiding, and some with vision have been placed forcibly in exile.

Such state terror tactics close off peaceful efforts at development and portent a vacuum that can all too readily be filled by hostile powers seeking to co-opt the popular demand for reform and social justice.

In this regard I think it instructive to include in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Yvens Paul, a popular Haitian journalist now in hiding which speaks eloquently to the tragedy being inflicted upon the Haitian people by a regime of terror.

Dr. Brailovsky and Yvens Paul are brothers victimized by state terror, the former by state terror of the extreme left, the latter by state terror of the extreme right.

I believe both these cases demonstrate our national interest, as well as the moral requirement, for keeping human rights a prominent factor in our foreign policy formulation.

The above-mentioned material follows:

[From the Miami News, Tuesday, Jan. 6, 1981]

TWO HAITIANS SEEK THEIR FREEDOM

(By Ivens Paul)

My house at Thorland was invaded on Nov. 28 by police in plainclothes who then kidnaped Carlo Dantus, drummer for the Konbit Petit Kay (KPK) theater group.

All my personal papers and working papers were taken away. The men shot at me. This has worsened my health, which has been poor since the tortures inflicted on me Oct. 16 and 19 during my arrest and detention at the Casernes Dessalines.

Ill though I am, I have been obliged to live in hiding since the end of November, in deplorable conditions of hygiene and without medical care. I chose to live in these conditions, without enough food, in order not to be again an innocent victim of the government's systematic destruction of the Haitian democractic movement.

I am writing after atrocious suffering, exacerbated by false accusations of police and the twisted information given out by Radio Nationale.

Four persons supposedly guilty of setting two fires in the capital were presented on the national media: Gabriel Herard, Frantz Dessous, Raoul Acean and Michel Francois (known as Tiotio). Tiotio is a double agent, a government spy who tried to compromise me by bribes at Radio Cacique. Such offers have been made to other independent journalists.

I solemnly declare that we never had any other objective than to transmit news, and truly educate the masses of Haitian people. In the name of human rights, I affirm that the pretexts used by the authorities are unjust. They are part of a long-term maneuver by the political power system.

Day after day I encountered the pawns sent by our government to preach communism. This is an old ploy, well-known. We were all fiercely determined not to fall into their trap. I am certain that the police have no proof against any of my colleagues jailed or deported under the pretext that they are tied to the communist movement.

We are not communists. We are humanists who sacrificed ourselves to bring some light into the darkness that weighs heavily and for too long on our country. It is that effort that earned for us the esteem of so many listeners, readers, admirers.

But it was time for the party to end. The clock struck the hour, and despotism and demagoguery enjoyed their usual victory—without regard for the most elementary human rights, despite Haiti's agreement to international human rights conventions, in contradiction to Haitian law, without respect for the laws of God.

No! I raise my voice again to denounce the illegal acts of the police, who came without warrants into my house, Radio Haiti Inter, Radio Cacique, into the homes of all my colleagues and fellow victims. They were kidnaped, arrested without cause, deported.

I protest this brutality.

I protest the dishonest scenarios presented by the government press to deceive people. For example, I was accused on Radio Nationale of having plotted with people I never met, such as Nicole Magloire and Jean-Jacques Honorat.

Another example: The confessions of Gabriel Herard, Frantz Dessous and Raoul Acean—who has been held in jail since Oct. 16—could have been extracted from them only under severest threats from the political police. As for Michel Francois, his arrest is just a part of the staging.

Our law does not give the police the right to act as judges or justices of the peace. They may ask questions and submit reports, along with any evidence such as firearms. But only the judicial authorities have the right to conduct trials. If we are accused of conspiring against the government, why not bring us before the Tribunal of State Security created to handle such cases?

I do not want this statement to be used to persecute my family, my friends or the actors of the KPK, all of whom are grieved by my absence.

On the contrary, I would like to emerge from hiding, be with those who are close to me, and seek medical assistance.

I would voluntarily appear before a civil judge, in the presence of the public and of honest journalists, if the government would:

Return my passport, work materials and personal belongings.

Release Carlo Dantus, the drummer.

Give a precise explanation of each of these cases: those of journalists, members of political parties and every other individual abandoned without hope of help in the cells of the Casernes Dessalines, the National Penetentiary or elsewhere for political reasons. Among them are: Jacques Price, Sylvio Claude, Marie-France Claude, Cervio Claude, Francois Dominique, Gabriel Herard, Bienvenu Theodore, Viviane Nicolas, Yves Richard, Frantz Dessous, Raoul Acean, Jacques St. Lot, Ernst Benjamen, Augustin Auguste (age 70), Eben-Ezer Jean, Delmont Chouboute, Guy Robert Joseph, Wilfrid Nicholas, Hilaire Joseph, Bien Aime Joseph, Jacques Jean Baptiste.

Reopen Radio Haiti Inter and revoke the exile of citizens Gregoire Eugene, Jean-Jacques Honorat, Nicole Magloire and Yves Richard and journalists Marc Garcia, Elsie Etheart, Richard Brisson, Michele Montas, Jean-Robert Herard, Pierre Clitendre, Anthony Pascal (Konpe Filo), Liliane Pierre-Paul, Henry Alphonse and Harold Isaac.

If my demands are accepted, I ask to be notified through the media, and ask that negotiation be undertaken by the Venezuelan, Brazilian and American chargé d'affaires.

I hope for the happiness of my country, and for the triumph of truth and justice.●

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE LATE HONORABLE EMANUEL CELLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable Emanuel Celler.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a giant of a man in spirit and wisdom, a man whose presence dominated this Cham-

ber for most of his 50 years here—Emanuel Celler—is dead. I rise to pay tribute to him.

Manny Celler, my friend for so many years, served the Nation and the Congress for 25 terms, but his service is better measured in eras. He was first elected from his Brooklyn district in 1922, during the years of the money boom. He was here through the depression years and the New Deal. He saw the rise of fascism, World War II, the cold war, the Korean war. He left here at the end of 1972 when the Nation was in the final throes of the Vietnam agony. He served with nine Presidents: Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon; and it should be noted he not only served with but closely advised and counseled many of those nine Presidents.

It is significant to realize that Manny Celler's lifetime has spanned about 50 percent of the history of our Republic and he served in Congress for almost a third of the entire history of the Republic.

Manny Celler's half-century here were years of achievement that will stand unsurpassed. More than 300 laws bear his name. But it is for his 22 years as chairman of our Judiciary Committee—a record that may never be surpassed—that a grateful nation will long remember Manny Celler. It was during those years that Manny Celler, with skill, perseverance, and dedication, pushed through Congress four constitutional amendments and five civil rights laws—every significant civil rights law passed in this century. It was in those 22 years that Manny Celler was truly the architect of a social revolution.

Let me list those laws and amendments so that we can appreciate the true measure of this man: The Civil Rights Act of 1957; the Civil Rights Act of 1960; the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the Voting Rights Act of 1965; the Fair Housing Act of 1968; the constitutional amendment allowing the citizens of the District of Columbia to vote in Presidential elections; the constitutional amendment outlawing poll taxes in Federal elections; the constitutional amendment on Presidential disability and succession; and the constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, after passage of the 1964 act, the House, in a rare tribute, gave Manny Celler a standing ovation. Those were exciting years. The issues were difficult and passions high. Through it all, Manny Celler was a fierce and untiring leader in causes he knew were just and right. It was my privilege to serve at his side. During those many years, during those many battles, Manny Celler generously referred to me as "my right hand." It is an appellation I am proud of and one that I will cherish all my years.

Because he was such a truculent and tenacious advocate for just causes, with a manner sometimes gruff, it could be forgotten that he was a gentle man, a master of words and wit and humor; a humor that was, as often as not, directed at himself. His supply of jokes was inexhaustible. For this, those of us less facile were grateful, for he generously tolerated our plagiarizing his humor for our own purposes.

As he had a way with men, so did he also with children. It was a warm and frequent scene to see Manny Celler gather children about him and charm them with his feats of magic.

Another enviable feature of this multifaceted man was his love of literature and his appreciation of the arts. His appetite for reading was legend, his skill with a sketch pad formidable. He loved the opera, as I do, and I will ever remember the joyous times we spent at the Met drinking in the lilt and grandeur of the music of the masters.

Emanuel Celler was a complete man.

All the tough issues are not behind us. Difficult challenges are ahead, challenges that we in Congress must not avoid, duties that we cannot shirk. It is well then today that we honor Emanuel Celler; that we look back at the man and the principles that were his beacon as he charted the course of history and use them as our guide for the future, for they are timeless in their simplicity, their strength and their applicability.

For the many who were not able to personally attend the funeral, I am going to insert at this point in the RECORD, the remarks—the eulogy—of Judge Irving Ben Cooper which he delivered so memorably on January 18, 1981.

REMARKS OF JUDGE IRVING BEN COOPER

Rabbi Weidner; the family of Congressman Emanuel Celler: Jane, Sidney, Sue, Jill, Jeffrey, Jennifer and the third great grandchild on the way; each of the other members of his family; devoted friends, ladies and gentlemen:

We have gathered here not only to mourn a great loss but to celebrate an exemplary life. This is one of those very rare occasions when words seem inadequate—even hollow. It is much harder to express genuine appreciation than it is to find fault. Where are the words that properly belong here and now? It is impossible when the eyes are blinded by tears. So I shall let my heart speak out.

Our beloved Emanuel Celler pointed the way. He had attained liberation from the self; he gave an excellent account of his existence; his life was devoted to fruitful thinking, a mind well-stored, the spirit enriched and beautified by renunciation, dedication and a boundless loyalty to life. How refreshing and inspiring in a world careless of human, ethical and spiritual values. No noisy fame was terminated when he left us a few days ago, for he lived and worked quietly and with a modesty in which he wrapped his uncommon ability.

I hasten to assure you that no recital of his enduring accomplishment will be offered here. They constitute solid, incontrovertible facts and are an everlasting part of any accurate record of his country. This remarkable group gathered here know it by heart. The New York Times touched on it yesterday. "To get the great civil rights legislation of the 1950's and 1960's took marches, tragedy and determination. Without [him] it would have been impossible to enact the historic statutes striking down discrimination in public accommodations, education, employment, voting and housing. The acts [over a period of ten years] all bear the imprint of [his] conscience and canny parliamentary skill. Emanuel Celler was a champion, as well, of other progressive causes such as antitrust law; he was the proud coauthor of the Celler-Kefauver anti-merger act of 1957."

Those who really knew and loved him know what impelled this indelible record and so very, very much more. You, too, were able to discern that he counted his days not by clock-ticks but by heart-throbs, the throbs of a heart sensitive to the sighs, the wails, the laments of men and women stricken, broken and bereaved.

His labors of love were not sporadic or occasional but constant and habitual and always sustained by a profound sense of the kinship of human pain and suffering and sorrow. Through his benign and far-seeing leadership countless men and women have given in turn of their substance and their selves to extending a helping hand to others. They learned how to do it—and do it well—from him. That alone will keep his memory ever green.

His accomplishments were spiritually inspired. He had faith in the triumph of right over might. He was a servant of his duty and not of his ambition. His vast experience taught him that when it comes to influencing others, "example is not the main thing; it is the only thing."

He took his religion into the thick of the world and put it to work there. He boldly entered the open lists—to win or lose. He respected the faith of others and genuinely believed in the common brotherhood of man. His very being was saturated with the entreaty of Micah: "Do Justice, love mercy and walk humbly with thy God."

Just listen to him: "Sometimes, in my eagerness, I would like to tear the curtains apart to see what our world has become in, say, one hundred years. Will there be compassion and justice and mercy and peace? Will man honor man and, in so doing, honor God? I think so. The seeds are planted—now it is up to us and those who follow us to keep the soil moist, to let the air and the sun in, to prune and to weed so that these seeds bear the brightest of fruit."

Those of us who were privileged to be his intimates witnessed the love, the devotion, the intertwining of heart with heart that were the give and take between Mannie Celler and his beloved Stella, his heavenly wife of 51 years, and his devoted daughters Jane and Judy. Stella forever hovering over him with the tenderest of care and his daughters filled with the pride of his ethically high standards which they well knew he not only spoke about but practiced without let-up. We all beheld the rare beauty that filled his eyes as he would frequently speak briefly but with a full heart—yes, of gratitude—of his three women! And of Sidney who both Mannie and Stella regard-

ed as their son. He gave them the comfort and security of his boundless love and there was plenty over for the legions he cared for.

We can testify to the deep affection and constant concern he evinced for the welfare of every member of his family. No matter what the relationship—near or far—each had a claim on him; that was the way he saw and met it. All relatives were unanimous in hailing him their cherished asset; he was the revered leader of them all. And I would be sadly remiss if I failed to mention one, not a blood relative, but regarded by all a member of the family, dear Mary Dougherty who, for half a century, served him lovingly, faithfully, selflessly. A salute is also due Hattie for decades of devoted assistance to the Congressman and his family.

Our beloved Congressman searched out the truth relentlessly, fearlessly, exhaustively and exhaustingly. He carried himself with dignity and humility. An ardent advocate, a determined and resolute fighter when the occasion demanded, equally important he was a natural peace maker, for he possessed not only an understanding mind but a deep understanding heart—a rare combination, indeed.

He had an inner devotion to causes he regarded meritorious. The late Mr. Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone observed:

"I have no thought that men are made moral by the mere formulation of rules of conduct no matter how solemnly bar associations may pronounce them or that they may be made good by mere exhortation. But men serve causes because of their devotion to them."

That was our Mannie—serving causes solely because of his devotion to them.

He looked life full in the face. What do we do about it? Pretend ugly facts do not exist? Say we are too busy with ourselves? Falsely reason that no one person can alleviate all human suffering and therefore it is better to do nothing at all? These excuses are not only available, they are popular.

And what inspiration we get when we contemplate how he made the crushing torments of others his own personal problems! He always realized, and translated that realization into action, that poverty of mind and spirit is as awful as poverty of the body; that, in indifference to misery and helplessness, lies disaster. He firmly and unalterably believed that in a fuller, richer, real democracy everyone counts; he knew the significance of imbuing each person with a sense of belonging.

He saw "the necessity of denouncing with unwearied and even troublesome perseverance a single act of oppression." Others have been surcharged the same way. It was Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who wrote, "I have had to deal with cases that made my blood boil and yet seemed to create no feeling in the public or even in most of my brethren."

Our Congressman Celler saw and properly interpreted much: he witnessed the unabridged confessions of the ashamed, the tortured, the heart run riot; he recognized the successful and those waiting for success, the arrogant and the meek, the parasitic and the selfish; he flinched at the powerless oppressed and the overpowering catered to and waited upon by unending lines; he knew that with many, insolence came with security; he recognized those without plans or objective, shutting out the future as a penny held close to the eye shuts out the sun; those who prefer, as John Dewey told us, being good fellows rather than good men. He saw and was crushed by the unfulfilled promises to the struggling; he was saddened by those who have never learned that education, as Abraham Lincoln warned us, is not given for the purpose of earning a living; it is learning what to do with a living after you earn it. Yes, he was fully aware of people who have no resources in themselves and cannot find happiness anywhere.

He grew angry in the cause of decency; he was a man with whom a principle is not a thing you talk about, but a thing you do something about; a man who realized that it is difficult to fight for principles but much more difficult to live by them. Yes, he was a man angry in his convictions; a man unable to compromise with injustice; a man placed among us as a standard against which we can measure our own integrity. He was a man who served with honor and not for honor. His sense of dedication spurred us on.

The more he saw of this waste of human resources, the more he held firm to his principles of what makes life really worth the living.

Desperately needed are such as he who come especially in times of great crisis, do the needed jobs, restore order, carry on quietly, contributing something preciously vital and beyond measure.

He had contempt for those who from time to time in our lives, and throughout the ages, come charging with colors flying and shining shield raised high. The fickle crowd may for a while cheer them as heroes, but the triumph is usually brief and they leave us nothing but "the echo of a name and a suit of rusty armor."

He did not confuse bigness with greatness, price with value, standard of living with standard of life. He appeared to realize that the essence of wisdom is to accept one's limitations and to make the most of one's potentialities; that without moral courage all virtue is merely a manner of speech; and that moral courage is harder than physical courage by as much as the reach of the mind far outdistances the reach of the body. I am sure he knew that "it takes durable values to make life endurable."

He lived what he preached, without compromise, without stint—and he proved by his career that there is nothing more adventurous, more dangerous than to practice what one preaches.

But how soft and tender he became when children were involved—his special and sacred concern. He was determined to teach children to understand the mind of others; to weigh their interests alongside their own without bias of any kind; pointing out what Santayana said, it is "not wisdom to be only wise;" urging them to get rid of false estimates and set up the higher ideals; to convince them that in our social order the ladder of opportunity is not so high above the ground that you must have a ladder of influence to get to the lowest rung.

It was his conviction that children should know the significance of life that is "content with small means; to seek elegance rather than luxury, and refinement rather than fashion; to be worthy, not respectable, and wealthy, not rich. * * *"

He believed with his mentor, Ralph Waldo Emerson, that "the true test of civilization is not in the census nor in the size of the cities, nor in the crops—but in the kind of man a country turns out."

And in Emerson's best essay on friendship we find the beauty and strength and quality of Mannie's devotion to friends. To be the beneficiary of such a friendship was to be possessed of a special benediction. His friends were exceptional and varied, among the great and the simple, the eminent and the humble. He found pleasure in the successes of others and had a strong passion for making his friends admire his friends.

The Congressman too had a sharp taste, a piercing eye for sham, an acid tongue when occasion warranted. But he had gusto, he genuinely liked what he praised and he cared infinitely more for the men and women he liked than he worried about those he did not like.

As insatiable as was his love of quality music and masterful books, so was his search for humor. As he put it, "humor is a great release from turmoil and trial. It is the red thread in the grey linen of life." One of my favorites from his endless collection appeared in The New York Times last Friday: "The many sides of Emanuel Celler came together when he was asked once to assess Congressional success. He spoke with the knowledge of experience, the tolerance of the grand old man, the ear for the colorful of the good phrasemaker: 'To be a successful Congressman,' he said, 'one must have the friendliness of a child, the enthusiasm of a teen-ager, the assurance of a college boy, the diplomacy of a wayward husband, the curiosity of a cat and the good humor of an idiot.'"

As to his estimate of old age: He summed it up this way: "You know age is but a state of mind—some are old at 20—others are young at 80—and remember, old trees bear fruit—and while the candle burns, there is work to be done. I am sure that we all feel there is much good that we can do in the remaining years of life." And thereafter? Here's his answer: his favorite quotation from Robert Browning, "No work begun shall ever pause for death!"

As a poor boy in London, I recall watching the street lamplighter light the evening lamps. He would place his ladder, climb and light the lamp, take down the ladder and go to another, and so on down the street until at last I could see the lamplighter no more, but could tell the way he went by the lamps he has lighted. So it was the Congressman Emanuel Celler. He was constantly lighting the lamps of truth and righteousness. And when the time came for him to move from the scene of action, those of us who remain, though he be lost from our physical view, can tell the way he went through life by the lamps which he lighted along life's pathway.

By his life's work, our Mannie well merits the epitaph originally inscribed upon the tomb of James Abram Garfield, 20th President of the United States.

Life's race well run,
Life's work well done,
Life's crown well won,
Now comes rest.

Our dearly beloved mentor and friend, Congressman Emanual Celler, by act and deed throughout his superlative life, always carried on and went forward in a spirit best examplified by the lines of Theodore Parker:

But give me, Lord, eyes to behold the truth;
A seeing sense that knows the eternal right;
A heart with pity filled, and gentlest ruth;
A manly faith that makes all darkness light.
Give the power to labor for mankind;
Make me the mouth of such as cannot speak;
Eyes let me be to groping men and blind;

A conscience to the base; and to the weak
Let me be hands and feet; and to the foolish, mind;
And lead still further on such as the Almighty seek.

□ 1245

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I thank my chairman for yielding, and, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that he is putting Judge Irving Ben Cooper's eulogy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it gives a real sense of the breadth and scope of the life of Emanuel Celler. Subsequently, in a special ceremony in the eastern district of New York, the chief judge made the point, as the gentleman has in his remarks today, of the enormous contribution to Federal court jurisdiction that Emanuel Celler made.

Mr. Speaker, I well recall his courtesy to me as a freshman member on the Committee on the Judiciary back in 1969, and he will long be remembered for the obvious pride he had in the Committee on the Judiciary and will be remembered for his dignity, his wisdom, his wit, as well as his leadership.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for taking this time to salute the onetime distinguished dean and chairman of the New York State delegation, Manny Celler.

I know that no one in this Chamber worked more closely with him or knew him more closely than did the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Because of the timing of the passing of former Chairman Celler, there were complications, in terms of paying tribute to him. The gentleman was on hand for the funeral ceremonies. A number of us were not available at that time. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) took a special order, I believe on the 17th or 18th of January, to honor Congressman Celler, and at the end of that week there was also a service held in the Federal courtroom in Brooklyn, on the suggestion of Governor Carey, at which many of Congressman Celler's former associates from the New York delegation and elsewhere were present.

I think it is unfortunate that perhaps not all of these remarks are going to be collected at one point in the RECORD, but we do remember, certainly I remember him in very much the same vein as the gentleman from New Jersey, as a person of great interests, of great wit, and of, certainly, magnificant achievements on the floor of this House during the 50 years that he served in this body. He certainly will be remembered and will be missed, not only by the people of New York, but by the people of the Nation.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the very distinguished chairman for yielding to me briefly, and I wish to thank the gentleman for this period in which we evoke the memory of his predecessor, a man who transcended the purely New York or the regional significance but had a great deal of meaning to every one of us in all parts of the Nation even before some of us got to the Congress. Emanuel "Manny" Celler, in my book, is more in the tradition of a jurist. Had he sat on the bench, I think he would have made history as such other famous judges as Learned Hand, also of New York, Justice Brandeis, Justice Holmes, great jurists in their own right. He was a seminal thinker and a great legislator. He was what I call a jurist turned law writer. My own personal association with him antedated my coming to Congress in our efforts down in my State to try to abolish the payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. And when I did come to the Congress the first resolution I introduced as soon as I lowered my hand from being sworn in was a resolution to abolish the poll tax, and I will everlastingly be grateful to Chairman Celler because I talked to him, he took an interest, and it was less than one and a half Congresses later that we had the successful effort, as the chairman knows, because he took a big hand in that.

So these are the things that come to my mind, and I felt that the least I could do would be to join the distinguished chairman, Mr. RODINO, in evoking the memory of such a distinguished American as Chairman Celler.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my chairman, PETER RODINO, and the many other friends of Emanuel Celler in memorializing him today. Manny Celler was an outstanding chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary and his influence on the work of that committee will be felt for a long time to come. But Emanuel Celler was not only a great chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he was also a very great American. He was thoroughly steeped in the philosophy of the Anglo-American system of jurisprudence and in his work he always sought to impart the best traditions of that system. He was always concerned about the need for fairness in the application and enforcement of our laws and worked long and diligently to achieve and maintain the proposals of equal justice under law and the insurance of due process of law for everyone.

The American people and the House of Representatives are fortunate to have had Emanuel Celler as one of the most active Members of the Congress for a period of 50 years. It is hard to realize it but he was a Member of the House of Representatives for more than a quarter of the time that our Nation has been in existence.

I feel that I am fortunate to have had an opportunity to work with Manny Celler for a time on the Judiciary Committee and I will always cherish the memory of that service.

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Manny Celler was one of the greatest statesmen to have inhabited the Halls of Congress. Each of us who had the honor of serving with him is now and will always be indebted to Manny for his leadership and scholarly counsel.

Similarly, the people of the United States owe Manny a special debt of gratitude for his many contributions to the quality of life in America. As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, a position he held for 22 years, Manny was instrumental in the passage of numerous civil rights laws and four constitutional amendments. He did much to improve the antitrust laws and the immigration laws. His effective chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee was marked by open mindedness, fairness, and integrity.

On the floor of the House, Manny Celler was an able orator, with tremendous powers of persuasion. His mastery of the English language combined with his sagacity and colorful manner guaranteed him an attentive audience whenever he addressed the House.

After Manny's retirement from the House in 1973, he returned to his law practice. He remained energetic, alert, and productive until his death on January 15, 1981. His death marked the end of one of the most remarkable careers in American political history. Throughout his career, Manny served the people of Brooklyn and the entire Nation with dedication and diligence. The solutions to many problems facing us today will be more difficult to find without the benefit of Manny's wisdom.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my own appreciation of Manny's tireless efforts to promote justice. I join my colleagues in honoring Manny Celler, and in expressing to his family our sympathy in their hour of sorrow.●

● Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in honoring a long-time friend and colleague, Manny Celler, with this tribute today.

Manny Celler was not only an outstanding lawyer and possessed a brilliant mind, but in debate he would take a positive and determined stand. However, he was always gracious and kind, and I never saw him get upset about anything that transpired on the floor of this House. Younger Members and older Members, whether they agreed or disagreed about the issue at point, would always be treated like gentlemen by Manny Celler and, as a result, he was always treated in the same manner. He set a fine example for the younger Members, not only because of his long length of service, but in the way he conducted himself during that period. I know that all of us profited by serving with Manny Celler.

We also extend sympathy to his family and his loved ones and announce again that the country has lost a fine citizen.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleague, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in paying tribute to Hon. Emanuel Celler, who represented the people of the 16th District of New York, located in Brooklyn, for half a century from the beginning of 1923 through the year 1972. His death is a sad loss, and he will be remembered for his vigorous dedication to the cause of genuine political freedom for all Americans.

When he left the House of Representatives at the end of the 92d Congress, Manny Celler was the dean of the House, and I had had the privilege of serving with him 8 years. The respect and esteem in which he was held by his colleagues in both Houses of Congress and from both parties reflect the sentiments of the Nation as a whole. To millions of people he embodied the ideals and aspirations of American democracy as very few men or women in this or any century.

During his brilliant career in Congress, Congressman Celler was a staunch supporter of President Roosevelt's New Deal programs, and consistently opposed the mandate and the existence of the House Un-American Activities Committee. In 1949, he became chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and there began the long struggle for stronger national laws to enforce the civil rights of all of America's citizens.

Chairman Celler won major victories with the passage of the 1957 and the 1964 Civil Rights Acts, and as the chief sponsor and manager of all our country's crucial civil rights laws of the modern era, he achieved, continued success through the decade of the sixties in becoming one of America's notable and effective civil rights proponents.

Manny Celler was a dedicated and devoted American, and a Congressman of outstanding ability, deep compassion, and courage. During the 50 years he served in Congress, he witnessed some of the greatest moments in the history of mankind, and experienced, in a very real sense, the triumphs and tragedies of our Nation. He retired with the assurance that through his efforts mankind had benefited, and there is no tribute higher than this.

Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our deepest sympathy to Emanuel Celler's daughter, Jane, and to her family.●

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with much regret that I note the passing, on January 15, of a great Congressman and the former dean of this body, Emanuel Celler. Manny Celler leaves a legislative legacy of awesome dimensions.

Manny Celler became chairman of the Judiciary Committee in 1949 and, except for the years when the Republicans controlled the House, held the post from then until his retirement in 1972. Under his enlightened and compassionate stewardship, that committee began to churn out the civil rights legislation which had been so studiously ignored for almost a century.

In 1957, Manny Celler wrote the first comprehensive civil rights legislation enacted by Congress in 82 years. He was the author of the even more comprehensive Civil Rights Act of 1960. His greatest achievement was not merely the authorship of needed civil rights reforms, but his skill and dedication as a legislator which allowed those bills to be passed.

In 1964, he guided to passage the landmark civil rights legislation which stands as one of the great and lasting accomplishments of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. His outstanding floor leadership on that bill earned him a standing ovation from supporters and opponents alike upon its passage. Emanuel Celler's contributions toward the achievement of civil rights in this country were seminal, and he will forever stand as a giant among the many who have served in this body.●

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this body held the Chair of the House Judiciary Committee as long as Manny Celler did; and very few did as much to advance the passage of the first comprehensive civil rights legislation ever enacted by Congress. Manny will be remembered in history, not only for that contribution to the betterment of our society, but for countless additional achievements as a great Congressman and a great American.

On a less grandiose level but in some respect, an equally important one, Manny Celler was one of the most effective advocates for his constituents that Brooklyn, N.Y., has ever had. For half a century, Manny went to work in Washington on behalf of the citizens he represented; and for half a century, those citizens returned him at 2-year intervals to carry on that effective and tireless work.

All Americans owe Manny an enormous debt of gratitude. The people of Brooklyn are still more deeply in his debt; and those of us who knew him and benefited from his counsel and his leadership are perhaps the most indebted of all.●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, in a half century of service in the House of Representatives, and almost a quarter century as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Manny Celler of Brooklyn made his mark on much of the most significant legislation of the 20th century. His earliest involvement in politics dated back to the progressive era, and he brought the most admirable qualities of that time as a legacy to those of us who came along after him.

There is no disputing Emanuel Celler's love for and knowledge of the law, which he practiced from 1912 almost up to the present. He was better able to construct and guide significant legislation, I think, because he added to an encyclopedic knowledge of legal theory a keen insight into human nature: His remarkable personality and the experience of 50 years service in the political arena made Manny Celler a national asset as a legislator. While it is almost impossible to pick out single accomplishments and still do justice to such long and honorable public service, I suppose that what people remember most clearly is how Manny steered the necessary but controversial civil rights legislation of the early 1960's through the House. Only his combination of fearlessness and knowledgeability could have gotten some of those bills through intact, and he performed his duty honorably and well. Yet we must not forget that his masterful performance at that time was just part of a long progressive record from the Teapot Dome through the New Deal to our time. As time brought him power and seniority, Chairman Celler used these assets wisely for the good of the country.

It is no surprise to those who knew him that this remarkable personality continued to practice law actively until just before his death at the age of 92. Age could not break his zest and energy because he was not the sort of person to let it. The same tough determination which helped him to continue his education and to support himself after the loss of both parents within a few months carried him through his long public service and down to his last days.

Manny Celler loved the Congress, in which he served so well. In turn, he has left us an example and a legacy of which we can be proud.●

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely saddened the other day

to read of the death of my very dear friend and former colleague, Emanuel Celler, and I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him and his outstanding record of service to his country and to his fellow man, and to his State of New York.

Manny Celler served in the House of Representatives for 50 years—a half a century—and during that time rose to one of the most powerful and influential positions in this body, that of chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, where he shepherded some of the most important legislation enacted in the history of our country in the fields of civil rights, immigration and antitrust. Without his expertise, ability, and influence the Congress would not have been encouraged to adopt such strong proposals, and the country and our citizens would have been deprived of some of their inherent rights provided by the Constitution.

As dean of the House he was beloved and respected by all who knew him, and rightly so. He knew how to maneuver, how to act, and react, how to bring pressure to bear when it was necessary, how to negotiate and compromise, and, most important of all, how to make and keep friends.

When I was elected to the House from the neighboring Borough of Queens, Manny had already been in Congress almost 40 years. He gave most generously of his time and advice, and he was always available to me when I needed his sage advice and counsel, which was quite often during the first days of my service.

He was a remarkable and beautiful man, and a warm and decent human being, always ready to do battle for a just cause, and always ready to help a friend. His kind are too few in this world we live in, and he will be sorely missed by all of us who loved him and admired him for what he was—a highly principled individual, absolutely and completely dedicated to his country and to the people he served for such a long, long period of time. He took his oath of office seriously, discharged his duties and responsibilities with distinction, and his contributions to the quality and integrity of the Congress are unequaled.

I am proud to have been his friend, and to have had the privilege of serving with him in this House.●

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for arranging today's special order to pay tribute to Emanuel Celler.

When I first became a member of the House Judiciary Committee, Manny Celler was my chairman. I am proud to be able to say that he was also my friend and my mentor. He was truly one of the great chairmen in the history of our committee, and it was an honor and a privilege to serve with him.

Manny exemplified some of the best qualities any legislator can have—a strong sense of commitment and determination, a passion for justice, and an abiding respect for the law and our Constitution. His example and the knowledge that he shared with all of us who served with him have greatly aided me in my work here in Congress.

As my colleagues know, Manny was one of the key forces behind the passage of the great Civil Rights Acts of the late 1950's and 1960's. It has been my privilege to chair the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, and in that capacity to be able to carry forward Manny's efforts to promote the full realization of civil rights for all of our country's citizens.

I would like to insert for the RECORD, two of the many articles which appeared in the press to pay tribute to Manny Celler. I hope my colleagues will find them of interest.

The articles follow:

EMANUEL CELLER

When Rep. Emanuel Celler of Brooklyn was rounding out his half-century in the House (he served longer than anyone but Carl Vinson of Georgia), he knew better than to criticize the seniority system. Combined with his staying power, it gave him charge of the Judiciary Committee for a total of 22 years and made him one of the most influential congressmen of the century. Besides, he claimed, other systems of doling out congressional power (by the whim of the Speaker, or logrolling among the members) were also subject to abuses.

Mr. Celler, who died Thursday at the age of 92, could have served even longer if he had not run afoul of the women's movement. His obstruction of the Equal Rights Amendment, which he thought would cause more trouble than it would solve, was one of the counts against him when he was narrowly beaten in a 1972 Democratic primary by Elizabeth Holtzman. Organized feminists remained unforgiving. They picketed a farewell dinner given him by civil rights groups.

The dean of the House was a genuine hero of the civil rights movement whatever the ERA people might think. He took credit for having written and floor-managed all of the major rights bills since 1957. A grandson of German-Jewish immigrants, he labeled as his "worst" experience in Congress the passage of the 1924 Immigration Act. Forty-one years later, he sponsored the bill repealing that law.

He shepherded several constitutional amendments through the House, including the one enfranchising District residents in presidential elections. He opposed efforts for a prayer-in-schools amendment to override court decisions against the practice.

Mr. Celler also was an advocate of stronger anti-trust legislation, and regularly made the sports pages as one who wanted the laws applied to professional sports. He had worked fruitlessly to keep the Brooklyn Dodgers from abandoning the borough. Another of Mr. Celler's lost causes was gun control.

Through more victories and reverses than most Hill observers can remember, Mr. Celler never lost his zest for legislative battle. A faster-changing Congress could well use more of his durable sort.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1981]

EMANUEL CELLER, FORMER BROOKLYN CONGRESSMAN, DIES AT 92

(By Maurice Carroll)

Emanuel Celler, who served a half-century in the House of Representatives, died yesterday at his home in Brooklyn. He was 92 years old.

Mr. Celler, one of the most influential New Yorkers who ever served in the House, was defeated in the 1972 Democratic primary in a stunning upset by a political unknown, Elizabeth Holtzman. Only days before his defeat, Mr. Celler had described his opponent as "irritating as a hangnail, which nail I am going to cut off."

The defeat ended one of the longest political careers in the state's history. Mr. Celler continued to practice law until shortly before his death from pneumonia.

When Mr. Celler, 34 years old, brash and bouncy, was first elected to the House, Warren G. Harding was President. The year was 1922.

LED ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS

Seven Presidents and 42 years later, Mr. Celler, still bouncy but his brashness mellowed by the years, became the dean of the House. The distinction, he said, had "crept up on me unawares."

Seniority brings power in Congress, and as Mr. Celler's service lengthened, his political sway grew. He became chairman of the Judiciary Committee in 1949, and, except for the years when Republicans controlled the House, held the post from then on.

His committee handled civil-rights legislation in the years of the nation's major advances in that area. In 1957, he wrote and shepherded into law the first comprehensive rights legislation enacted by Congress in 82 years.

He was the author of the more comprehensive 1960 Civil Rights Act, and in February 1964, he guided to passage for the Johnson Administration a law retaining virtually all the elements of a draft that President Kennedy had submitted the year before.

"I feel like I've climbed Mount Everest," Mr. Celler said wearily after the 1964 bill passed, 290 to 130, and the House gave him a standing ovation.

PARLOR TRICKS AND PUNGENCY

In his later years, he remained a peppery, combative, always colorful and anecdotal debater, but his grandfatherly figure—bandy-legged, slope-shouldered, only a thin patch of white covering his tanned dome—came to be matched by a grandfatherly manner.

In private his bright blue eyes twinkling, he played parlor tricks for children, converting linen napkins into rabbits. In public he had the habit of finding stories and pungent phrases to dramatize his points.

During one of his periodic squabbles with Rep. Michael Feighan, the No. 2 Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Celler listened, glowering, to a Feighan denunciation of him during a House debate. Then he said icily, "To what the gentleman from Ohio says, I give the thunder of my silence."

Emanuel Celler was born May 6, 1888, in a frame house at Sumner Avenue and Floyd Street in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn. His father, Henry, owned a whisky business. There was a 25,000-gallon tank in the basement. Young Manny helped paste

"Echo Springs" labels on his father's products.

HEARD WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

His introduction to politics came young, as it did for many in that era, when the clubhouse was a neighborhood social center, the party-sponsored picnic and boatride were major social events and Tammany Hall—in most years—ran the city. In 1896, Henry Celler, a Democratic district leader, hoisted his son to his shoulders to watch William Jennings Bryan speak in Arion Hall. Or so the Congressman remembered, more than half a century later.

The father's business failed at about the time that Manny was graduated from Boys High in 1906. Then, soon after he entered Columbia College, his father died. Five months later, his mother died.

"I became head of the household," Mr. Celler wrote in this 1953 autobiography, "You Never Leave Brooklyn." He went on: "Following his failure, my father had given up his business and become a wine salesman. I took up his route. I went to college in the mornings and sold wine all afternoon until 7 o'clock in the evening."

The schedule did not halt his education. He was graduated from Columbia in 1910 and Columbia Law School in 1912. Two years later, he married Stella B. Baar. By then, he had settled down to law practice in Brooklyn.

FIRST CAMPAIGN IN 1922

In 1922, A Democratic leader asked if Mr. Celler would like to be the party's nominee for Congress from the 10th District, an honor but hardly a prize. The district had never sent a Democrat to Congress.

But the young lawyer enlisted friends, relatives and neighbors and went to work in the old New York style of block-by-block door-knocking and speech-making. He traveled the district speaking from the tailgate of an open truck. A burst of fireworks would be set off and, when a crowd gathered, he recalled, "you'd get up and harangue them."

He won by 3,111 votes.

Over the years, reapportionments stretched, squeezed and shifted the district boundaries, but Brooklyn became ever more Democratic, and the Celler victory become a biennial certainty.

"What did you say my opponent's name is?" Mr. Celler asked one pre-election day in 1966. "Please don't think I'm being immodest," he added quickly. "I just haven't heard who it is this year."

A LIBERAL FROM THE START

From the start, he had been the liberal that his upbringing, and his district, dictated. He supported the major New Deal and Fair Deal programs. He was among the small band that opposed the House Un-American Activities Committee, he pressed antitrust legislation and he regularly scored high on the liberalism ratings compiled by the Americans for Democratic Action.

In 1967, feeling itself faced with the obligation to discipline Harlem's flamboyant Representative Adam Clayton Powell, the House leadership entrusted the first step of the task to a special committee headed by Mr. Celler.

"As a good soldier," he said, "I am willing to take on the task." Someone wished him well. He winced. "I'm entitled to commiserations, not congratulations," he said.

The Celler committee recommended that Mr. Powell be censured, fined and stripped of the seniority that had earned him a committee chairmanship, recommendations that seemed to steer the tricky path between the need to satisfy the public outcry for action against Mr. Powell and the need to devise punishments that would not lay the ground for a court challenge.

HOUSE IGNORED RECOMMENDATION

If the House followed the committee's carefully fashioned plan, Mr. Celler said, Mr. Powell would have no "right of appeal except to the Lord Almighty."

The House did not. The members ran away from their leaders, voting to exclude Mr. Powell and setting up the very clash between Congress and the courts that the Celler committee had tried to avoid.

Over the years, Mr. Celler conducted a variety of investigations. Among the subjects: insurance companies, organized baseball, the steel industry, television.

Like most New York members of Congress, he commuted back to his home city on weekends. He also conducted an active law practice, which Miss Holtzman made an issue in the 1972 campaign.

WIFE DIED IN 1966

His 51-year marriage ended in March 1966 with the death of his wife, and he began spending more time in Washington, where he had one of the biggest and most comfortable offices in the huge Rayburn Building and where he lived in the Mayflower Hotel.

Part of Mr. Celler's endless store of anecdote and analogy came from voluminous reading. He favored biography and the classics. Part stemmed simply from a natural talent for the pungent phrase.

A regular opera-goer, he thought the old Metropolitan Opera House was a monstrosity and, protesting one day at the sudden formation of groups to save it from demolition, he said: "Why the sudden urge? Is it publicity? Some of them probably think Puccini is a name for spaghetti and that Richard Wagner was a baseball player."

It was with apparent spontaneity when he complained that American policy in the Middle East amounted to "Suezcide."

HIS FORMULA FOR SUCCESS

The many sides of Emanuel Celler came together when he was asked once to assess Congressional success. He spoke with the knowledge of experience, the tolerance of the grand old man, the ear for the colorful of the good phrasemaker:

"To be a successful Congressman," he said, "one must have the friendliness of a child, the enthusiasm of a teen-ager, the assurance of a college boy, the diplomacy of a wayward husband, the curiosity of a cat and the good humor of an idiot."●

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of our former colleague, Emanuel Celler, and I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory.

When I came to the House of Representatives in 1959 and was assigned to the Judiciary Committee, my chairman, Manny Celler, already had acquired a well-known and well-deserved reputation. Throughout his congressional career, Manny Celler was an advocate of progressive causes and legislation that benefited society. He will be particularly remembered for his leadership role in the writing of the great civil rights laws that were enacted during the 1960's, for his insistence upon the freedom of the marketplace through his pursuit of the breakup of great corporate giants which preyed upon the American economy, and for his devotion to the defense of civil liberties of American citizens.

Manny Celler served 50 years in the House. He was chairman of the Judiciary Committee for 22 years. He also was the dean of the House. We, who served with him, remember him as a wise and kindly man. He was incredibly witty and he had a treasury of anecdotes to fit any occasion. He also was capable of outrage when discussing issues which concerned him deeply. Above all, Manny Celler was a man of great eloquence, particularly when he rose on the House floor to defend the rights of those American citizens who were disadvantaged, mainly because of race, creed, or color.

Chairman Celler had an unusual sense of character. His public life was exclusively dedicated to the House which was the instrument through which he could express has values. And although he was the senior Member of the House, he also took an interest in the activities of junior Members and he generously offered us his wisdom and counsel.

Anyone who knew Manny Celler will remember him warmly. It was a privilege to serve with him, to know him, and to honor his memory.●

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, Mr. RODINO, for arranging this time for us so that we may pay our last respects to a man who was truly an institution here in Congress. I speak of the Honorable Emanuel Celler. I would like to take a few moments to recall the life and accomplishments of this great man, and of the many years of service that Emanuel Celler gave to the people of his district, the House of Representatives, and the Nation.

Although born to a family of meager financial means, Emanuel Celler combined his studies with honest, hard work, and graduated from Columbia College as well as receiving the law degree from Columbia University Law School in 1912. Just 10 years later, elected to the House of Representatives, Manny embarked upon a journey that was to enable him to contribute to the well-being of the people of this Nation probably more than anyone could dream of.

Evidence of this, first and foremost, was his continued reelection to this body. Emanuel Celler never forgot the people who sent him to Washington, and their needs were his primary consideration. Side by side with his caring for his constituents was Manny's need and desire to serve all the people. His niche was established on the House Judiciary Committee, and as its chairman for 22 years, Manny was the key to the civil rights legislation which became law. Equal employment opportunities, equal education benefits, the

right for 18-year-olds to vote, all fell under Manny's domain, and he fought for these things with fervor and zest. Manny Celler was instrumental in giving all Americans a better environment in which to vote, work, and study.

Mr. Speaker, among the many great men and women who have served their Nation here in Congress, I hold none in higher esteem than Emanuel Celler. His determination to bring to the people that which should be theirs, as well as a host of other contributions, makes me regard him as my mentor. We all benefited from having Manny serve with us, and he remains forever an inspiration to all.

My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our deepest condolences to the entire Celler family, as well as the residents of Brooklyn's 16th Congressional District. Manny will be missed by us all, but neither he nor his many accomplishments will ever be forgotten.●

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for reserving this time so that Members of the House of Representatives can pay tribute to perhaps this body's greatest champion of justice, human decency, and civil rights—the Honorable Emanuel Celler. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, Emanuel Celler died Thursday, January 15 at the age of 92.

It is only fitting that we pause at this juncture to pay homage to a man who during his 50 years in Congress gave hope and a fair chance to those who were hopeless and shackled for so many years by this society's prejudices and inequities. Undoubtedly and appropriately, history will credit Emanuel Celler as the chief architect and primary advocate of the major civil rights legislation in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Emanuel Celler was the undisputable guiding force who took the struggle for equality and civil rights from the demonstrations, sit-ins and marches in our Nation's streets to the Halls of Congress. He then became the tower of strength and conscience needed to push major civil rights legislation through both the House and the Senate at a time when his efforts were given only a token chance of success.

Courage, foresight, compassion, and leader amongst leaders—all of these words characterize the man who in 1957 wrote and shepherded into law the first comprehensive civil rights legislation in the Congress since Reconstruction. Emanuel Celler went on to become the author of the more comprehensive 1960 Civil Rights Act.

Refusing to rest on what many people called remarkable achievements in the area of civil rights, Emanuel Celler through his position as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee went on to serve as the major strategist for the passage of the 1964, 1965, and 1968 Civil Rights Acts. During this time, Mr. Celler was engaged in many floor battles on behalf of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may recall at the age of 75, Emanuel Celler waged an impressive battle on behalf of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Armed with his legendary oratory and wit, he led a 2-week debate that held together the farthest reaching civil rights bill ever written. The measure covered desegregation in education, employment, public accomodations, and other basic aspects of life.

After the house passed each civil rights bill, Mr. Celler went on to tackle the Senate Judiciary Committee which at that time was dominated by southerners who traditionally kept legislation of this kind bottled up in committee. In every instance, he pressured the Senate to pass the bills despite the opposition of some of the Senate Judiciary Committee members and the threat of filibusters and other tactics.

In addition to his achievements in the area of civil rights legislation, Mr. Celler is noted for his work with four constitutional amendments. The first amendment allowed the citizens of the District of Columbia to vote in Presidential elections. The second amendment effectively banned the levy of poll taxes in Federal elections. The third was an amendment on Presidential disability and success. The fourth lowered the voting age to 18.

Additionally, Mr. Celler was associated with over 400 laws which passed the House including a measure abolishing the use of national origins in setting immigration quotas and the Celler-Kefauver Antitrust Act of 1950 which tightened existing laws.

Mr. Speaker, Emanuel Celler was a bulwark of human decency in this Congress and in this Nation. His achievements in the area of civil rights legislation stand as a lasting monument to his greatness as a legislator and human being.●

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring one of the most outstanding legislators of the 20th century, a man whose district I am now proud to represent. When Emanuel Celler died of pneumonia on January 15, 1981, he left behind a stunning legislative record in the areas of civil rights, antitrust legislation, and immigration laws, as well as a colorful reputation as an anecdotal orator and a man of pungent wit.

The grandson of German Jewish immigrants, Manny Celler first came to Congress in 1922 as a brash 34-year-old who had wrested the 10th Congressional District of New York from the tight hold of the Republicans, pledging "It's time for a change." With that slogan, Mr. Celler launched an exemplary legislative career that was to last half a century, during which he earned national significance as a political powerhouse and a staunch defender of civil rights.

Mr. Celler's defense of constitutional liberties and his efforts to protect the right of the individual from institutional abuses dominated his legislative career from its earliest days and continued to characterize his legislative service thoughout his 25 terms in office. Mr. Celler demonstrated his opposition to the abuses of monopolies by calling for an investigation of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in his first decade of service. By the end of his congressional career, he had conducted investigations into such varied companies as the steel industry, organized baseball, and insurance companies, always combining principled dedication with political finesse. As early as 1938, Mr. Celler opposed the methods of the House Un-American Activities Committee, sensing potential danger to constitutional liberties, and in 1966 he was 1 of 24 House Members who voted against that committee's appropriation. In the first major debate of his career, Mr. Celler opposed the establishment of the national origins quota system under the Johnson Immigration Act of 1924, and 41 years later, he sponsored a bill that repealed that law.

Having secured through seniority the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee in 1949, Manny Celler became a crucial political figure as the Nation awakened to the need for civil rights legislation. His Civil Rights Act of 1957 was the first comprehensive civil rights bill to be enacted by Congress in 82 years. In 1964, Mr. Celler waged the legislative battle of a lifetime, during which he steered the far-reaching Civil Rights Act of 1964 through a 2-week debate in the House and successfully protected it from formidable political foes in the Senate. Recognizing this substantial achievement, the House awarded Mr. Celler a standing ovation after its 290-to-130 vote in favor of passage, and Mr. Celler, in his descriptive way, acknowledged, "I feel like I've climbed Mount Everest."

Manny Celler's extraordinary legislative accomplishments will figure prominently in the history of the past 59 years, and his incisive yet grandfatherly manner will become a cherished memory for residents of my district, and for all who knew him. It is my hope that his lifelong example of political integrity, determination, and legislative skill will be well remembered by the people of this Nation to whom he dedicated his life.●

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Emanuel Celler was one of the giants of the House. And he was my first committee chairman.

Thoughts of Churchill would not go away when one was in the presence of

Manny Celler. His English was precise, his grasp of history immense and his concern for justice—the word which is big enough to hold the terms, "human rights", "civil rights" and "fairness"—was awe inspiring.

Those of us who knew and loved Manny Celler know that his majestic being will live on larger than all of Mount Rushmore.●

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a former colleague and respected friend, Manny Celler, who passed away on January 15 of this year.

All of us who had the privilege of knowing Manny were deeply saddened at the news of his death. Manny's 50 years of service on the House, as the Representative of the 16th District of New York, leaves a record of accomplishments and achievements that is unlikely to be equaled. His efforts on behalf of the poor and disadvantaged will long be remembered by grateful Americans from all walks of life. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee for 22 years, Manny was in large measure responsible for the passage of the most important civil rights legislation ever considered by the Congress. The landmark 1964 Civil Rights Act, among others, was enacted largely due to Manny's skillful guidance and his tenacity in securing its passage.

I am honored to have had the good fortune to serve on the Judiciary Committee under Manny's leadership during his last term in office, and I extend to his family my most sincere condolences on their loss.●

● Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in remembering a great former Member of the House, Emanuel Celler. While I did not have the opportunity of serving in Congress with Mr. Celler, his 50 years in the House of Representative established an outstanding record and earned the respect and confidence of his associates.

As a liberal Democrat, he stood in the forefront in the civil rights era. In 1949, when Mr. Celler took over the chairmanship of the House Judiciary Committee the luck of seniority gave him jurisdiction over civil rights. His appointment came at a time when the anti-civil rights Senators bottled up all the civil rights legislation. Never afraid to differ with his colleagues and peers, he mustered strong majorities in the House and generated pressure to pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

A man who worked tirelessly as a legislator, his political energy was channeled to raise the quality of life for those who needed help the most, he had the ability to look perceptively beyond the facts and paperwork to understand the hopes and fears of human beings.

He always spoke with the knowledge of experience. We will miss his courage and wisdom.●

THE 63D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE, JANUARY 22, 1981

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, January 22 of this year marked the 63d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. As we have done regularly for many years, Members of the House have participated in special orders to salute this important anniversary date, to express the hope for a speedy return of the independence of the Ukraine, and to salute, encourage, and commend those Americans of Ukrainian descent.

Of course, as we are aware, because of the various festivities associated with the inauguration of President Reagan, the House was not in session on January 22, and so the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) and I selected today instead to render our comments and observations on this most important anniversary.

The Ukraine is, of course, one of the most important of the captive nations, whose plight this Congress annually recognizes pursuant to a resolution adopted more than 20 years ago. It is perhaps true that because the independence of the Ukraine survived for only a relatively short time, between the fall of the czar and the military takeover of the Ukraine by the Bolshevik Government under Lenin, people tend to forget that the Ukraine was indeed at one time a free area with a separate political identity of its own, even though since 1918 it has been incorporated into the territory of the U.S.S.R.

After all, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are also incorporated within the territory of the Soviet Union. But their independence, which was established as part of the treaty which took czarist Russia out of World War I, continued until the Soviet counterattack against the Nazi forces in World War II, some 22 years later.

Actually the Ukraine has also had a long and distinguished history, with a distinct identity of its own, both geographically and ethnically. In fact, so important was the area, especially in the richness of its agricultural production, that for centuries it has been the target for aggression on the part of whatever European power might believe itself at the moment to be in the ascendancy—by Poland, by Sweden, by Prussia, by Nazi Germany, and of course by the Bolsheviks. Yet throughout all of these invasions and occupations, including the current one, the people of the Ukraine have maintained their fierce love of freedom, their bold sense of independence, and their own individual identity.

In the spring of 1978 our House Armed Services Committee made a 10-day trip to the Soviet Union, the last 3 days of which were spent in the Ukraine, in its capital of Kiev. Although now politically a part of the Soviet Union, it was perfectly obvious to all of us on the trip that the Ukrainian people were a very special breed—more open, more friendly, and much more insistent on their own special identity. It was clear to all of us that not even the harsh controls employed by the Soviets through the KGB could impose the kind of cautious hesitation upon Ukrainians that one encountered on the part of citizens in other parts of the U.S.S.R.

For example, at the time we were visiting the Ukraine, the U.S. Department of Commerce was making plans for holding a trade and agricultural show in the Ukraine. Before our group left the United States we had learned that explanatory pamphlets that the Department had printed up to hand out to visitors to the Kiev trade show had been printed in Russian, rather than in the Ukrainian language—a very important and always a very sore point for any Ukrainian citizen.

We were advised that this failure to print the information in the Ukrainian language, rather than in the hated Russian language, would doom the success of the show. I brought these facts to the attention of the Department before we left, and by the time we reached Kiev the Department had reissued its information pamphlets in the Ukrainian language as well as the Russian language.

Considering what happens in the Soviet Union, that was a very positive assertion of independence on the part of the Ukrainian people, which illustrates the point I have been making.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the oppression which the Soviet masters have imposed on the people of the Ukraine has had a very strong and positive impact on these United States. We have been most fortunate in inheriting the drive, the skills, and the rugged independence of those Ukrainians who could no longer put up with life without the freedom they valued so highly.

As a result, hundreds of thousands—nay, millions—of Americans of Ukrain-

ian descent have made over the years extremely valuable contributions to the growth and development of the United States; and their children and their children's children have continued those great contributions.

We salute these brave Ukrainian American people in this anniversary year and we honor them for their achievements.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the plight of the people still living in the Ukraine. They share the same hope for freedom and independence in their individual lives that the people of Poland—another captive nation—have been demonstrating so dramatically this past year.

Surely we can hope that this same small breath of fresh air, this same small bright ray of sunshine of freedom, will also break through in the Ukraine in the days ahead.

This is not just a rhetorical statement, Mr. Speaker. Who could have thought just a year ago that what has been happening in Poland could have ever happened behind the Iron Curtain? If it can happen in Poland, it can certainly happen in the Ukraine.

So on this 63d anniversary of the brief but brilliant freedom of the Ukraine, let us simply make this prayer—"God speed the day when the sunshine of freedom shall indeed come once again to the Ukraine."

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include two impressive statements by Dr. Lev Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The statements follow:

HEROES WELCOME TO METRINKO AND ALL OF OUR RETURNEES

DEAR MR. AND MRS. HARRY METRINKO: In this period of glad tidings and on behalf of the entire Ukrainian American community we rejoice with you on the release and homecoming of your beloved son Michael. This is an historic moment for a heroes welcome for him and all the returnees. I feel an even deeper affinity because of Michael's Georgetown background. With all of Gods blessings.

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

WHY OBSERVE UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY?

With the 97th Congress, I extend in behalf of this national committee and myself our warmest felicitations for your most successful leadership in the years ahead. Hopefully, I also look forward to work with you in an area which seems alien to our people and yet is very basic to our national security as well as to our American ideals and principles. UCCA represents the convictions and values of our 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, small in percentage but long in ideas and experience.

For a quarter of a century Members in every Congress have observed the Independence of Ukraine. This is its 63rd anniversary. Upon the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire, the Ukrainian National Republic was established on January 22, 1918, highlighting another phase of independence for the Ukrainian nation. By 1920 it was destroyed in the first wave of Soviet Russian imperialism that in a succession of waves has reached in our day into Afghanistan. January 22nd is the date, but because of our Presidential Inauguration and its aftermath, this singular commemoration has been scheduled for the first week of February.

As Americans, why do we observe this historic event of declared national independence in the area of our prime enemy? The clear answer is seen in these few facts: (1) our America was primarily born in severance from an empire, and those nations today, like Ukraine, seeking independence from the Soviet Russian empire cannot but magnetize our instinctive, spiritual affinity (2) in fact, Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation both within the USSR and all of Eastern Europe, with a population and territory easily comparable with France (3) its long record of opposition to Soviet Russian domination, marked today by widespread human rights dissidence, is documentarily incomparable in contemporary times and (4) its strategic position in relation to Poland and others in Moscow's outer empire and to the Mideast and South-Asia adds substantially to its Achilles Heel status in the last remaining, major empire.

Through our VOA, Radio Liberty and many other media your address on these and other facts during the "63rd" will doubtlessly go a long way in intensifying our natural alliance with the 50 million Ukrainian nation. It will certainly signal the dire need for policy in this direction. To this day we have no strategy for Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the USSR—not to irritate or provoke Moscow into any hot war, but to preclude any such confrontation by meeting their primary challenge on the ideological plane. Though we have to recoup our military posture across-the-board, this is not the decisive answer to the Soviet Russian challenge. To put it simply, when we had clear-cut military superiority, Moscow advanced nevertheless. Hopefully, the new Administration will address itself to this most basic problem.

Under the co-sponsorship of Representatives Samuel S. Stratton and Edward J. Derwinski, the "63rd" commemoration will be held in the House on Tuesday February 3. Following this in the Senate (Room 207) a reception will be held under the co-sponsorship of Senators Charles H. Percy and Paul S. Sarbanes on Wednesday February 4. I most warmly invite you to speak out on this fundamental issue of national independence in your respective chamber and to join us at the reception. For, in truth, we haven't begun to realize the opportunities that face us in terms of peace and expanded freedom.

Your participation in this event will be greatly appreciated and with all best wishes,

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join this afternoon with my colleague from New York, Mr. STRATTON, in cosponsoring this special order in recognition of the 63d anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence. Today, we direct attention to the plight of the people of the largest non-Russian country in Eastern Europe being held captive by the Soviets. The people of the Ukraine continue to be victimized within the Soviet borders by the repressive internal policies of the Communist leaders.

We must continue to champion the rights of national, individual, cultural, and religious freedoms for all peoples held captive. The Ukrainian people are among the millions of those who are looking to the United States to live up to that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert several articles which appeared in the Ukrainian Catholic Daily, published in Philadelphia, Pa., which provide background information on this anniversary and on the conditions in the Ukraine. These articles appeared in the January 19 edition of that newspaper.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE (A BRIEF HISTORY)

January 22 is the anniversary of one of the most important dates in the modern history of Ukraine that of the rebirth of the independent Ukrainian state.

With the fall of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, both of which controlled Ukrainian territory at the time, the Ukrainians, who for centuries had been resisting foreign domination of their country, took a decisive step towards insuring their national freedom. On January 22, 1918 the Ukrainians declared their full and unqualified independence from all foreign powers.

The Ukrainian Revolution took on, at once, an essentially national character. A Central Council (Central Rada) was established in Kiev and became the center of the Ukrainian liberation movement. It organized the Ukrainian National Army, established Ukrainian schools, introduced Ukrainian administrative and judicial system, and prepared a Ukrainian Constituent Assembly. By these actions it established a full-fledged independent state: the Ukrainian National Republic.

After a heroic struggle lasting three years, the Ukrainian National Republic, as we all know, succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia.

The alien Communist power destroyed the Ukrainian national state and replaced it with a puppet and subservient government with the name of the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic." Even though it became a charter member of the United Nations in 1945, it is not a true government of the Ukrainian people, but an instrument of the Russian Soviet colonial empire, which enslaves and brutally persecutes the Ukrainian people.

Ukraine, with a population of 50 million, embraces 289,000 square miles, making it the largest country in Europe, in population it ranks fifth, and its natural resources make Ukraine one of the richest European countries. Its capital, Kiev, was the center of eastern European trade and culture long before Moscow was built. Despite its size and wealth, Ukraine is practically unknown; for most people it is "just a part of Russia." This gross misconception stems from the common practice of using the terms "Russia" and "Soviet Union" synonymously.

This is incorrect because Russia is only one of the republics which make up the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Ever since the conquest of Ukraine by Communist Russia in 1920, the Ukrainian people have suffered political and cultural repression, economic exploitation, and all-encompassing Russification. Both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches were destroyed brutally. In an enforced collectivization of Ukraine's agriculture in 1932-33, some 7 to 10 million Ukrainians were starved to death, by the government sponsored famine. During and after World War II, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were deported, exiled or annihilated for their support of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), both of which fought against the Nazis and then the Soviet Russian occupation of Ukraine.

On the 63rd anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine's independence on January 22, 1918 and the 62nd anniversary of the Act of Union on January 22, 1919, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one sovereign and independent state of the Ukrainian people, the true ideal of Ukrainian Independence lives on in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainian people, as attested to by writings, memoranda, appeals and trials of Ukrainian patriots-dissidents in Ukraine. In mid-1979, 18 prominent Ukrainian political prisoners and members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, appealed to the U.N. to take appropriate steps for Ukraine's secession from the USSR, which they called an "occupation government" installed by Communist Russia. In early 1980 an appeal from the "Ukrainian Patriotic Front" supporting the statement of other Ukrainian dissidents called for the secession of Ukraine from the Soviet Union.

At this time, when the free world is stunned by the Soviet seizure of Afghanistan and Moscow's readiness to move into Poland, the anniversary of Ukraine's Independence is a reminder of the fact that Moscow's aggression and conquest of independent nations is not a novel development.

In past years many U.S. senators and congressmen, governors and mayors paid tribute to the Ukrainian people on the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence in official proclamations and statements, thus giving encouragement and hope to Ukrainians in their struggle for the rebirth of Ukraine's freedom and independence to which they are rightfully entitled under the law of God.

We hope that American officials will again voice their support of Ukrainian aspirations in this crucial year during which the world at-large is threatened by the forces of darkness more than ever before.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA.

JANUARY 5, 1981.

APPEAL OF THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY ON THE OBSERVANCE OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people through their legitimate government, the Ukrainian Central Rada in Kiev, proclaimed a sovereign and independent state of the Ukrainian people. The Ukrainian independent state, as we all know, after three years of heroic struggle in its defense, succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia.

The alien Communist power destroyed the Ukrainian national state by replacing it with a puppet regime under the name of the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic." This "government" is not a true government of the Ukrainian people, but an instrument by which the Soviet Russian colonial government oppresses and persecutes the Ukrainian people.

But the true ideal of Ukrainian independence lives on in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainian people in captive Ukraine: witness the writings, memoranda, appeals and trials of dissidents in present-day Ukraine.

The anniversary of Ukrainian independence has been solemnly observed by Ukrainians in the free world ever since the destruction of the independent Ukrainian state.

This tradition has been kept alive especially in the United States, not only by Ukrainian American communities, but also by the U.S. Congress, and the many governors and mayors who issue annual proclamations in their states and cities in honor of Ukrainian independence.

Just as the 4th of July commemorating American independence is a day important in our history, so too for us of Ukrainian descent and origin is the 22nd of January. Blessed as we are here in the United States with the fullness of independence and freedom, it is incumbent upon us to commemorate the declaration of freedom in Ukraine, the country of our fathers and forefathers.

Therefore we direct our parishes, schools and all other institutions in the United States to observe January 22 as our national holiday. All Ukrainian Catholic schools should be closed on that day, and appropriate programs, concerts and other public gatherings are to be held in our communities. Likewise, the Ukrainian blue-and-yellow flag, along with the American stars and stripes, is to be hoisted on all Ukrainian buildings to let our fellow Americans know that we are observing the 63rd anniversary of Ukraine's declaration of independence.

Our observances of January 22 in America will certainly be known in Ukraine via international broadcasts. Our brothers and sisters in captive Ukraine will thereby be encouraged in their ongoing struggle against the oppressor and for the rebirth of a new independence which they, under the law of God, rightfully deserve.

Archbishop Myroslav, Apostolic Administrator of the Archeparchy of Philadelphia; Bishop Basil, Eparch of the Eparchy of Stamford; Msgr. William Bilinsky, Administrator of the Eparchy of Chicago.

Following these articles is a commentary by Bui Anh Tuan, a columnist for the News World newspaper in New York City. His column of January 14 concentrates on the lack of information that is reaching the United States on the true situation in the Ukraine and in other captive nations.

AMERICAN LEFTIST DISINFORMATION PLOT AGAINST UKRAINE SHOULD END

(By Bui Anh Tuan)

By a happy coincidence, this year's 63rd anniversary of Ukrainian independence will be commemorated two days after President Ronald Reagan officially brings his "mandate for change" into the White House. No contemporary U.S. leader is more aware of the fate of captive peoples inside the USSR than Reagan. That's why two million Ukrainian-Americans and millions of their supporters throughout the world are asking: "Will the Reagan avalanche, with its pledges and expectations, finally be able to bury the fiendish American leftist disinformation plot over Ukraine?"

Last year, as well as the years before last, each January 22 was an occasion for congressional conservatives to pay tribute to Ukraine's incessant struggle for national independence and human rights, and to denounce Soviet illegal occupation of that country of 47 million people whose cultural heritage predates the birth of the United States by some 800 years. As usual, they urged the United States to do something, anything, for Ukraine.

But as usual, their pathetic appeals were just water off a duck's back. The commemoration rite has become so boring, and so hollow, that last January nearly all these eloquent statements of support were not delivered by their authors in person on the floor of Congress! Unfortunately, that's the way it was.

PLOT OF SILENCE

But, for all its flaws, that timid show of solidarity was already encouraging news. At least some 40 statements baring Soviet crimes in Ukraine were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD between January 22 and 30, 1980. As for American leftists and liberals, they have, purely and simply, blacked out all reports in connection with the true situation in Ukraine.

So, the first thing American conservatives can do this year for Ukraine is to expose that plot of silence. We must tell the Left, loud and clear, that their all-too-familiar disinformation tactic no longer works. We must tell the liberals that it is high time for them to draw a patriotic line between the liberalism which serves our system of checks and balances and the one which serves the interests of Soviet imperialism.

The liberals have lectured Reagan on the need to pursue the Carter human rights policy. Well, human rights is what Ukraine has needed and still needs.

Ukraine—the largest nationality group within the Soviet colonial empire, which is being forced to produce one-fifth of the Soviet Union's grain and one-fourth of its meat and dairy products—needed human rights long before America's most vocal human rights advocates were even born. "The entire history of Soviet-dominated Ukraine," the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America stated, "is a ghastly record of inhumanity, out-right persecution, terror and genocide; Russification and denationalization plus violations of human rights, on a scale not known in the history of mankind, has occurred."

Those with "Clergy and Laity Concerned" used the human rights label to defeat the Republic of Vietnam. Now, they focus on Latin America, also in the name of God. They have said not a word about Ukraine.

Why is it that, in His name, they failed to see that half of the registered Protestant community in Ukraine were forced to demand emigration because of religious oppression, and that of 53,000 churches in 1917 only 11,000 are left?

THE UKRAINIAN STATE

The Ukrainian state was founded on January 22, 1918, following the end of Czarist rule. That independence was recognized by many nations, including Lenin's Russia. But soon later the same Leninists invaded Ukraine, imposing on it an alien totalitarian police-state regime.

A single political trial in South Korea, the death of a group of terrorists in El Salvador, and the 17-month imprisonment of an Argentinian sculptor-human rights activist have made the headlines. However, not a word has been printed about thousands of arrests and murders in captive Ukraine.

Ala Horska, poetess and literary critic, was murdered by the KGB in Kiev, capital of Ukraine. Volodimir Iwasiuk, music composer, was murdered in Lwiw. Members of the Ukrainian Helsinki groups were given harsh sentences during show trials.

Others have been tortured, incarcerated, and confined in psychiatric asylums were drugs and chemicals are administered. Vivid symbols of Ukrainian resistance to Soviet domination such as Rudenko, Stus, Romaniuk, Matusevych, Marynovich, and Lukyanenko . . . have been relegated into oblivion in the West. So have been Vins, Moroz and other heroes of Ukraine's struggle for human rights who are now in the United States.

After 30 years in Soviet prisons, Yurij Shukhevych is still there. His crime is to refuse to denounce the memory of his father who led a Ukrainian army against both the Nazis and the Soviet forces occupying Ukraine in World War II.

For decades, disinformation agents aided by liberal cat's paws have flimflammed America. Let's hope that next week's commemoration of Ukrainian independence which marks the beginning of the new Reagan era, will also mark the end of that lingering disinformation evil.

In addition, I wish to insert a resolution adopted by the Illinois General Assembly. On the occasion of the convening of the 13th Congress of the Ukrainians of America in October 1980, the Illinois General Assembly passed House Resolution No. 1007, which commends the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and its president, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, for the dedicated efforts of that organization on behalf of Ukrainian Americans and their relatives in the Ukraine.

[State of Illinois, 81st General Assembly, House of Representatives]

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 1007

Whereas, the diverse contributions to American life made possible by the variety of our cultural and ethnic origins are a major source of our strength as a Nation; and

Whereas, it is in keeping with the best American traditions that those of our citizens who share a proud common heritage should voluntarily join together in free association, to honor that heritage and to advance shared interests; and

Whereas, citizens of Ukrainian descent throughout America have maintained an inspired interest in the sophisticated culture and language of their former homeland; and

Whereas, for the past 40 years the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has been instrumental in uniting Americans of Ukrainian descent, and has provided them with an excellent forum for exploring their common concerns and expressing their strong religious and community feelings; and

Whereas, the members of the Illinois Ukrainian Congress Committee of America have contributed richly to the valuable ethnic diversity of Illinois, and have played an active and important role in the varied cultural activities of our State; and

Whereas, their burning dedication to freedom and incessant demand for basic human rights has made the people of the Ukraine an inspiration to the Free World and a constant obstacle in the path of Russian Communist imperialism; and

Whereas, the 13th Congress of Ukrainians of America will convene in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on October 10, 1980; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we express our concern for the faith and future of the Ukraine, and our appreciation for the many contributions to our State and our Nation by Americans of Ukrainian descent; and, be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to Dr. Lev Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, with our best wishes on the occasion of the 13th Congress of Ukrainians of America.

Adopted by the House of Representatives on November 13, 1980.

Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians and other captive peoples have paid a drastically high price for voicing their opinions in favor of basic human rights, cultural and religious freedom, and their opposition to the repression and harassment to which they are subjected. We, in the United States, must continue to speak out in the defense of those in the Ukraine and in other oppressed nations held captive by Soviet rule, so that their shattered dreams of freedom will once again become reality.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I appreciate his cooperation on this important occasion.

● Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1981, marked the 63d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. It is a date that recognizes the 60-year struggle the Ukrainian people have waged to reclaim their independence from Russian occupation armies which crushed the flowering Ukrainian National Republic and enslaved her people.

Americans and free people throughout the world cannot afford to forget the plight of oppressed Ukrainians. It is a tribute to the spirit of mankind and the ideals of freedom and liberty that Ukrainians have continued to fight for human rights. It is a tragedy that Ukraine's heroic struggle has remained largely unknown although it involves 50 million people embracing 289,000 square miles of rich natural resources. The world must not dismiss Ukraine as just another part of the Soviet Union. For centuries the Ukrainians have resisted foreign domination and persisted, despite brutal persecution, to maintain a sense of national identity. We must strive to support efforts for national self-determination for all oppressed nations. Our support of Ukrainian independence will show that the spirit of freedom can never be extinguished by generations of oppressive tyrants.

The Ukrainian people in the free world celebrated January 22 as their greatest holiday. American cities and States from coast to coast have proclaimed the 22d of January as Ukrainian Independence Day. Therefore, it is in the common spirit of liberty and justice that the American people and particularly the U.S. Congress, join Ukrainian people all over the world in giving moral support to Ukrainians in their struggle for human rights and freedom.●

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 63d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is one of great significance for freedom-loving peoples everywhere, and especially Ukrainians living under Soviet domination and oppression. This day also we in the United States can push for strict adherence to the human rights provisions of the Helsinki agreements.

We are all to familiar with the events that led to the fall of the Ukrainian Republic in 1920, when the Red army led by Trotsky finally defeated the gallant and proud defenders of the republic. The Russian tactics of subversion and blatant aggression became the tools of Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. Today, we see the same approach being used by the Soviet Union in its outrageous activities in the invasion and control of the independent republic of Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the President are keenly aware of the importance of human rights in the Ukraine and all parts of the world. I have already spoken on the floor of the House today regarding the imprisonment and mistreatment of an eminent Soviet Jewish scientist, Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, whose only crime was his desire to leave the Soviet Union and emigrate to Israel.

While over 2 million Americans are proud of their Ukrainian heritage and live freely in our society, over 47 million live under continuing oppression in their homeland without guarantees of civil rights, without self-government, still fiercely proud of a cultural heritage that predates the establishment of the United States by 800 years.

Mr. Speaker, I join all of my colleagues today in their hope that some day freedom will return to the Ukraine and other nations living under the dark cloud of Soviet rule.●

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 63d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. We are here to celebrate and recognize the 50 million captive Ukrainians in the Soviet Union who continue to struggle against aggressive Soviet domination.

The independent Ukrainian National Republic was established by democratic popular vote and national self-determination on January 22, 1918, and was one of the first to proclaim freedom for its people in the area of the traditional Russian empire. Despite its

heroic struggle for over 4 years the Ukraine succumbed to the overpowering forces of Communist Russia. In 1921 a large part of the Ukraine, constituted as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, with 32 million Ukrainians, went under Soviet rule and in 1922 became part of the U.S.S.R.

The Ukrainian people in this area are fully aware of the severe, legal, political, and administrative limitations within the U.S.S.R. The people living in this fertile and native land are forbidden to celebrate this date of great historical importance that we recognize and commemorate each year. The Soviet regime prohibits any observance of the anniversary of the Ukraine's independence and it has expeditiously eliminated this date from the annals of the recent history of the Ukraine. Instead, the Kremlin imposed its own anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian Soviet State, a date where Moscow brought the Communist puppet government to the Ukraine.

The Soviet secret police, the KGB, have ferreted out a number of clandestine Ukrainian anti-Soviet organizations. Ukrainian intellectuals have been sentenced at secret trials. These arrests are directed at destroying the essence of the Ukrainian national identity. Despite the oppression by Moscow, the spirit and freedom and need for independence of the Ukrainian people is very much alive. These individuals are fighting for their survival as a distinct historic, ethnic, cultural, and political entity. In destroying Ukrainian independence, the Russians did not destroy the soul of the Ukrainian people nor their national ideals and undying yearning for freedom.

Soviet domination over the Ukraine and other captive nations has gone on for many years. The Soviet attack in Afghanistan, in defiance of the provisions of the SALT I agreement, shows the world that their aggressive tactics continue today. The Soviet design for world dominance and expansionism evidenced itself in Afghanistan and a threatening shadow is cast in Poland today. As the Polish people are fighting for basic human rights such as freedom of the press, speech, and religion so do Ukrainians in their struggle to exist as free, independent people. We must reassure those people, who are not accorded their basic human rights, that we do remember them and that we must continue to fight against Soviet repression and domination.

The Ukrainian people, the largest non-Russian group in the U.S.S.R., have not given up hope of regaining their independence. Let us, at this time, continue to show our hope for those courageous people who have been forced to live without freedom.

I am proud to pay tribute to those who still recognize the sovereignty of the Ukraine. As a free nation, we must not forget that the Ukrainian people fight daily to achieve the basic human freedoms they so richly deserve and that we cherish today.●

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to commemorate the 63d anniversary of the Ukraine's independence.

Marked today by a long record of opposition to Soviet domination, dissidents from the Ukrainian community continue to battle at great personal risk for those rights which have been denied them since 1920. Nonetheless, despite Soviet domination, the proud spirit of freedom continues to flourish in the Ukraine and the support and commitment of millions throughout the world have not abandoned the just cause of Ukrainian self-determination.

During this time of continuing international turmoil, it is particularly crucial that we, as Americans, reaffirm our commitment to freedom and human rights worldwide. Within the past year alone, the world has witnessed yet another blatant act of Soviet aggression—and the Soviet Union has claimed yet another victim of Soviet domination.

A nation founded on the primacy of individual liberties, the United States must never allow its vigilance and dedication to human rights falter or diminish. Our commitment to personal dignity and national integrity must continue to be exercised as an inspiration to all those who struggle against cruel and harsh oppression. The United States must not forget the plight of the Ukrainians and the millions of others who have been silenced by Soviet repression.

As a Congressman who has strongly supported resolutions to protest continuing violations of human rights, I salute the Ukrainian-American community for its untiring efforts on behalf of the Ukraine. Such determination cannot fail.●

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives pays tribute to the Ukrainians, who, 63 years ago, valiantly sought and gained their independence. We salute that proud, resolute people just as we most recently hailed the liberation of our former hostages—freedom fighters, then and now—heroes in their own right.

In New Jersey's 15th District, there is a special regard for the Ukrainians who must struggle still to be free under the cloud of the Soviet bloc. Here, where tens of thousands of Europeans have made their homes—freely—the heritage left behind is never long forgotten.

For our Ukrainian compatriots abroad, we in the 15th District maintain a constant vigil of hope that ultimately they too can be free. They deserve nothing less.●

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 63d anniversary of the Ukrainian nation, which has since become reenslaved inside the modern Russian empire.

There are about 40 million people, who resisted the Soviet takeover during the bloody civil war precipitated by the Russian revolution of 1917, and who still find, today, that the Soviet Government denies them basic, fundamental rights such as freedom of worship, political expression, free association, free movement, freedom from cruel and unusual punishments, and many more.

Let me commemorate the independence of this brave country, which is now held in the hammerlock of Soviet political repression, having first been subjected by the tsars of old Russia, whose spirit lingers on in the Soviet regime of today.

I am introducing today a resolution calling upon the Soviet tsars to permit their brave Ukrainian people a resurrection of free expression of the various religious faiths by which the people may be comforted and heartened. I urge your support and interest for this simple resolution, which might mean a great deal for the people of the Soviet breadbasket, the fertile and once free Ukraine.

H. CON. RES. 53

A concurrent resolution to seek the resurrection of churches and religious freedom in the Ukraine

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations, as well as its Declaration of Human Rights, sets forth the objective of international cooperation "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion . . ."; and

Whereas in the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics article 124 unequivocally provides that "In order to insure the citizens' freedom of conscience, freedom of religious worship, and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens"; and

Whereas not just religious or civil repression but the absolute physical extermination of churches, among them the Ukrainian Orthodox, Catholic, Jewish, Pentecostal, Baptist, Seventh Day Adventist, and other denominations, in a nation of over forty-five million brutally violates the basic human rights cited above: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States of America shall take immediate and determined steps to—

(1) call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to permit the concrete resurrection of churches of all the various denominations, such as the Ukrainian Orthodox, Jewish, Baptist, Catholic, Pentecostal, and others in the largest non-Russian nation both within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and in Eastern Europe; and

(2) utilize formal and informal contacts with Union of Soviet Socialist Republics officials in an effort to secure the freedom of religious worship in churches as provided for in the Soviet Constitution; and

(3) raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of Stalin's liquidation of these churches and its perpetuated effect upon the posture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the light of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights.●

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is again my privilege to participate in a special order focusing attention on a brief moment of freedom in the history of the Ukraine.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic was established. Just 2 short years later, units of the Soviet Red army crushed the last elements of opposition and erected a repressive government structure that has maintained Soviet dominance to this day. While infrequent reports appear in the West about Ukrainian dissidents and their efforts to gain freedom, it is clear that the world must continue to promote their cause with ever increasing ardor and determination.

The struggle to dramatize the plight of the Ukrainian people and the other captive peoples in the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. takes on particular importance today in light of Soviet aggression in Afghanistan. Their latest demonstration of disregard for sovereignty and freedom is a grim reminder that left unchecked and undeterred by a militarily strong United States, their ability to expand still further will persist unchallenged. I am encouraged, therefore by the Reagan administration's dedication to a strong defense.

The Ukrainian people are a strong and intensely proud people who, like so many others living in captive nations, look to the United States—through the Voice of America, Radio Liberty, and other sources—and the West for support. Through the observance of their brief experience of freedom from Russian domination, the United States can play an important role in perpetuating their hope and struggle for independence.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1981, the Nation and the world observed the solemn anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. On this occasion, we pause to assess the state of life today in the Ukraine and in other Soviet dominated regions of the world—and our assessment finds that the oppressive influence of the Soviet Union is as strong as ever.

It was 63 years ago when the independence of the Ukraine was declared by the Ukrainian Central Rada. The experience with freedom was a short-lived one—Just 4 years later, the Soviet Communists ruthlessly seized control—installed a puppet government—and have maintained control ever since. The hopes of freedom were dashed by the realities of genocide and persecution.

During these past six decades, the Ukrainian people have had to endure Nazi occupation, then the horrors of Stalin with his purges that resulted in the deaths of millions of Ukrainians. In the past two decades, the Ukrainian people have endured several stages of "Russification" which attempts to impose Soviet influence over every phase of life.

Tragically in this year, we find the situation in the Ukraine to be anything but free. According to Andrei Sakharov, the Ukrainian people comprise only 20 percent of the Soviet population yet they make up 50 percent of all Soviet political prisoners. Furthermore, prison sentences handed down to Ukrainian political prisoners are generally twice as long as those dispensed to other political prisoners.

Yet despite all the adversities, the spirit of the Ukrainian people continues strong—and their yearning for freedom undaunted. It is a struggle which we as the greatest freedom-loving peoples of the world should actively associate ourselves with.

The new administration is properly focusing its early attention on the Soviet Union. We must be concerned about their continued policies of aggression. They remain in Afghanistan. They are lurking, waiting for an opportune moment to crush the Polish labor movement through an invasion. Internally, the numbers of visas granted to Soviet Jews dropped dramatically between 1979 and 1980. The number of captive people under Soviet control continues to grow.

On this occasion, let us continue our hopes that the struggle by the Ukrainian people for freedom can at long last be won—so the next anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day can be a celebration instead of a somber observance.●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, I introduced legislation which recognizes the very significant role Eastern Europeans have played in American society, and reaffirms our Nation's dedication to the acceptance of refugees from Eastern Europe. Today, as we celebrate the 63d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, I am reintroducing that legislation.

The history of the Ukrainian people is replete with outstanding achievement, and includes a long record of opposition to Soviet dominance and Soviet human rights abuses. Upon the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire, the Ukrainian National Republic was established on January 22, 1918. By 1920, that independent republic was destroyed by Russian aggression. Since that time, the people of the Ukraine have withstood a barrage of Soviet police state administration, constant KGB terror, religious persecution, intensified russification of Ukrainian education and culture, exploitation of Ukrainian economy and industry, and the regular persecution of Ukrainian dissidents courageous enough to speak out against Soviet dominance.

I praise the Ukrainian people for their brave fight against Soviet violations of human rights. I do not believe, however, that the fight should be theirs alone. We in Congress must recognize the gravity of the conditions prevalent in the Ukraine and throughout Eastern Europe and express our support for these courageous people. We must also demand that Soviet authorities cease and desist the continuation of repressive policies and we must ask the United Nations to focus on this critical issue.

Many Ukrainians wish to flee the repression and join nearly 2 million compatriots here in the United States. Ukrainians and other Eastern Europeans who have settled in the United States have immeasurably enhanced the cultural wealth of our society. In the arts, education, business, and medicine, immigrants from Eastern Europe have made important and valuable contributions. While we have admitted refugees from Eastern Europe, they have never received the generous treatment recently accorded to Cubans and Indochinese; Eastern Europeans who do arrive on our shores frequently have great difficulty adjusting to their status.

The resolution which I am introducing today expresses the sense of Congress that refugees from Eastern Europe, who are also the victims of Communist tyranny, ought to be given the same generous treatment as those from Cuba and Vietnam. The people of the Ukraine have faced 63 years of persecution and repression. We must insure that they, and their fellow Eastern Europeans who come to our shores, are afforded every benefit which they deserve. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution.●

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as the Soviet Union is in the forefront of the affronts registered against many ethnic groups, we cannot forget the grave wrong that was committed by the Soviet Union against the people of the Ukraine. The denial of basic human freedoms by the Soviets has, unfortunately, become an everyday occurence, and the Ukrainian people are among those denied.

It was 63 years ago this past week, that the people of Ukrainia declared themselves an independent and sovereign state. In the city of Kiev, the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukrainian National Republic was issued. Later, Kiev became its capital.

But at the very time that the Ukrainian people were rejoicing in their new-found independence, the Government of the Soviet Union was plotting to rob them of their country. A carefully organized military cam-

paign to absorb the Ukraine into the boundaries of the Soviet Union was begun, and it was to last for over 3 long and bitter years.

Unable to resist any longer, the Ukrainian nation was forced to succumb, and was conquered by the Russian Army. The territory and the people were incorporated as part of the Soviet Union, although the Ukrainian people have never disavowed their national heritage. They continue to be the largest, non-Russian ethnic group within the U.S.S.R.

The desire of the Ukrainian people to be free again has spanned these 60-odd years without interruption. During World War II, the Ukrainian partisans army was formed to fight both the Nazis as well as the Red army, all toward the sole end of obtaining their freedom once again.

Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people will never rest until they have regained what is rightfully theirs—their own national homeland, under their own administration. It is for this desire that we commemorate the declaration of Ukrainian independence, with the fervent hope that this dream will someday soon become a reality.●

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my colleagues SAM STRATTON and ED DERWINSKI have taken this special order to highlight the plight of the Ukraine, one of the largest of the captive nations with a longstanding devotion to freedom. A group of citizens in Cincinnati, organized as the Ukrainian Society of Greater Cincinnati, have been working to alert Americans to the plight of captive nations and, in particular, Ukrainian prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union. They are a part of a larger group of Cincinnatians—the Joint Committee of Soviet Occupied Nations—which has worked to publicize this noble cause.

I have been closely involved with the cases of three Ukrainian prisoners of conscience and I wanted to share their plight with my colleagues.

Vasyl Omelianovych Romanivk was arrested at age 19 for being characterized as a nationalist churchgoer. Romanivk's father and brother died in 1944; his father in Siberia from hunger and ill-treatment, his brother in the Ukraine running from his home. Vasyl Romanivk took a theological correspondence course to become a cleric.

During the 1960's, Reverend Romanivk stressed ideas of religious pride and led the fight against corruption in the church. For his preaching, he was charged in 1972 under article 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian S.S.R.

In prison, Reverend Romanivk has participated in hunger strikes as a protest. It is reported that he has been denied access to a Bible. Reverend Romanivk has applied for papers to emigrate after he is released.

Mr. Shukhevych was arrested and imprisoned at the age of 14 for 10 years. He since received two additional 10-year sentences. Shukhevych was born in Luiu, Ukraine in 1934. His father, Gen. Taras Shukhevych-Chuprynka, was the commander in chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

It was reported that Yuriy Shukhevych was released in 1956 because of the fact that he was a minor when first arrested. However, he was sent back to Vladimir Prison because the Prosecutor-General Roman Rudenko termed him "the son of a nationalist leader." This seems to be his only offense. In 1979, Shukhevych renounced his Soviet citizenship and joined the Ukrainian Public Group To Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords.

Vyacheslav Chornovil received a degree in journalism from Kiev University in 1960. The Ukrainian Society of Greater Cincinnati traces his problems to his refusal to testify at the trial of some 30 Ukrainian intellectuals in 1966. He had a book published in the West entitled "The Chornovil Papers" which precipitated his arrest and imprisonment for slandering the Soviet state in 1967. He was arrested again in 1972.

Mr. Chornovil is a true believer in human rights and in 1979 he became a member of the Ukrainian Public Group To Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords. Chornovil is currently living in exile in the Yakutsk A.S.S.R. He renounced his Soviet citizenship on March 1, 1975, and applied to leave the country.

Through the works of groups such as the Ukrainian Society of Greater Cincinnati and the Joint Committee of Soviet Occupied Nations, and the continued attention of the Congress, the Soviet Union will know that freedom-loving peoples will never forget their cruel subjugation of nations such as Ukraine.●

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to join in celebration of the 63d anniversary of the Ukraine's Declaration of Independence.

This is a day on which Ukrainians throughout the world commemorate the innumerable sacrifices of their countrymen on behalf of the Ukraine's right to a free and independent existence. There are over 2 million Ukrainian Americans in this country, and I am immensely glad that many of them reside in New York's 27th Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent. At the same time that they preserve their homeland's precious cultural, historical, and spiritual heritage, they continue to make invaluable contributions to the flourishing of democracy in the communities of their adopted country.

I salute them for their perseverance, I rejoice with them in the vitality of their spiritual values and their dedication to freedom, and I urge all my fellow citizens to observe carefully their example—for those who take freedom for granted cannot be motivated to preserve its blessings.

In particular on this occasion, I commend the great energy and contributions of the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This organization, with branches throughout America, is a national representative body of American citizens of Ukrainian descent. It embraces over 1,200 Ukrainian American organizations, clubs, fraternal lodges, veteran and youth societies, women's and sports groups, as well as cultural, social, church, and political organizations. It is a dedicated and eloquent advocate of freedom and independence for the Ukraine, which has been under the forcible domination of the Soviet Union since 1922. During that period of time, the Soviet record has been an infamous saga of genocide, ethnocide, cultural suppression, religious persecution, economic exploitation, and wanton violation of human and national rights.

As we join this year in commemorating the day on which the people of the Ukraine achieved a freedom that lasted all too short a time, we are reminded of the anguish that engulfed our own country over the past 14 months as several dozen of our fellow citizens were imprisoned by international criminals in Iran, who do not respect principles of international law and cooperation. During this past year, Mr. Speaker, we have also been able to observe the chilling reality of Soviet expansionist intentions in the brutal Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Yet, given the sordid example of Soviet tyranny over the Ukraine and so many other captive nations, we should not be surprised. What is now important is that we take to heart the lessons which current history teaches us about international treachery—which we have recently experienced in our dealings with Iran and which the people of the Ukraine have for so long suffered at the hands of the Soviets. It is now our vigilance and firmness which must put those lessons into practice, both for our own security and the survival of liberty in a volatile world.●

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 63d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. In the midst of these turbulent times of international crises fostered by Soviet aggression and expansionism, it is fitting that we pause for a moment and reflect on our own fortune as citizens of this great Nation. At the same time, we should consider those whose freedom was deprived by a brutal Communist takeover in 1922.

Since that year, the citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic have been subjected to a constant program of repression and denial of basic human rights inspired and carried out by the Government of the Soviet Union. The slaughter of hundreds of thousands of innocent people, the attempts to denigrate and destroy Ukrainian language, culture, and religion, and other official policies enforced by the Soviets, have been courageously endured and steadfastly opposed by the people of the Ukraine. Those who have attempted to protect Ukrainian institutions have been systematically persecuted by the Soviets in flagrant disregard for international agreements respecting human rights of all nationalities such as the Helsinki Final Act.

Today as the military forces of the U.S.S.R. continue their ruthless incursion into Afghanistan and threaten the infant Polish labor movement, let us not forget the captive nations such as the Ukrainian National Republic who remain in the grip of Soviet communism. I urge every Member of this body to redouble his or her resolve to protest the activities of the Soviet Government to coerce people of many nations into a single Russian Communist State. We must use every appropriate forum to support the Ukrainian people in their quest for true independence from Soviet domination.●

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the facts which many Americans tend to forget is that the political entity we refer to as the Soviet Union or Russia is in fact an empire that has absorbed and suppressed many other nations and ethnic groups. While the Russians are the largest single group in this empire, they do not make up much more than half of the total population of the Soviet Union.

After the Russians, one of the largest nationalities in the Soviet Union is the Ukrainians. The Ukraine has a long and proud history. Although it has been united with the Russians, it also has known independence.

Its cultural history is distinctive and brilliant. The Ukraine has historically been close to a diversity of European influences, just as it is relatively close to the main body of Europe geographically.

Ukrainian culture is also ancient. Its capital, Kiev, was the site of a brilliant civilization over 1,000 years ago. In fact, in 1988 many Russians and Ukrainians will celebrate the bringing of Christianity to Russia by St. Vladimir, the Duke of Kiev.

That celebration will not be joined in by the militantly atheistic Soviet State, which represses religion just as it represses all forms of national culture which threaten its political hegemony. It is appropriate, then, that we take today to pay tribute to the courage and historical achievements of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues, SAM STRATTON and ED DERWINSKI, for taking this special order and I join with them in honoring the people of the Ukraine as well as all Americans of Ukrainian descent.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1981, marks the 63d anniversary of independence for the people of the sovereign state of the Ukrainian Republic. I am pleased to be part of this memorable celebration which commemorates a most significant event. As a nation of people who enjoy personal liberty, we should not be complacent about the greatness of our country or the many freedoms it offers us. The people of the Ukraine are struggling to secure the rights and freedoms that we as a nation fought for and won over 200 years ago. We should join together in saluting the Ukrainians to demonstrate that they are not forgotten by those of us who cherish the freedoms of a free society. Standing firmly and proudly, the people of the Ukrainian Republic have courageously battled continuous Soviet domination. The Ukraine, which is the largest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R. and all of Eastern Europe, has a strong and commendable record of opposition to the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., serves an admirable function by drawing attention to the plight of those who live through this terrible ordeal.

The Ukrainian spirit remains undaunted and strong in spite of the adverse conditions these people valiantly struggle against. The Ukrainians nurture a flickering flame of freedom that cannot be snuffed out by acts of Soviet imperialism. For their courage and constancy, they deserve our support.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes forget that the Soviet Union is an empire of many nationalities dominated by the Russians, and the non-Russian people have never abandoned their longing for independence.

It is time for this House to again remind the world of Russian imperialism. The largest nationality under Russian imperial rule is the Ukraine, and today we commemorate the brief period of independence enjoyed by the Ukraine from 1918 to 1920.

When the czarist empire collapsed in 1918, the Ukrainians declared their independence and governed themselves until the Soviet Russian empire swallowed their country in 1920.

But the spirit of independence has never died in the Ukraine. Incidents of dissent continue to arise, and the people cherish their language, their culture, and the hope of independence.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 63d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, let us express faith that these people and the other captive nations of the Soviet empire will someday be free.●

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in this special order commemorating the 63d anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

The fall of the Russian czar was a great moment in Ukrainian history. It was an opportunity for the men and women of the Ukraine to form their own free government. But that joy, that taste of freedom, was shortlived. The government that began so valiantly on January 22, 1918, was wiped from the face of the Earth by the coming to power of the Communist regime.

The freedom enjoyed by the people of the Ukraine between 1918 and 1923 when the Soviets took control will be years always worthy of celebration. At the same time the Soviet domination of the Ukrainian people should never be accepted or tolerated by any freedom-loving individual.

I will continue to hope that freedom will return to the people of the Ukraine and I urge my colleagues to join me in lending support to their cause.

At this point I insert in the RECORD some material recently sent to me by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, the president of the Metropolitan Detroit Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Detroit, Mich., January 17, 1981.

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLANCHARD: As the 97th U.S. Congress begins its sessions, we would like to call your attention to the fact that, in January, Ukrainians, all over the free world, will celebrate the Proclamation of the Independence of Ukraine.

January 22, 1981 will mark the 63rd Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Independence of Ukraine and the 62d Anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one independent and sovereign nation. Both, the Independence of Ukraine and the Act of Union, were proclaimed by a duly elected parliament in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, on January 22, 1918 and in January, 1919.

This sovereign Ukrainian nation was immediately recognized by a large number of nations, including France and England. Diplomatic relations were established with them. Recognition was granted, also, by Soviet Russia. But, despite the fact that the Soviet government had officially recognized Ukraine as an independent and sovereign state, communist forces attacked Ukraine both by military aggression and by subversion from within.

For three and one-half years the Ukrainian people waged a gallant struggle in defense of their country, alone and without aid from the western nations and unfortunately were overpowered by numerically stronger and better equipped Russian Bol-

sheviks. They destroyed the Ukrainian National Republic and created a communist puppet government known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The entire history of the Soviet-dominated Ukraine is a ghastly record of inhumanity, outright persecution and genocide and in last year's Russification and violation of human and national rights, on a scale not yet known in the history of mankind.

In summing up, the colonial rule of Soviet communism, in Ukraine, can be characterized by the following:

A. During the sixty years of Moscow rule in Ukraine, literally millions of Ukrainians have been annihilated by man-made famines, deportations and executions.

B. Both the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church were ruthlessly destroyed and their clergy, along with hundreds of thousands of their members, were arrested, persecuted and many killed.

C. All aspects of Ukrainian life are rigidly controlled and directed from Moscow.

D. Permanent violations of human and national rights was instituted in Ukraine. Thousands of Ukrainians have been charged with "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation," arrested, tried and sentenced to long terms. Many have been tortured and confined to psychiatric asylums where drugs and chemicals are forcefully administered.

All members of the Ukrainian public group to promote the implementation of the Helsinki Accords were arrested, tried and sentenced to from seven to ten years, among them such prominent members as Mykola Rudenko, Oleksa Tykhy, Mykola Matusewych, Myroslaw Marynowych and Lew Lukianenko.

The Russian-Communist enslavement of Ukraine has brought much suffering to the people of Ukraine. In spite of this oppressive yoke, Ukrainians have never accepted foreign domination and are continuing to struggle for human rights, freedom and national independence. The new breed of young and adamant fighters for human and national rights gives us hope that Ukraine will be free again.

The Ukrainian people, in the free world, are celebrating the memorable January 22nd as their greatest holiday. Also, for many years, the 22nd of January has been proclaimed, in our American cities and states from coast to coast, as Ukrainian Independence Day.

Therefore, it is in the common spirit of liberty, faith and justice that the American people, and especially the U.S. Congress, join Ukrainians all over the world in giving moral support to the Ukrainian people in their struggle for Human Rights, Freedom and National Independence for Ukraine.

Sincerely,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, Detroit Branch.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

A BRIEF HISTORY

January 22 is the anniversary of one of the most important dates in the modern history of Ukraine: that of the rebirth of the independent Ukrainian state.

With the fall of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, both of which controlled Ukrainian territory at the time, the Ukrainians, who for centuries had been resisting foreign domination of their country, took a decisive step towards insuring their national freedom. On January 22, 1918 the Ukrainians declared their full and unqualified independence from all foreign powers.

The Ukrainian Revolution took on, at once, an essentially national character. A Central Council (Central Rada) was established in Kiev and became the center of the Ukrainian liberation movement. It organized the Ukrainian National Army, established Ukrainian schools, introduced Ukrainian administrative and judicial systems, and prepared a Ukrainian Constituent Assembly. By these actions it established a full-fledged independent state: the Ukrainian National Republic.

After a heroic struggle lasting three years, the Ukrainian National Republic, as we all know, succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia.

The alien Communist power destroyed the Ukrainian national state and replaced it with a puppet and subservient government with the name of the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic." Even though it became a charter member of the United Nations in 1945, it is not a true government of the Ukrainian people, but an instrument of the Russian Soviet colonial empire, which enslaves and brutally persecutes the Ukrainian people.

Ukraine, with a population of 50 million, embraces 289,000 square miles, making it the largest country in Europe; in population it ranks fifth, and its natural resources make Ukraine one of the richest European countries. Its capital, Kiev, was the center of eastern European trade and culture long before Moscow was built. Despite its size and wealth, Ukraine is practically unknown; for most people it is "just a part of Russia." This gross misconception stems from the common practice of using the terms "Russia" and "Soviet Union" synonymously. This is incorrect because Russia is only one of the republics which make up the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Ever since the conquest of Ukraine by Communist Russia in 1920, the Ukrainian people have suffered political and cultural repression, economic exploitation, and all-encompassing Russification. Both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches were destroyed brutally. In an enforced collectivization of Ukraine's agriculture in 1932-33, some 7 to 10 million Ukrainians were starved to death by the government-sponsored famine. During and after World War II, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were deported, exiled or annihilated for their support of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), both of which fought against the Nazis and then the Soviet Russian occupation of Ukraine.

On the 63rd anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine's independence on January 22, 1918 and the 62nd anniversary of the Act of Union on January 22, 1919, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one sovereign and independent state of the Ukrainian people, the true ideal of Ukrainian Independence lives on in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainian people, as attested to by writings, memoranda, appeals and trials of Ukrainian patriots-dissidents in Ukraine. In mid-1979, 18 prominent Ukrainian political prisoners and members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, appealed to the U.N. to take appropriate steps for Ukraine's secession from the USSR, which they called an "occupation government" installed by Communist Russia. In early 1980 an appeal from the "Ukrainian Patriotic Front" supporting the statement of other Ukrainian dissidents called for the secession of Ukraine from the Soviet Union.

At this time, when the free world is stunned by the Soviet seizure of Afghanistan and Moscow's readiness to move into Poland, the anniversary of Ukraine's Independence is a reminder of the fact that Moscow's aggression and conquest of independent nations is not a novel development.

In past years many U.S. senators and congressmen, governors and mayors paid tribute to the Ukrainian people on the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence in official proclamations and statements, thus giving encouragement and hope to Ukrainians in their struggle for the rebirth of Ukraine's freedom and independence to which they are rightfully entitled under the law of God.

We hope that American officials will again voice their support of Ukrainian aspirations in this crucial year during which the world at-large is threatened by the forces of darkness more than ever before.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA.

JANUARY 5, 1981.●

□ 1300

RUSSIAN GRAIN EMBARGO SHOULD BE CONTINUED

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the topic that I wanted to bring out today—and it could not be more timely, because my understanding is that the President and his Cabinet are meeting tomorrow to discuss the issue—is the continuation of the grain embargo against the Soviet Union. This was the embargo that was put in place by President Carter at the time that the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan.

At that point, Mr. Speaker, the entire world was justifiably deeply disturbed and upset at the move that the Soviet Union had made, and in finding a response that was very meaningful the United States reached the decision that it would embargo the balance of the grain shipments that had been agreed upon to sell to the Soviet Union. We also, at that time, put in place several embargoes on technological equipment, and if the members will recall, we, in effect, embargoed the U.S. participation in the Moscow Olympics.

Now, since that time there have been efforts made right here in the House of Representatives to lift the embargo. Last fall an effort was made, and the House in its wisdom defeated that effort by nearly 100 votes. There are those today, of course, who sincerely feel that the embargo should be lifted at this time.

President Reagan is finding himself in a very difficult situation—but no one ever told him that the Presidency was going to be easy—whereby in his campaign he very clearly stated that it was his intention to lift the grain embargo when he became, or if he became, President. Well, now he has

become President, but with the Presidency has suddenly come both increased information of the impact of the grain embargo on the Soviet Union and also the responsibility of what the lifting of the embargo means to not only the Soviet Union, but to the rest of the world.

First, let us discuss for a minute, Mr. Speaker, as to the meaning of the lifting of the embargo at this time, and the kind of message it conveys. The Soviet Union today still has 80,000 combat troops in Afghanistan. A colleague of ours has just recently returned from China, and was at a meeting with the Foreign Minister of that country. The Foreign Minister said to him, "Are you going to legalize the invasion of Afghanistan by lifting the embargo?"

That is exactly how it would be viewed. I do not want to keep an embargo forever. That is certainly not my intention, and would not be. I think an editorial yesterday in the New York Times spoke very clearly to this point, that we should not be talking about the fact that we are going to embargo the Soviet Union forever, but to lift the embargo, as I said in this one instance of one government's reference to it, but other governments around the world would say, "What is the matter with the United States?"

The big problem that they have been discussing over the years has been that we do not seem to have a foreign policy. We say one thing one day, and then a little time goes by and we say something else even when the situation has not changed.

Now, the argument that I hear is that some of the countries that are saying, "Stay with the embargo," are selling grain to the Soviet Union. Well, I cannot control that, nor can this Congress, but certainly we can take the action that allows our own integrity and our own honesty in the situation to prevail, and I think this is of the greatest importance.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for bringing this topic to this Chamber. I can recall when he served as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, that time as a Republican. Now, he is on the other side of the aisle, and perhaps has a little different view of certain things like this.

I am struck by the gentleman's comment as to the response of the outside world should we choose to eliminate the embargo, and the gentleman relates that to the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. Now, I am almost led to the conclusion from the thrust of the gentleman's remarks that he would think it unwise ever to lift the embargo so long as Soviet troops remain in Afghanistan. Is that a fair conclusion?

Mr. PEYSER. I would say that if circumstances do not change from where they are today, that that would be a fair conclusion. However, if the Soviet Union in its dealings with the United States on, say, the opening of rearmament talks or on other areas that would serve the United States well, and wished to use the shipment of grain as a bargaining point, I would certainly say that I think our State Department and the Executive and the President himself should give consideration at that time to a lifting of the embargo.

But, I am talking about where we are today, and today we have no indication of the Soviet Union's willingness to do anything in the area of disarmament; to do anything to help the United States, and they still have these 80,000 troops in Afghanistan.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman can conceive of circumstances in which he thinks the embargo should be terminated, notwithstanding the fact that Soviet troops remain in Afghanistan. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. PEYSER. I say that that is possible, depending on the circumstances at the time that we would reach that decision. I am saying that it would be possible, if the Soviet Union in this very real world that we are living in, were to make moves and steps that the United States felt were in its advantage, and would serve the purpose of peace in the world; but short of that, I would say that as long as the Afghanistan situation remains alive, with nothing else to counter it, that the embargo should stay in place.

Mr. FINDLEY. I do not wish to intrude heavily on the gentleman's time, but will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield. We have plenty of time. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. When the embargo was first announced, I voiced my concern, my opposition. One of the concerns I had was that President Carter was, in a sense, sending a boy to do a man's job. The grain embargo could cause inconvenience and cost to the Soviet Union, but it was unlikely to be viewed by the Soviet Union as a lever, as an influence large enough to alter its attitude on a major foreign policy undertaking like the invasion of Afghanistan. In other words, it was not a club that would cause the Soviets to back away from this major undertaking. It was more like a powder puff.

I still see it that way, and I would like to make the observation—perhaps the gentleman would like to comment on it—I would be inclined to think that the Soviet Union will invade Poland to save its own purposes within the Warsaw Pact whether we have a grain embargo or not. I doubt that the existence or the absence of a grain embargo would weigh not 1 ounce on either side of that decision by the Soviet Union. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me on that point?

Mr. PEYSER. Well, I would unfortunately have to strongly disagree with the gentleman on that point. You see, I feel that one of the things that has kept the Soviet Union at this point from invading Poland was the reaction of the world—not just the United States—the reaction of the world at the time they invaded Afghanistan. I believe they were quite shocked to see the reaction of the world expressed in the United Nations in opposition to them; the Third World countries and practically every country speaking in strong opposition.

Now, coupled with that was the action of the United States in moving on something like the grain embargo and on moving on the technological embargo of equipment. I think that it is important not to think for a minute that this has had no impact on the Soviet Union.

Mr. FINDLEY. It may well have had an impact, but what effect has it had on Soviet policy?

Mr. PEYSER. I think the effect it has is that the Soviet troops today: First, have not invaded Poland; second, I recognize that they might if the circumstances in Poland get to such a degree that they will then waive all other considerations, and they could very well make the invasion.

I happen to believe that the grain embargo has been a specific way of showing the Soviets that we mean something. We have said it, and it has cost them. When you look at the figures we are now getting on things like their cattle production, which has been cut back substantially because of the lack of feed grains, because of the bad crops they have had, practically running over 2 years; with their next year's grain production at 180 million metric tons instead of 235 million metric tons that they had anticipated; where they are out in the world almost paying, incidentally, far more for this replacement grain; where they have paid in the last year over $1 billion of their hard currency to try to replace, and they have not fully replaced it.

The figures we got, the argument on this issue, were based on the fact that they had only replaced 45 percent of the grain we were going to be committed to give them. I think we have had a real impact, and it was very worthwhile.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend him for taking this time before the House today to address this issue.

I want to address a point that was raised both by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York in regard to what it was that the Soviets reacted to. I do not believe that the Soviets reacted at all to the embargo itself. Rather, I think they reacted to those other world pressures, political that they were, upon the Soviets placed by the entire world within the United Nations, within various other elements.

We have the ability to put upon the Soviets the kind of pressures that they felt. But when it comes to the embargo itself, I would argue very strongly with the gentleman from New York that food should not be a weapon at all. In this case, it has not worked. As a matter of fact, I think the Soviets are laughing all the way to the grain bin when it comes to the hard-learned lesson we have had to suffer for the last year.

The gentleman from New York was talking about the cost to the Soviets in terms of hard currency. He used the figure of about a billion dollars. But the cost to the U.S. Government, according to the Department of Agriculture, was $3.4 billion last year. When we estimate the actual cost to the farmer and to the Government, I have seen estimates of up to $10 billion.

The export price of grain in December 1979 was $120 a ton for corn. By April, that fell to $112 a ton. As a measure of comparison, let us look at Argentina. With Argentina, we saw that $120-a-ton corn rise by April to $160 a ton. We had a $48-a-ton disparity between United States and Argentinian grain.

When we talk about grain and the cooperation we received from our allies, I think we can point to Argentina, Australia, and even to a certain extent Canada, and the lack of cooperation we have had there.

So the net result—the net result of this grain embargo to the Soviet Union during the last crop year was dismal. Out of the 35 million tons they were supposed to get, according to the Department of Agriculture, they received all but 4 million tons—31 million out of 35 million tons over the last year were delivered. This year, with the 34 million tons they are expected to receive, they are going to receive 34 million tons, so if we take that 4 million tons, the cost to the Federal Government was about $1 billion—not the total cost, but the cost per ton to the American taxpayer and to the farmer across this country. What kind of policy is that?

I think the action taken in Afghanistan was inexcusable. I think we need to find areas where we can show the Soviet Union that we are absolutely abhorred by the kind of intervention in another country. But for us to use the embargo which, as the gentleman so eloquently pointed out, is not a weapon at all, clearly demonstrates that we again have stubbed our toe very seriously in our foreign policy.

I think the time to remove that embargo is now and there is an element of fairness in this. The Reagan campaign was laced with arguments, very well put, that the embargo needed to be removed. There are millions of people in this country who at least in part made their decision on whom they were going to vote for on the basis of those arguments. It is only a question of truth and fairness that now the administration is in office, they remove that impediment to proper foreign policy, to proper agricultural policy, and to a fair shake for the U.S. farmer.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), and before responding specifically to the gentleman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN).

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan is expected to make a decision this week on whether or not to continue the embargo on exports of agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union. This issue is not a simple one; it is not black or white. I urge him not to forget why the embargo is so strongly opposed in the agricultural sector, but, at the same time, I hope he does not let himself be trapped by the rhetoric of last fall's campaign.

Clearly, my record shows that I am no advocate of trade restrictions of whatever type. They create blockages in the international economic system which time and again have meant problems for Americans. I also trust it is clear that I, like all Americans, strongly disapprove of Soviet expansionism. The Soviet move into Afghanistan last year was a travesty, and the potential threat the Soviets now pose to Poland is something we must see does not become a reality.

The President's options as far as what to do about the future of the embargo are not limited to continue or not to continue. Clearly, he cannot ignore the need to alleviate the burden on farmers which he so strongly emphasized during the campaign. But he also needs to remember the theme of consistency in foreign policy which he found lacking in the Carter administration during the campaign.

President Reagan's recent statements about the Soviet Union have been tough, they indicate that we are posturing ourselves in a hardline position vis-a-vis the Soviets. Lifting the embargo without condition at this point would send just the opposite signal. While the administration is talking about reasserting U.S. resolve and muscle around the world, completely lifting the embargo would add to the image of fragmentation and weakness. The Soviets would likely disregard the rhetoric and our allies would be left totally confused.

Fortunately, President Reagan does have another option. He can lift the embargo with conditions. We are all aware that in many ways the embargo has been circumvented. All too many of our allies have not cooperated in stopping their own grain sales to the Soviets. And, when a decision was made by our Government last summer that affiliates of U.S. grain companies could continue sales to the Soviets, the impact of the present embargo was severely minimized and the inequity it imposed on American agriculture was made even more blatant. At that point, I came to the conclusion that we should terminate the embargo.

But, especially in light of the precarious situation in Poland, I think we should lift the embargo conditionally. In announcing his decision, President Reagan should make stridently clear his willingness to reimpose the embargo—in a more effective and equitable fashion—should the Soviets continue their aggressive posture in whatever part of the world. For example, should the Soviets put even one toe inside Poland, they should realize that we will cut off these shipments. This is clearly within his authority under the Export Administration Act.

And he needs to address the problems which the embargo has created. The burden has fallen entirely on the farm sector. That is simply not fair.

In the hurry to put the embargo into place last year, the Carter administration devised an ineffective, bureaucratic program of commodity purchases to help the American farmers who all of us realize were shouldering the economic burden. The program has not worked. Perversely, the preeminence of American agriculture made this embargo a meaningful weapon, and our agricultural producers have been dealt its harshest and most demonstrable blow.

Current law requires an increase in loan rates when an embargo is imposed for reasons of short supply. That would moderate price fluctuations and maintain market levels. But, since this embargo was imposed for foreign policy reasons, that requirement was not activated. Instead, the unworkable and inadequate purchase program was put into place.

We need to extend the application of that price protection provision to all embargoes when the farm bill is reworked this year. Specifically we need

to insure that farmers receive 90 percent of parity loans in the event of an embargo. And, in the meantime, this President who in his campaign recognized rhetorically the hardship which the embargo was causing our farmers has an obligation to see that such price protection is put into place administratively and without delay.

So, as I see it, President Reagan's decision is not simply one of to continue or not to continue the embargo. And it should focus immediately on the need to see that any burden caused by such an embargo is shared by all Americans.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) raises some interesting issues here. I came out against the embargo predominantly because I felt the bureaucratic nightmare that resulted from the implementing of it and the unfairness of the embargo were outrageous. I still do not like the embargo, and I do not like the fact that farmers were given so little priority in the area of market protection.

But after watching the President call the Russians thieves, liars, and cheats and after seeing what conceivably is going to be the policy of this administration, I say that we have got to decide what is a rational policy to pursue in this area and still protect the farmer.

I have a third option. The gentleman may have talked about this before. That option is that there is a possibility—and we have checked this under the Export Administration Act—that we could lift the embargo conditionally. The President can keep what I call conditional ad hoc authority over all sales over and above whatever the embargo limits are.

For example, he could announce that we would lift the embargo, but should the Soviets put even one toe inside Poland, they should realize that we would immediately cut off shipments.

The reason why I say that is because I think, in all fairness to the President, what we have seen as his extreme position on the question of relieving the embargo is because of his interest in free trade.

I agree with that. These embargoes do not work. The Russians are getting most of the grain they would like to receive from everybody involved, and our agriculture is hurting in this country. But at the same time we have to recognize that this administration is taking a very strong anti-Soviet policy, and after our President calls them every name in the book, then to say, "You can have it all" would probably be an unusual signal to the world, and one that I think is perhaps not particularly prudent right now.

So what I say is this: I say that he ought to lift the embargo but, pursuant to his authority under the Export Administration Act, do so conditionally with strings, and to this extent: to the extent that the Soviets engage in any specific behavior—and he may have to outline the kind of specific behavior he is talking about—that any shipments that would be lifted would be immediately stopped. And in addition, of course, we need to pursue in our own farm legislation methods to protect our farmers in future embargoes, such as 90 percent of parity loans.

But I submit that we may have ourselves in a situation here in which we have campaign rhetoric on both sides that may not result in the best kind of both farm policy and foreign policy.

I want to see this embargo lifted, but let me say that I have taked with many of my farmers and they say that they want to see it lifted, but after hearing the Russians called thieves, liars, and cheats and worse, they ask, what are we going to do? That is not sending a proper signal.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that I think we have an obligation to lift the embargo, but, based on the Export Administration Act, I think we can lift it conditionally.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas, and I yield further to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE).

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, let me take just 1 minute because I want to address a point that I think we may have been forgetting. That is that we do not have a complete embargo today. The President may have called them liars and cheats already, yet on the same hand we are exporting many goods to them right now. That is one point raised by the farmers frequently. We should put on a complete embargo if indeed we have one at all. We are not doing that, so in essence we are in the position the gentleman from Kansas has already outlined.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we made the decision last year in the House that we would not cut off the Russians entirely from purchasing goods. I believe that was the McDonald amendment that was defeated.

We have a question of symbolism here. One is that the farmers got the shaft in the embargo, and that is clear. There was not any market protection mechanism for them, and I think they were improperly singled out.

Second, the rest of the world, particularly Western Europe and Eastern Europe, may be getting the shaft from the Russians, so somehow we have to combine those two things and come up with some sort of sensible policy to protect our farmers which at the same time does not make Ronald Reagan look like a fool to the rest of the world.

As much as I would like perhaps to see our party predominate in the executive branch, it does not predominate now for 4 years. So I am saying that perhaps we do have a conditional embargo here, and I am saying that symbolically we could devise a policy that says, "It is lifted, but, fellows, you step one toe in Poland, and it slams on back again, and maybe worse." That is just a possible suggestion.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to those remarks, but first I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his generosity in yielding.

I am very pleased to hear what the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN) has said. The Export Administration Act clearly gives the President the authority to act as he suggests, but the 5-year grains arrangement with the Soviets does the very same thing because it provides that whenever the Soviet Union should seek to secure commodities beyond the 8 million ton level, they shall make their wishes known in a conference with officials of the U.S. Government, which means that the partial lifting or the interruptible lifting or the flexible lifting of the embargo would be accomplished by terminating it. And that would actually give the President greater leverage than whatever leverage does exist in grain sales.

Mr. GLICKMAN. And to come back again?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, to come back again and talk about other issues in connection with this request for sales or to terminate the whole thing, or, even more broadly, terminate the grain sales when Soviet behavior does its worst.

I have never been a fan of using food exports as a tool of international politics. They are very limited in their potential, for one thing, and probably in such circumstances, when the President shall decide yes or no on a particular sale of commodities, there are very few things that could influence Soviet behavior on a rather modest level. And why not use that, inasmuch as we have an international Soviet grain arrangement in place today?

Let us use it to the maximum. The best way to achieve that is to lift the total embargo that now exists on sales above 8 million tons on the interruptible or flexible basis the gentleman from Kansas recommends. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), and I will yield further in just a minute. However, I do want to respond for just a minute.

Part of what was interjected here is the fact that the President during the campaign made very strong state-

ments on what he would do, and, therefore, because he made those statements and the people elected him, he should go ahead and do it.

Now, I do not really think that that is what the American public thinks. I think the American public recognizes that he could have, with all the best of intentions, while he was campaigning, felt the grain embargo should be lifted, but upon assuming the Presidency—and many of us who have run for public office have found this kind of a problem—he suddenly becomes aware of a couple of things.

One is that in this great moving world of ours situations have changed. We really did not have the Polish situation to the point it is today when the President was campaigning last September and October. The President now has learned some things.

It is interesting for me to note the position of the Secretary of State, Mr Haig, who the President went to great lengths and battles, frankly, to get in place as Secretary of State, because, as we know, it was in the early stages a hotly challenged appointment, but President Reagan said he wanted General Haig. The Secretary of State, Mr. Haig, now does not support the immediate lifting of this embargo.

This is the man who the President has fought for to have in place to play a role in directing foreign policy. And now we have just seen in this last week that Mr. Stockman, one of our former colleagues, ventured into the foreign affairs world by putting an announcement out that he was going to recommend the cutting of foreign aid drastically. Then we saw Mr. Haig immediately move into this situation and demand who was running foreign policy. Mr. Stockman has since backed down from his position, as well he should.

But the point is that we have, as far as I know, the only member of the President's Cabinet today who supports the position of lifting the grain embargo, and that is in the person of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Block.

I would like to caution my friends in the agricultural areas, because I think their people are just as patriotic and just as strong to do what is right for America, if not more so, than anybody else's. I think the battle they fight to see that their product is released so a greater area of profit may be realized by them may not really be reflecting their thoughts, because if the President reaches the decision, as I am convinced he will—and we will know very quickly whether I am right or wrong—from the talks I have had with people within the administration, I am convinced the President is not going to lift the grain embargo.

What I am doing here today, with nearly 70 other Members who have joined with me, including the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who has long been opposed to the lifting of the embargo, and some of the very top Republicans on the committee who have also been opposed to lifting the embargo, is to point out the President is going to make a courageous decision because of the campaign and is not going to lift the embargo, and I think very properly so.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I thank him especially for giving all of us an opportunity to engage in this colloquy.

Let me hasten to agree that the agricultural community is as patriotic as any segment of the American population. As my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), well knows, because he comes from another strong farm bureau State, that organization and other farm organizations came out in support of the President's position when the embargo was announced, and that was an act of patriotism.

Their experience with embargoes can hardly be questioned. They experienced one under Ford and Butts on soybeans, and, prior to that, on other grains under other administrations. In each and every case they were harmed seriously economically. But I believe one of the reasons that they exerted and exhibited this kind of patriotism to which my friend, the gentleman from New York, alludes is that the President made an all-encompassing promise that the farmers will not bear this burden alone, and that it would be equally distributed among our people.

The fact of the matter is that for two or three reasons that did not turn out to be the case. First of all, the administration, as is typical of all administrations in the attempt to put on an embargo, with the problem of secrecy and all the other things that are needed, did not have the flexibility to negotiate with our other supplier nations to make it effective. So while this was being contemplated, we were not in a position to negotiate with Australia, Canada, and others, and did not do so, and while the embargo was in place those nations went ahead and concluded long-term grain agreements.

The second point I would like to make is that of the unfairness of which the President obviously was aware in the impending election when he said that all would bear equally, but it simply did not pan out. It works out to the long-term detriment of one segment of our economy. Each time we single out one segment's trade with another nation, any segment that is so easily dependent on foreign trade, once we single that out and impair for whatever reason the normal flow of goods, we raise the question in all of the foreign markets as to whether the United States is and will continue to be a reliable source of supply. Then we answer that question with an overwhelming "no," that we are not any longer a reliable source of supply. And this was no exception to that.

Staying just within the general farm and agribusiness related portion of the economy, I would point out to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), that while we stopped grain sales, we did nothing to stop the sale of phosphates and fertilizers so the Russians could grow more grain. We did nothing to stop the sale of manufactured agricultural implements to assist the Russians, nor did we do anything to stop the sale of manufactured goods of other kinds, other things which most of us really believe—and I refer to the high technology items—would have actually done more damage to the Russians in the first place.

I have a kind of a theory about that, I will say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER). I believe that the organized and more powerful interests in our economy are able to translate their viewpoints to Washington with a great deal more effectiveness than a very small minority, less than 3 percent of the people in the country, can accomplish. So those with large organized business interests are able to carry on their trade and their profitability, insure the integrity of their marketing situation, and insure continued relations regardless of how they feel about Soviet foreign policy.

There is still an argument with regard to the ineffectiveness of this particular embargo. My friend, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), pointed out correctly that the Russians essentially got the grain they were trying to get. The Argentines appreciate, I am sure, the 65 cents to 95 cents per bushel on corn in terms of advantage over the world market, so the long-term impact on the market was not nearly what anybody expected it to be.

□ 1330

The point I would make to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), is from this Member's standpoint, I think the interruption in basic commodity sales abroad is bad policy—always bad policy. You always come out on the short end of the stick and always end up hurting your own people more than you do the Russians in this case. However, if any future administration deems it necessary and goes ahead with it anyway, and we do not have the votes here to stop it, I think one could see the logic then of

saying that all should bear the burden equally, which means that we would stop sales of other kinds of products to the Russians. This was not done. I do not know whether we have the votes here on the floor of the House to do it—we did not the last time—but perhaps another try would make that better. I am just hopeful that the President will take a look at the fact that the Russians are still in Afghanistan, that they are still exerting their pernicious influence around the globe, and that in essence in terms of change or behavioral change of the Russians, the embargo was a failure and it continues to be a failure.

I would think, just as the gentleman has called upon the President to have the courage to change, I would call upon the President to have the courage of his convictions and commitments if there have been no great fundamental alterations. The Polish crisis was already brewing while he was making these statements in October. One can hardly stretch the Russian grain embargo to the point where one could attribute that to the reasons for the Russians not acting in Poland. I think without going into this, it is prima facie that there is a whole host of reasons why the Russians have not gone into Poland, and we believe and hope that those conditions prevail.

But I would hope that the usual syndrome within the administration of OMB, the State Department, and others who have little or no appreciation for the farm economy of this country—and I am not singling this administration out; they had very little appreciation of the farm economy in the Carter administration; I did not see any evidence of it in the Ford administration or the Nixon administration before that—and I would hope that that same kind of coalition within the Government is not this time powerful enough to overrule the President's reasonably good sense of things when during the campaign he pledged to the American people and to the American farmers, and carried farm State after farm State partly as a result, that he would lift the embargo.

I would call upon the President of the United States to uphold his commitment to the American farmers. We are asking him to make all kinds of sacrifices. We will go into a farm bill, and we will have all kinds of difficulty getting a decent farm bill. And I understand that, but I would hope that the President and this new administration would not back into what I think would be a continuation of a sad and sorry mistake in this economy.

The agricultural sector has perhaps appropriately been termed "the soft underbelly of the Soviet economy." Year after year, rigid, ineffective management, capricious weather, and the disincentives to productivity inherent in the Marxist system have combined to create a totally unpredictable pattern of harvests.

When the Soviet Union brutally invaded Afghanistan in December of 1979, the Carter administration responded within weeks by embargoing 17 million metric tons of grain destined for Soviet ports. However well-conceived the intention may have been to concentrate on the weakest link in the Russian economy, the sad fact remains that this decision was made without a prior assessment of the impact such action would have on our own farming community. That impact is known to us all by now: Our farmers suffered a drastic reduction in total income, while food prices kept pace with double-digit inflation.

Farmers have justifiably continued to protest the embargo; such policy sets a bad precedent. It is bound to harm long-range sales prospects, as it will drive traditional customers to other more reliable suppliers.

From the standpoint of foreign policy, the embargo was poorly administered from the outset. The announcement was made unilaterally, without first seeking international cooperation to successfully isolate the Soviets and shut them out of the market. Our action shook the confidence of our allies—while the embargo was in effect, Canada, Australia, and Argentina all concluded long-term grain agreements with the Soviet Union.

Aside from the demonstrable ineffectiveness of the embargo—85,000 Soviet troops are still dug in in Afghanistan—the inconsistency and unfairness of this policy has especially rankled the agricultural community. Although we withheld grain from the Russians, we continued to sell them farm machinery, phosphates and fertilizers, and a variety of manufactured goods. Clearly, the burden of this action was not equitably distributed across the American economy.

An ironic footnote to this whole affair deserves our attention. Although we have been quick to employ trade restraints on basic commodities which can be obtained elsewhere on the world market, we have blithely continued to provide the Soviet Union with samples of American high technology. For your review, I am having inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which addresses this serious dilemma. By making available American technology—often produced only after years of painstaking and costly research and development—we allow the Soviets to have models which they can effortlessly duplicate domestically. The absurdity of this situation is clear.

My policy has always been one of opposition to embargoes. However, should any embargo become a policy initiative, it should in fairness and in quest of effectiveness be an across-the-board prohibition of all trade, including a cessation of scientific and technological exchange. The worst type of policy is one which singles out a special commodity for embargo, while other businesses are permitted to continue trade as usual.

I hope those of you who presently support the continuation of this unjust policy will weigh these remarks and consider the article I have submitted before you cast a vote on this issue.

The article follows:

SELLING RUSSIA THE ROPE

(By Arnaud de Borchgrave and Michael Ledeen)

For nearly two decades the West has been financing two separate defense budgets: its own, and a steadily increasing part of the Soviet bloc's. Some of president-elect Ronald Reagan's closest advisers insist that the new administration take the lead in establishing more stringent controls on the flow of information and advanced technology to the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries. But even though Reagan's counterparts throughout NATO countries and Japan agree with the diagnosis, they will be very reluctant to reduce high-technology trading with the communist nations.

In one of his most oft-quoted remarks, Lenin predicted that the capitalist countries would provide the Soviet Union the rope with which it would hang the West. And today, in the words of Senator Henry Jackson—

"* * * our export control system is a shambles. The United States and its allies have been selling the rope to the Soviets. What we haven't sold, we have been giving away in educational, governmental, and technical exchange programs. What we haven't sold or given away, they have been stealing."

In the last 10 years alone, Western countries have sold the Soviets $50 billion worth of goods, including machine tools; power lines; sophisticated technology that has gone into missiles and tanks; command, control, and communications systems; spy satellites; and radar. The Russians also have been able to purchase complete factories, designed and built by Western companies and financed with Western credits, that produce a substantial part of their military stockpile. Restraints on Western shipments to the Soviets actually have weakened in recent years. This is partly because the people and institutions that are supposed to regulate this traffic are generally ill equipped to judge the possible impact of technology transfer; and it is partly because of a blind faith in the virtues of East-West trade.

Last year, for example, Datasaab of Sweden sold the Soviet Union an air traffic control system that is able to detect any kind of airborne object (even if there is no radio signal), and also can determine if the object is a hostile aircraft or missile. The Datasaab system can calculate the flight path of the object, and can predict its location at a specific moment in the future. In short, the "air traffic control system" sold to the Soviet Union has many characteristics uniquely suited to military purposes. This Swedish system, destined for Moscow airport, contains American integrated circuitry and was sent to Moscow with American approval, even though some Pentagon officials expressed concern.

In 1972 the U.S. government approved the sale of 164 Bryant Centalign-B grinders to the Soviet Union. These machines manufacture tiny ball bearings to remarkably precise specifications—a 25-millionth of an inch. Such bearings are indispensable for advanced missile guidance systems. The Russians first had requested the Bryant system in 1960, when the Eisenhower administration approved the sale. President Kennedy's experts concurred the following year, but the president himself canceled the sale after a congressional investigation highlighted the enormous military potential of the technology. One expert told the Senate that:

"Our manufacture of these small devices is no secret—even the manner is not difficult to determine—but the capability to do it well and economically has taken years to develop and should not be sold to a potential adversary. . . . The situation is not one of selling our adversary a club—but machines which help to produce better clubs faster and cheaper."

Ten years later the Russians finally obtained approval from the Nixon administration, on the grounds that the Byrant technology allegedly could be duplicated by other countries (such as Switzerland). The $20 million deal was a bonanza for the Soviets, for it enabled them to produce a new generation of highly accurate ICBMs. The United States now face the possibility of having to spend tens of billions of dollars to defend its own land-based missiles against this new Soviet threat. "It is hard to believe," Lawrence Brady, former deputy director of the Office of Export Administration, told a Senate Committee, "It is hard to believe that machines comparable in quality and scale of production could have been acquired elsewhere, when the Soviets waited 11 years for Bryant to obtain an export license."

Sometimes it may be hard to see the military potential of the sales to the Soviets. But even when the military implications have been all too clear, the American government—like those of other Western countries—has failed to move. In 1977, for example, the government learned that many missile launchers were being produced at the Zil truck factory in Moscow, and that thousands of Zil trucks were being sent to military camps. Earlier, the Zil-131 truck had been used in Vietnam to move material down the Ho Chi Minh trail. Yet the United States continued to license sales of computers, computer parts, and even a laser system for use by Zil at both is truck factory and its laboratory in Moscow. American experts were able to establish that trucks from the massive American-built Kama River project were being used for miltary purposes, and here again there was no action to stop licenses for further support. American participation in the Kama River project—located in Naberezhnye Chelny in the Urals—was finally suspended when Kama trucks were found involved in the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

The Kama and Zil cases showed the failure of one of the major theories of detente—that the Soviet Union would become enmeshed in a network of agreements and interlocking interests with the West. Instead, in Senator Jackson's words, the Carter administration "behaved like a brain-damaged spider caught in its own web, unable to extricate itself."

Other Western countries have been similarly obtuse. For example, the West Germans have exported to Russia computer-controlled, multiple performance machines to treat titanium, thus facilitating the development of the most modern generation of Soviet missiles and the new monster Soviet submarine that is almost twice the size of the American Trident. And when the United States tightened export controls after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the French announced plans to have their leading steel manufacturer, Creusot-Loire, build a $350 million electric steel plant in the Soviet Union.

Giovanni Agnelli, head of Fiat, has argued, "It is impossible to prove—with the exclusion of a few high-technology areas—that East-West trade adds more to Soviet power than it contributes to the well-being of the Western economies." Officials in the Commerce Department and in most European ministries of foreign trade seem to agree. But many military experts disagree. So do a striking number of émigrés and defectors from the Soviet bloc. They say Western technology is crucial to the growth of Soviet power. Dr. Igor S. Glagolev, a senior research member of the Soviet Academy of Science until October 1976, when he was granted asylum in the United States, told us that, "Soviet society would be confronted with intolerable strains without all the assistance they have received from Western countries." The Soviets buy much Western technological know-how, but they also get much of it free by exploiting the openness of the West. Roughly 80 percent of all requests to the federal government under the Freedom of Information Act regard industrial and scientific information. Some of these requests come from the Soviet bloc. Various federal departments are deluged with requests regarding patents, manufacturing methods, and engineering designs, and they often have no way to check the true source of the requests. "When I think of the hundreds of bits of information I release each year," a top Pentagon official said, "I shudder to think about the overall picture the Russians are able to obtain of our activities."

Soviet experts attend Western scientific conferences, take specialized course in Western universities, and have access to advanced research projects in Western laboratories. Western researchers have no such opportunities in the Soviet Union. It is interesting to compare the research projects of the 45 graduate students and "young faculty" from the Soviet Union studying here and the equivalent number from the United States studying in the Soviet Union in 1980. Almost all the Soviet projects in America are highly technical in nature (including such subjects as "interaction of ions and plasmas with solid surfaces," "automatic control as applied to space ships," and "principles of analog computer design . . ." while the American scholars in Russia are working on almost exclusively humanistic subjects like "Soviet Tort Law," "A Comparative Semantic Analysis of Verbal Aspect in Russian and Serbo-Croatian," and "Musical Genres in Russian Music."

The Soviets have used sleight-of-hand to stir up enthusiasm for, and reduce objections to, East-West technology transfer. For example, in mid-1972 the Russians put on an exhibition of their latest computer hardware in Moscow. According to Eugene Douglas, an executive of the Memorex Corporation, "Much of the equipment was not operation-ready. Some models were no more than empty shells, dummy machines displayed for effect." These "Potemkin computers" were intended to serve two purposes. First, they were meant to convince Western companies that there was—in the Soviets' own slogan—an "enormous untapped Soviet computer market." Second, they were meant to suggest that the Russians had made such substantial advances in computer technology that there were no longer any national security grounds to deny them our own computer technology. Once the first licenses were granted, all the other computer companies rushed to compete for the new market, thus enabling the Soviets to obtain even more information without actually making costly purchases: they simply asked representatives of one company what set their product apart from those of their competitors.

KGB agents have been caught in Western Europe and the United States attempting to recruit Western computer experts. Belgian computer engineers were contacted by KGB agents in an attempt to obtain microfiches of up-to-date computer designs, and one West German and an American were arrested in America in the mid-1970's in a similar case. More recently, Soviet specialists visiting the Boeing plant in Seattle, Washington, were found picking up metal filings from the floor of the factory by means of special adhesive soles on their soles. Boeing employees watched the Soviets take the metal pieces from their shoes and put them in their pockets. Expressions of concern from Boeing executives were pooh-poohed by State Department officials, who insisted that the Russians be permitted to carry out their visits.

The Russians have even begun to get Western technology by buying controlling interests in Western companies. One of these is Unitronex, located in Des Plaines, Illinois, just outside Chicago: Unitronex is partially owned by a Polish computer-electronic complex known as Unitra, and deals with some of the most advanced computer technology available in America today. None of this is illegal; American companies with foreign communist shareholders are permitted to do business just like any other American firm. According to sources in the Pentagon and the intelligence community, companies like Unitronex can gain access to advanced technology that might be denied for export.

There are now over 25 of these companies in the United States, a development that reportedly prompted a paper on the subject by the National Security Council this past summer. When the NSC study was subjected to an inter-agency review, the Pentagon urged that the names of these companies be published, so that everyone would know who they were. But State Department officials suggested that the government refrain from interference, and stressed the importance of good relations with the Soviet Union.

One of the basic themes of Soviet propaganda in favor of access to Western high-technology transfer is that such access could help the Russians develop their own energy supplies, and thereby reduce their temptation to launch a military strike in the Persian Gulf. This has been one of the central themes in the debate over the so-called "Dresser deal." In 1978 Dresser Industries of Dallas, a leading manufacturer of oil drilling equipment, obtained export licenses to build a $144 million plant to manufacture oil drilling bits in the Soviet Union, and for a computer-controlled electron beam welder that could be used in manufacturing the bits. The licenses were approved by both the Commerce and Defense depart-

ments, but Senator Jackson's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations challenged the decision. In testimony before Jackson's subcommittee in October 1978, J. Fred Bucy, head of Texas Instruments and chairman of the Special Defense Science Board Task Force, identified the central question:

"There is no policy as to whether the United States considers it to be a good thing or a bad thing to help the Soviets develop their energy resources. Until that decision is made, it seems to me that we need to preserve the option, either to help them or not help. It is my personal feeling that if this drill bit factory goes through, we have, in essence, given that option away."

The Carter administration postponed final approval of the Dresser plan for two years, and the matter apparently was resolved shortly after the presidential elections when National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski—speaking for the president—announced that the Dresser factory should not be built for the Soviets. Carter's decision leaves the basic issue unresolved; president-elect Reagan will have to address the broader question of whether the West wishes to assist the Soviet energy program.

There is an international organization for controlling exports to the Soviet bloc, known as COCOM—the Coordinating Committee—that includes Japan and all NATO countries except Iceland. COCOM lists certain technologies that cannot be sent to the Soviet bloc without a special exemption. Before the Carter administration, most of the exemptions were granted to West European countries. In recent years, however, the United States has accounted for more than 60 percent of the special cases, thus making it difficult for the American government to demand a tougher stand from our allies. Exports to the East account for only a small part of American foreign trade, but they are far more significant to the Europeans.

The latest European breakthrough is West Germany's swap of technology for Soviet natural gas. The Soviets are attempting to involve most of Western Europe as part of the package, which amounts to some $12 billion. A group of Belgian banks is negotiating with the Soviets for a one billion dollar line of credit, and the country's largest bank has asked the Belgian government to guarantee the credit. The Soviets would use these credits to buy pipe and pipe-laying tractors of extraordinary size (currently under negotiation with the Caterpillar Corporation in Washington), and other equipment, and would repay with natural gas. If this package goes through, West Germany eventually will come to depend upon the Soviet Union for 30 percent of its natural gas, while the Soviets will have all the technology necessary to develop their own resources, and even build a pipeline into the Persian Gulf area.

Reagan favors a policy of linkage in dealing with the Soviets, and technology transfer is expected to play a major role in this policy. Reagan hopes to be able to reduce Soviet adventurism in the third world by threatening to withhold sophisticated technology. But there can be no linkage without full cooperation by all members of COCOM. Technology transfer is one more potentially divisive issue for the already strained Western alliance.

Arnaud de Borchgrave was chief foreign correspondent for Newsweek. Michael Ledeen is executive editor of the Washington Quarterly.

Mr. PEYSER. I appreciate the gentleman's thoughtful statement, and I also appreciate the sincerity of it.

I would like to make an observation regarding the agriculture community. When the gentleman was making the point of the comparative weakness of the 3 percent of the people involved in the agriculture area against big industry who can fight their cases very well, I would like to say, as a compliment to Members on both sides who represent the agriculture community in this Congress, that they have been highly effective in the maintenance of agriculture programs, support programs, target programs, targeting price on various commodities. That they have been highly successful means to me that they are a very effective and outspoken group in this House, but when it reached the question of the embargo, there were 135 votes that voted to lift the embargo, and something is vastly out of line there when you get the activity of being able to pass major agriculture bills, which, incidentally, I supported this past year—one of the few that I have supported in recent years—but they are there to do the job. I am saying I think many of the Members of this House who have voted with the agriculture community, when it comes to the issue of this embargo see something that is far broader. They see the United States of America having made a commitment that was our President's commitment that said, "We will not tolerate what the Soviet Union has done, and one of the best responses is to stop this kind of trade that is so important to them." And I allow that it is important to the Soviet Union. I have just finished a meeting on this matter in researching some of the problems in the Soviet Union, and we find out they are faced with several problems today.

They have major labor shortages, surprisingly enough. They have energy problems, even though they are the biggest oil producers in the world. Their technological programs have been failing miserably, and they have a major agriculture problem. The one consistent problem they have had has been in agriculture. They have had 5-year plans, and 3-year plans, and none of these plans fulfill what they anticipate doing.

I think that we must stand by our guns on this issue merely to show the world that we mean what we say, and, too, to show the Soviet Union that when the President, as someone just said—the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN) I believe—the President had called the Soviets thieves and other things, that we now do not in effect go to bed with them, because it would make us look absolutely ridiculous. So I believe we must stand with this, and I believe, incidentally, if we put this to a vote in the House—which I hope to be able to do within the next 2 to 3 weeks, assuming the President has not, as I do not believe he will, lifted the embargo at that point—hopefully, within the next 2 or 3 weeks to have a chance for the House to vote, and I think we will see the House vote again to maintain the embargo.

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

Mr. PEYSER. In trying to balance this out, I will yield to the gentleman, my friend from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am struck by a recent comment. The gentleman links the hardship of inconvenience caused to the Soviet Union by the grain embargo with the outrageous action of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. We are now in the last year of the 5-year grains arrangement. In order to really show our determination on this point, would the gentleman suggest that we now renew that arrangement and that we terminate all the grain sales?

If the basic embargo has been some form of notice or signal or punishment to the Soviet Union, would not a total embargo be even a greater signal to the Soviet Union? In other words, if Soviet troops are still in Afghanistan when the 5-year grains arrangement terminates, would the gentleman recommend that we not have a follow-on arrangement?

Mr. PEYSER. I would say in September when I think the grain deal ends—and I think it is this fall in September—the 5-year period, that prior to that time our State Department would have met with the Soviets and would have reached some agreements or understandings that our State Department and our President felt were the right steps to take in order to be able to continue to deal with the Soviet Union in grain.

However, I would say this, that if the circumstances in September were identical with the circumstances today, in other words, no type of agreements or meetings with the Soviet Union on any of these other issues that are most important, and the Soviet Union remains active in Afghanistan with their combat troops, then I would say if none of those things had happened, then I would support a continuation of—not then an embargo because there would be nothing left to embargo—but the suspension of that most needed item in the Soviet Union.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the gentleman permit me to respond to that?

Mr. PEYSER. I certainly will.

Mr. FINDLEY. I just have one further question. The gentlemen heard the colloquy involving the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN) and my own comments about changing the terms of the embargo to an interruptible or flexible basis. Would the gen-

tleman agree with us that this would open up new opportunities which do not exist today for a President to deal face to face with the Soviet Union on matters of interest to them, and perhaps open up the possiblity, minor though it may be, to influence Soviet behavior?

Mr. PEYSER. I would say in answer to the gentleman that I am perfectly willing, if the President of the United States feels that a meeting with the Soviets to discuss this temporary type of lifting based on certain other factors was acceptable to the President, then I, too, would be willing to support that. But it is predicated on that kind of a meeting, not the unilateral lifting now of the embargo and simply then saying I hope we can work something out with the Soviet Union because I see no reason to trust that the Soviet Union is going to do that if we take the action first.

Mr. FINDLEY. But if the grain embargo is terminated today, the Soviets could not buy 1 bushel of corn or wheat without the concurrence of the U.S. administration; does the gentleman recognize that?

Mr. PEYSER. I recognize that, which seems to me another reason not to be overly concerned whether the President does anything with the embargo until he has basically made up his mind whether we are going to trade with them at all on this issue. I think the major decision that must be made is whether it is in the best interests of world peace for the United States in its foreign policy dealings to lift the embargo unilaterally, and I would say it is not.

Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), for having this special order.

I am privileged to represent 57 counties out on the high plains which in my district, the big First District of Kansas, grows more wheat than any other State. What my producers do not understand is why we are singling out the farmer's grain as a tool in foreign policy on an exclusive basis. The practical effect in farm country—I am not so sure what the practical effect has been in terms of Afghanistan or Poland, or in terms of foreign policy—I can tell you has been a dollar loss at the elevator in terms of market price. It has been a huge debt load for the farmer to carry. We have had some increase in our market prices, but it has been due to the dry weather—certainly nothing that has been done by anything from Washington.

What my producer cannot understand is why his product alone is singled out for this foreign policy tool, more especially when the Soviets are buying grain from other countries and the embargo is in effect circumvented.

I would just like to associate my remarks—and I will have a statement to follow—with those of my colleague from Kansas who made the point that if the grain embargo is lifted, any new U.S-U.S.S.R. grain sales agreement could insure higher—above 8 million tons—thresholds for Soviet purchases so as to moderate the swings in demand and thus protect U.S. commodity markets as well as strengthen U.S.S.R. dependency on U.S. production. It also should be pointed out that any sales of grain to the Soviets beyond the 8 million tons in 1981 can be negotiated on terms acceptable to the United States, including linkage to any future military actions. Then we have a handle on it. It seems to me that that is the way to go.

Mr. PEYSER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. They certainly are speaking to the problems that his constituency faces, and I appreciate that and I understand it. I am sympathetic with it. I think what we are dealing with here is a problem or a situation that faces the entire United States and the future of U.S. foreign policy at a very early stage of this new administration.

It is, indeed, unfortunate, and I will not challenge any of the gentleman's statements that it has created some hardships in the community that he represents. I accept that, and I am sorry for it, but I feel that anytime that you are dealing with something that affects the entire country, where a segment of the population might possibly be hurt, or a segment of an industry might possibly be hurt, that we in the Congress here, and certainly the President, must act in what we see as the best interest of the entire country and the entire problem. I guess the thing that I keep coming back to is the United States has been plagued with a feeling abroad of weakness in our foreign policy.

I have been very actively involved in NATO and with the North Atlantic Alliance, and I have met with the leaders over there on this issue. They look to anything that shows that the United States is finally standing firm and strong on an issue.

□ 1345

Now, believe me, it does not mean our allies are always right, because our allies in NATO have not been putting in, I do not believe, what they should be putting in, and there are a lot of other problems. But they are people in the Western World who have gotten very concerned over the United States over the last 3 or 4 years and, unquestionably, this is one of the items that defeated President Carter, that feeling that the United States is not strong, we are not respected, we must get our strength and integrity back. And I happen to believe that. And so I think for today—and the gentleman from Kansas before stated very plainly—the difficulties of what has already been said by President Reagan, attacking the Soviet Union most vigorously—they have not been attacked that way by an American President. In fact, I do not know when anyone has spoken that bluntly about what they viewed the Soviet Union, and then in the next breath to say that we are now going to lift the grain embargo I think would make the President and our foreign policy and our supporters around the world really wonder what we were talking about. And that is my concern.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from New York and, as we close out this colloquy, I think there are really a couple of points that I would like to make sure are clear in the RECORD.

First of all, the gentleman from Kansas has pointed out that it is a matter of concern to those of us from farm States, but by no means is it a parochial issue; by no means is it related only to agriculture. This is a national issue. In my opinion, this is a national mistake.

Second, it is a question of credibility. Credibility for the President and credibility for this country. When we talk about credibility for this country I do not think there is any doubt in any country's collective mind that we are not fooling anyone any more. We know and they know that the Soviets have received the grain that they need. We know and they know that we are already exporting 8 million tons of grain this year to the Soviet Union. We know that they know that grain is going to be shipped to the Soviets in any case.

So when it comes to credibility, I think that the most credible thing that we can do is to recognize what everyone knows, and that is that the embargo has not worked.

Finally, when it comes to the credibility of the President, the gentleman said earlier that he expects people now to have doubts about their leaders when they come into office, that they can change their mind. Well, I think that the people are tired of being promised one thing and then discover later that once the candidate is in office, they have a position entirely different. I believe very strongly that the American people will feel conned once again if indeed that promise made in the rhetoric and the heat of the campaign is not kept. We do not have the right to change promises made intentionally time and time again. I think it is absolutely impor-

tant that we keep the promises that we make in a campaign as we hold public office.

Mr. PEYSER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's side may prevail on this. Should the gentleman prevail on this, I wonder, as a Representative of an urban State, whether or not the gentleman would support a policy which would truly spread the burden equally, which would, for example, make it necessary for all administrations, this one and future administrations, to raise the loan rate on any embargoed products to a specified percentage of parity if they are going to impair the overseas shipment in sales and thereby destroy a portion of the market. Would the gentleman be susceptible to agreeing to that as an element of fairness to American farmers?

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend and say that if such a situation again comes about, where embargo of food products, whatever they may be, or, for that matter, any major embargo, that it is an obligation of this Government to see that that action does not destroy or sorely affect any segment, and it should be spread throughout the country.

I would find absolutely no problem in that because I do not think that that was the intent, certainly, of President Carter, to sting the grain producers. If in fact they have been hurt by this, it was not a planned hurt. But the point I am saying, to answer the gentleman's question, I would support such a concept, and I think it would be fair and I think the American people would support it.

I would like to touch one other point, and then I will certainly come back to the gentleman, a point we have not touched on, and it is one that I think bears a great deal of thought for Members of this Congress.

At the same time that we passed the grain embargo in this House, we voted for registration for the draft. This was another program put in place because of the Afghanistan invasion. Now, I happened to vote against the registration because I felt the registration program being proposed did absolutely nothing. It provided millions of names on pieces of paper with date of birth and no classification, no examinations, and, according to Selective Service itself, might make a difference of 13 or 14 days in the calling up of any personnel.

But it certainly caused a lot of disruption among the young people in our country and a kind of concern that I do not think it should have caused.

However, the Congress did pass that, and in its wisdom this became signed into law. So we now have in law a registration for a draft. My youngest son just happened to register a week ago.

Now, it seems to me that if we are now going to lift a grain embargo, and we have said to the young people of this country, "Look, you register, because we have a major problem with the Soviet Union," and by registering they are potentially exposing themselves to a draft, which means they are potentially exposing their lives in an international situation of military conflict, how can we ask our young people to do this and then lift the grain embargo, which, to me, plainly says that we feel very strongly about these issues but when a few dollars get in the way of it we are going to let the dollars come back into it but let us keep our young people up there? I think this is a terrible potential reaction of young people in this country if we were to lift the grain embargo today.

Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree with the gentleman's basic point, in terms of example of our young people, but I do not think that is the equation. I know that in terms of U.S. industrial machinery shipments, such as those extended by our corporations in building a new Soviet natural gas pipeline into West Germany, that raises the same kind of question. What my farmers want to know is, why is their product singled out and then, in terms of results, the troops are still in Afghanistan?

I would only add that certainly the situation has changed, with the Soviet troops poised on the Polish border, and no farmer, no producer, no stockman in my district wants to stand in the way of the national interest. But I would also point out to the gentleman that it is in our national interest to keep our food and fiber production machine viable. And in terms of cost of production, my farmers in the high plains still see their price far below the cost of production. As of today, the price of Hard Red Winter in Dodge City, Kans., is $3.86. That is below the cost of production. We cannot continue with this.

I would also point out, in closing, that perhaps the vote total that the gentleman has referred to, in terms of 135 votes, when that was cast during the last session of Congress, I do not really think that was a vote up or down on the embargo so much as it was some votes cast in opposition as to the method; because as I look back on that vote, I think it was an amendment to an appropriation bill, and there was a lot of feeling on both sides of the aisle that that was not the way to do this.

I might also just simply say that there has been a cost to our Nation. Of course, the defense agencies have placed the embargo's cost to the Soviets at about $1 billion, but in terms of lost tax revenue and in terms of the direct outlays alone by the USDA, it has cost our country twice as much, and it still has not worked. I think we should lift the embargo. I think we should establish direct linkage with the Soviet Union, in terms of our foreign policy, and enter into very tough negotiations. I would think that that would be understood by our young people, our senior citizens, and everybody who is on the receiving end of the farmers' food and production machine.

President Reagan and his Cabinet are meeting this week to determine whether our grain embargo has outlived whatever usefulness it might have served during the past year. To me, there is no doubt that it has.

True, the embargo on grain sales did cause the Soviets inconvenience and expense. Perhaps our response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has influenced the Soviet response to the labor situation in Poland. I would hope so, for there seems to be little else that it has accomplished.

In his recent "Dear Colleague" letter, Mr. PEYSER cited Defense Intelligence Agency estimates that the embargo had cost the Soviets $1 billion in the past year, and that costs would continue to rise. In a response, I pointed out that our Government had spent more than that in direct outlays alone. The net cost of retendering grain contracts was estimated by the General Accounting Office to be somewhere in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars. Direct purchases from farmers cost the Government almost $1 billion. And, market price declines cost farmers millions more, leading to losses in tax revenues for the Government.

Because of the selective nature of the embargo, farmers feel that they were singled out to bear the burden of our response to the Soviet invasion, with nothing to show for their sacrifices. Farmers feel that the embargo represents a symbolic, rather than a real, response to Soviet aggression. They feel that any embargo, to be effective, must be all inclusive. President Reagan, himself, said in his recent press conference that the choice was between ending the embargo and expanding it. Certainly expanding the embargo would reduce what little influence we have over Soviet policy toward Poland. With all shipments cut off, they would have nothing to lose by invading that country.

I submit that the embargo, as implemented, was a mistake. We unfairly

placed the burden of our foreign policies on the shoulders of a small segment of our population. True, the Government took some actions to alleviate the effects of this selective action, but many of these actions were a day late and a dollar short. If the embargo was, indeed, a mistake, then we will not correct it by continuing it.

Thank you.

Mr. PEYSER. I thank the gentleman very much for his thoughts, and I want to thank all of those Members who have participated today in this, because, to me, this is both timely and important that we do this today, with the Cabinet meeting tomorrow that is presumably going to reach some decision on this matter. We, I am sure, started out with different opinions, and we are undoubtedly still with different opinions, but at least we have explored many of the issues and avenues of the pros and cons. It obviously is my hope, as I said earlier, that the President will say—and I really believe that it will be an act of courage far greater than lifting the embargo: "Not now. Let us study it so that we know the full implication; let us see where we are going on this issue; let us see if we can get the kind of response from the Soviet Union that we need to guarantee world peace." If he does that, I think he is certainly off to a flying start in his new Presidency.

● Mr. ROE, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this very important resolution urging President Reagan to continue the grain embargo against the Soviet Union.

Over the past year the Soviet Union has embarked on a new program of aggression around the world. The brutal invasion of Afghanistan by Russian soldiers last year should serve as a warning to all nations that the Soviet Union has not changed from its original goal of controlling the world through the use of force and intimidation.

Look for any trouble spot in the world and you will find that the Soviets are deeply involved in trying to expand their sphere of influence at any cost.

Today, Soviet tanks and soldiers stand ready to crush the legitimate rights of Polish workers who have asked their Government for nothing more than decent wages and fair working hours.

While the Russians love to boast of their mighty military powers, they do have a major Achilles' heel. While the population of Russia is increasing at a very rapid rate, the Soviets cannot produce enough food to meet that growth.

Russia has, in the past decade, become one of the largest food importers in the world. And the United States was, up to the point of the embargo's initiation, the largest supplier of wheat to the Soviet Union.

To now resume the grain shipments to the Soviets would be ludicrous. Perhaps more so than at any time, food has become as important a weapon as guns and bullets.

We have the Russians in a very tight spot and they know it. There are many reports filtering out of the Soviet Union of the early slaughter of cattle because there is not enough grain available to feed their herds.

And despite reports from some sources, no other nation in the world but the United States can provide the Russians with the quantities of food they need to meet their nutritional demands.

The Russians must be made to know that if they wish to play the bully they will have to pay dearly for that privilege.

Mr. Speaker, last summer the young athletes of this Nation gave up the chance of a lifetime, to participate in the Olympic games, because of the Russian invasion of Afghanistan.

To now resume the shipment of food to the Soviets while that aggression is still taking place would be an insult to all Americans.●

● Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, while suspension of grain trade with the Soviet Union may have had immediate foreign policy benefits, continuation of the grain embargo will only seriously affect one group—the American grain producer.

Since the embargo of American exports to the Soviet Union began on January 4, 1980, American farmers have borne the expensive burden of suspending trade to a major customer.

While other facets of the economy continued to function without noticing the financial hardships of the embargo, farmers fretted over mounting bills and attempted to continue operating in spite of a $1 per bushel slash in their markets.

It would be naive and uninformed to assume that the embargo did not have an adverse effect on American farmers, who faced skyrocketing production costs and plummeting incomes last year.

A major incentive to produce was removed from the agricultural scene with the 1980 embargo. We must give grain producers a new incentive this year.

A prolonged drought throughout the Grain Belt, double-digit interest rates and increased debt loads are enough to make anyone quit. But American farmers persist. However, continuation of the embargo could be the final financial burden that will begin to take its toll on American farms.

I think we all agree that the grain embargo did cause the Soviets some expense and inconvenience.

However, the Russians have been able to import 31 of the 34 million metric tons of grain they had planned to import.

And the Soviet troops are still in Afghanistan.

Even though the U.S. Government spent $3 billion in an attempt to minimize the grain embargo, farm income declined 40 percent in the second quarter of 1980. The grain embargo figured heavily in that decline.

Although prices did recover, many farmers in Oklahoma consider the early part of the year as a critical grain selling time in which they must pay land and production expenses.

Farmers were totally unprepared and unaware of the impact of a halt to grain trade with the U.S.S.R. Many farmers had no choice but to sell at drastically reduced prices. Other farmers were able to hold their grain until the market improved.

While the U.S. Government paid $3 billion to offset the effects of the embargo, it is estimated that the embargo cost the U.S.S.R. only $1 billion last year.

In addition to losing $1 per bushel on grain, farmers in my district still face an unsteady and unpredictable position in the highly competitive foreign market for agricultural products.

The Soviet Union had an extremely poor harvest this year, which would be a strong argument in favor of continuing the embargo.

However, we must closely analyze the dramatic shift in the world grain trade pattern since last year.

This year, it is estimated that the U.S.S.R. will import a record 34.5 million metric tons of grain even with the U.S. sanction. The partial participation in the embargo by Canada, Australia, and the European community is eroding rapidly.

While the United States refuses to sell its grain, other grain producing powers are rapidly filling the void.

Trade sanctions will not work unless we have a unified effort from all grain producing nations. Grain is flowing freely from other large exporters. The Soviets are able to import grain in record levels. They are not doing without.

Meanwhile, we are losing valuable world markets.

More than 10 years of Government and private efforts went into developing the Soviet market for U.S. grain. Agricultural products have contributed substantially to improving the U.S. balance of trade since extra world markets were developed.

If agricultural products are returned to a free market, we can hopefully continue to improve our balance of trade.

Agriculture, one of America's most efficient producers, should no longer be punished by this trade sanction.

It is time to get the U.S. economy moving again. And one sure economic stimulator is a healthy agriculture.

Farmers throughout the Third District of Oklahoma and across the Nation are among the most patriotic people in the world. When the grain embargo was announced, Oklahoma farmers took the lumps—by themselves. And they continue to be adversely affected by the dark cloud hanging over their markets.

In future trade sanctions, all facets of the U.S. economy should share in the burden. No other phase of the U.S. economy was or ever has been singled out as a foreign policy tool like grain producers were in 1980.

It would be easy to say that the recent strength in grain prices indicates that the embargo did not affect grain prices. However, recent price strength is due to a prolonged drought, which cut agricultural production in half in Oklahoma.

If current world situations prevail, we may have to give serious consideration to using U.S. products as international bargaining tools. However, every phase of the U.S. economy should share in the responsibility.

Discontinuation of the grain embargo is extremely important in this period of economic uncertainty. We must provide some incentives for the people who produce America's No. 1 product.

Ending the Soviet grain embargo would be an added and welcomed incentive for the U.S. agricultural community.

Thank you for considering my views.●

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, recent remarks by Mr. Block, the newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, indicate that the administration is considering discontinuing the Soviet grain embargo. I speak to urge the administration to stiffen the embargo rather than weaken it.

This is an important time to demonstrate clearly to the Soviet Union that the position of the United States is firm and unwavering with respect to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and all other travesties against human rights currently perpetuated by the U.S.S.R.

To withdraw the embargo at this time would be a mistake which would give the U.S. Government the appearance of hesitancy, lack of assurance, and inability to follow through with conviction. Further, evidence from bipartisan sources indicates that the effects of an embargo will be dramatically felt in the Soviet Union during the coming year as severe grain shortages and increased prices for grain products make a deep impact on the Soviet economy. If the embargo has been less than effective up to now, for a variety of reasons, forceful maintenance of the embargo for the next year should make our message clear. The use of food as a weapon is regrettable; but it is, without question, a more rational weapon than guns in the struggle to restrain the flagrant Soviet transgressions of international norms and human rights.

We must reassure American farmers that the price of this political strategy is not borne inequitably by them. The price stabilization programs, potential for crop acreage diversion programs, along with increased foreign markets in Europe, South America, and Asia have reduced the negative impact on the farm community. However, we should consider the grain embargo only one political tool in our expression of outrage about Soviet policy. Other trade policies need examination.

This is a critical period for maintaining a strong and unified position with respect to Soviet disregard for the rights of individuals and nations. In this field, the embargo, as in others we should work for more cooperative and united efforts with other nations. With Canada, Australia, and Argentina in particular we should move toward friendly cohesion to develop a coordinated food strategy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.●

REV. RAYMOND C. BAUMHART

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a special order today so that my colleagues might join with me in paying tribute to Loyola University's outstanding leader, Rev. Raymond C. Baumhart in recognition of his 10 years of extraordinary leadership as its president.●

● Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday of this week, the alumni of Loyola University of Chicago will pay tribute to the beloved man who has served for 10 years as the university's president, Rev. Raymond C. Baumhart.

The occasion is significant to me for two reasons: As an alumnus of Loyola, I have watched with pride as my alma mater has prospered under Father Baumhart's remarkable leadership during these difficult times for institutions of higher learning; and as a Member of Congress, I respect the intellectual and reasoned contribution he has made to our congressional deliberations on a host of issues.

Father Baumhart has given generously of his time and many talents to Loyola's administration, to its students, and to society. He deserves this special celebration, and I want to join other alumni and Illinoisans in saying thank you to this rare and good man.●

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the distinguished president of Loyola University of Chicago, Rev. Raymond C. Baumhart.

In his 10 years of service as president of Loyola, Father Baumhart has enriched this university as a superb institution of education and medical research. He has clearly demonstrated his skills as an administrator while carrying out his personal commitment to the religious and educational development of others.

The list of his personal achievements clearly illustrates that Father Baumhart is a man of both hard work and commitment. Having received degrees in theology as well as philosophy, Father Baumhart was the first priest to receive a doctoral degree in business administration from the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

Additionally, he has written extensively on business ethics. Father Baumhart wrote the book "An Honest Profit: What Businessmen Say About Ethics in Business," and he coauthored "Cases in Business Ethics." His articles have appeared in various publications including the Harvard Business Review and Social Order.

Chicago's corporate community has recognized the great value of Father Baumhart's business judgment, and accordingly he is a member of the board of directors of the Jewel Cos. and Continental Illinois National Bank.

But exceeding even his personal achievements has been Father Baumhart's unwavering commitment to the Jesuit belief of the development of the whole person. As he has often stated, intellectual competence is essential and without it one cannot be effective. However, a student's social, moral, and spiritual growth must accompany intellectual competence for one to be of genuine service to our society.

Mr. Speaker, Father Baumhart has contributed and continues to contribute intellectual and spiritual leadership not only to Loyola University but to the entire Chicago community.●

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to pay tribute to Rev. Raymond C. Baumhart, Loyola University's outstanding president, on the 10th anniversary of his presidency.

The entire Chicago community is fortunate to have such a gifted educator. Father Baumhart is an excellent administrator, a strong community leader, and a gifted writer. He brings insight, dedication, and social responsibility to his varied activities. He has served with distinction, enriching the lives of countless students and contributing to the health and well-being of our community.

We wish Father Baumhart well on his 10th anniversary, and we look forward to many more years of his fine leadership.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Loyola University of Chicago, it is a special pleasure for me

to join this afternoon in honoring Father Raymond Baumhart, S.J., for his 10 years of outstanding service to the university as its president. Father Ray has earned the great respect and admiration not only from the academic and theological communities, but from students and laymen as well.

During the past decade of Father Baumhart's presidency, student enrollment has grown to make Loyola of Chicago one of the largest Jesuit universities in the United States and the second largest private university in Illinois. Loyola has become a center of education in the fields of law, medicine, the sciences, business, and the arts as a result of Father Baumhart's dedication to continually improving the educational facilities.

As one who is privileged to know Father Baumhart, he quickly earned my respect for his competence, diligence and resourcefulness in administering to the spiritual as well as educational needs of Loyolans. Father Baumhart possesses that rare quality of instilling an appreciation for the value of education and the development of spiritual awareness. His faith and devotion to his chosen vocation is a source of great inspiration to all who know him.

Father Baumhart has earned a most honored reputation as a scholar, teacher, author, and administrator. In addition to his present duties, Father Ray plays an active leadership role as chairman of the board of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities and is a member of the executive committee of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities.

I know that I speak for all the Members who attended Loyola who know Father Raymond Baumhart, S.J., in expressing our sincere gratitude and appreciation for his leadership as an effective and dedicated educator during this productive period at Loyola University of Chicago. I join in offering my prayers for his good health as he continues God's work.●

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years Loyola University of Chicago has benefited from the leadership of its president, Father Raymond C. Baumhart of the Society of Jesus. I wish to bring attention to the achievements of this remarkable man.

Father Baumhart distinguished himself at an early age. He served his country during World War II as an officer in the Naval Supply Corps. He earned a bachelor of science degree from Northwestern University and then three separate degrees from Loyola. As a young Jesuit, he taught high school students in Cincinnati. He also was the first priest to receive a doctor in business administration degree from Harvard University. The same path breaking spirit that led him to Harvard later inspired him to become an internationally recognized scholar in the field of business ethics.

Father Baumhart's administrative career began at Loyola in 1963, when he took the post of assistant dean in the school of business administration. He went on to serve as dean of that school and, later, executive vice president of the university. In July of 1970 Father Baumhart became president of Loyola, at the age of 47.

Under his guidance Loyola has flourished. New buildings have been constructed. More students have matriculated than at any time in Loyola's history. Large and generous bequests have been made to the university. New chairs in various departments have been founded. The research done at the university has achieved an unprecedented scope, investigating topics from the neurology of hearing to the Epistles of St. Paul.

Through his many years at Loyola Father Baumhart has always maintained that the university exists to educate the whole person.

Father Baumhart has said:

> There is more to an education at the university level than graduating large numbers of men and women proficient in economics, history, psychology, and a dozen other subjects.

Therefore, he has worked to make all learning done at the university value oriented. Under his administration the university planning committee formulated two documents which enunciate this policy, the "Mission Statement" and the "Statement of Values and Ethics."

Father Baumhart is a committed Chicagoan. He is mindful of Loyola's role in the Chicago community. He has maintained and expanded Loyola's many relationships with its neighbors. He has been an ambassador of good will for the university throughout the city.

In recognition of Father Baumhart's many achievements I am proud to join with other Loyola alumni and friends in celebrating his 10 years of guidance over the university, and in wishing him many more years of accomplishment.●

NUCLEAR INSPECTION TOUR OF THE FAR EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in a statement filed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD earlier this year, from January 8 through 18 I traveled to the Far East to inspect various nuclear power and waste facilities. This tour involved 5 days in Japan and 5 days in Taiwan. While the primary purpose of this visit, especially in Japan, was to learn about the status of the commercial use of nuclear power in these foreign countries, I also used the occasion to talk with the officials of these Governments about other matters of foreign and domestic policy.

The overwhelming impression I have of these countries is their successful economic growth and the purposeful linkage of that objective with developing independent sources of energy. Both countries have expanded their economies using the free enterprise system as much as possible and keeping State planning restrictions to a minimum. What this means for the stability of their currencies, unemployment rates, and the continued improvement in the standard of living for the Japanese and the free Chinese people, I will defer to the economists for detailed analyses. But there is no doubt that in general, both countries are in very good shape economically, despite having small land masses and very few natural resources of their own.

Mr. Speaker, although there are many factors contributing to the success stories of these two allies of the United States, as you know, my responsibilities on the Energy and Commerce Committee would cause me to look carefully at their energy policies. Having done so, I believe that these energy policies—keyed to making Japan and Taiwan independent of the OPEC oil cartel—constitute a major reason for the current good health of the Japanese and the free Chinese.

The time spent in Japan was devoted to examining the country's nuclear power developments. Japan presently has 22 nuclear powerplants in operation, with an installed capacity of 15,000 MWe, thereby making it the second largest nuclear power producer in the world. Nuclear power supplies approximately 13 percent of Japan's total electricity and accounts for about 4 percent of its total energy supply. By 1990, Japan's goal is to almost triple the percentage of nuclear power in its energy mix.

As in other countries, there is some opposition to nuclear projects, especially from local populations of proposed nuclear sites. Nevertheless, I believe there are three fundamental reasons why Japan will move forward with its nuclear programs: First, there is a strong consensus in the Government and among the Japanese people in favor of nuclear power because of its critical linkage to their domestic economy and international trade; second, the nuclear industry is well-staffed, and well-financed. It is better integrated with the other Japanese economic sectors—banks, universities and government—than any other Japanese energy producer. The Japan Atomic Industrial Forum is made up of a large cross section of Japan's economic interests going far beyond reac-

tor manufacturers. Accordingly, one can expect an expanded public relations campaign designed to educate the public to the positive aspects and benefits of nuclear power; and third, nuclear power represents the closest energy-independent source that Japan can attain. Toward this end, Japan has a vigorous research and development program in all aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle beginning with exploration for uranium through waste disposal. The principal Japanese organization for undertaking these programs is the Power Reactor & Nuclear Fuel Development Corp.—PNC. PNC is actively engaged in reprocessing spent nuclear fuel at its Tokai-Mura facility, which I visited. Close to a hundred tons of spent fuel have been reprocessed at this facility. Moreover, at the same site, a plutonium fuel fabrication plant is in operation. PNC also has responsibility for the design, construction, and operation of Japan's "JOYO" fast-breeder research reactor. Plans are underway for construction of the 300-MWe MONJU fast breeder prototype reactor and a target date for operation has been set for December 1987. The total cost of construction will be approximately 400 billion yen—$200 million. Twenty percent of the total cost—80 billion—will be borne by the private sector.

Taiwan has an equally, if not more ambitious nuclear program for the future, although due to the difference in industrialization with Japan, it, of course, has far fewer nuclear powerplants now in operation. Nevertheless, by the end of this century, the goal of the free Chinese is to have about half of their electricity emanating from nuclear power.

Their existing powerplants have been built by General Electric and Westinghouse. However, for the first time, the Taiwan Power Co. is now seriously considering purchasing a system bid by a company other than one from the United States. The company in question is a French one. In answer to my inquiries about this possible change in what has heretofore been an exclusively "buy American" policy on nuclear matters, I was given the following answer: recent uncertainties about the consistency and reliability of U.S. commercial nuclear power export policies.

My visit to Taiwan was more general in nature than in Japan, so that the itinerary included more than just nuclear matters. As a result, I was able to talk to President Chiang Ching-Kuo, Premier Sunyun Suan, and several of the Cabinet Secretaries about developments in their areas of responsibility of interest to the United States.

Along with inspecting one of their nuclear powerplants in the Republic of China, I had the unique opportunity to spend a day on the island of Quemoy, where the state of military readiness is indeed something to see. I also met with representatives of the American Institute in Taiwan, the American Soybean Association, and the American Chamber of Commerce to learn more about current conditions in Taiwan, especially following the U.S. derecognition decision in 1978.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, a legislative factfinding trip is more important for what one learns than for what one sees. While I saw some new things—since I had never been to the Orient before—among other things, what I learned in Japan and Taiwan that has particular significance for current U.S. export and energy policies was two-fold: First, in order to get out from under the thumb of the OPEC oil cartel, both countries are offsetting oil as an energy source with nuclear power; and second, not only are we losing business for our people because of the inflexible Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, but more importantly we are losing control over the sensitive material—plutonium—which becomes more accessible with the development of advanced nuclear technologies around the world. Both Japan and Taiwan would rather work with the United States on constructing nuclear reactors, purchasing enriched uranium, reprocessing the spent fuel, safeguarding the sensitive material, and managing the wastes involved, but for reasons of energy independence, they will go elsewhere if rigid U.S. policies force them elsewhere.

With particular reference to Japan, I would urge my colleagues in the House to read "The Risen Sun," an article by Isaac Shapiro in the winter issue of Foreign Policy magazine pointing out recent changes taking place in Japan which suggest a revival of Japanese nationalism and growing independence in international affairs like the neonationalist movement in France during the 1960's.●

DAVE STOCKMAN IS RIGHT ON THE MARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, after less than 2 weeks at work, Budget Director Dave Stockman, has already incurred the wrath of special interest groups by attacking the runaway Federal budget. Mr. Stockman has thrown down the gauntlet by challenging this Congress to live up to its commitment to cut Federal spending immediately.

Some of Mr. Stockman's recommended budget cuts in foreign aid were made public last week, and as we might expect, this proposal was greeted unfavorably by the foreign aid lobby. But, as Mr. Stockman says, if we are serious about cutting the Federal budget, then all programs must be scrutinized. Before we begin trimming domestic programs, we had better be prepared to reduce the dollars that flow out of this country in the form of foreign aid.

As the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations for the past 4 years, I found many foreign aid programs that could and should be reduced. Mr. Stockman's suggested foreign aid cuts are an excellent starting point, however, we may be able to go even further in reducing some of these programs.

Regardless, the fact remains that Mr. Stockman has taken the initiative in cutting the budget. No one said that it would be easy, but reducing runaway spending is the most important challenge facing this Congress. I intend to support Dave Stockman in his effort to stop the hemorrhaging Federal budget. Clearly, foreign aid is an appropriate beginning.

As an example, one of the suggested Stockman cuts would substantially reduce the U.S. contribution to the International Development Association (IDA), which is the soft loan window of the World Bank. A soft loan is for 50 years with a 10-year grace period. There is no interest charge, rather only a less than 1 percent administrative charge. IDA extends these credits to the so-called least-developed countries. It is important to remember that Mr. Stockman is not suggesting that the United States should pull out of IDA, but rather we should reduce our contribution to it.

This proposed reduction is in reference to the IDA VI replenishment which the Carter administration negotiated. Under the terms of this replenishment, the U.S. share would be $3,240 million or 27 percent, to be paid in three annual installments of $1,080 million, fiscal year 1981-83. There were many of us in the Congress, including both Democrats and Republicans, who advised against such a large U.S. contribution to IDA VI. Consequently, the Carter administration was never able to obtain either the required authorization bill or the appropriation of $1,080 million in fiscal year 1981 as the first installment to IDA VI. The Carter administration in its last days did submit a fiscal year 1981 supplemental appropriation request for these funds and has resubmitted the authorization bill for consideration by the 97th Congress.

There are some who feel that President Reagan and the 97th Congress must enact the necessary legislation for IDA VI because it represents an internationally negotiated commitment which the United States should honor. I would point out that the U.S. Government's participation in the IDA VI negotiations was undertaken with the

full knowledge of all participating nations that these negotiations were contingent upon the United States obtaining both the authorizing and appropriating legislation from the U.S. Congress. This condition was spelled out in the communication delivered by the the U.S. representative participating in the replenishment negotiations when indicating preliminary U.S. acceptance of the terms of IDA VI. Consequently, since the 96th Congress never enacted either the required authorization or the appropriations necessary for U.S. participation in IDA VI, neither the Reagan administration nor the 97th Congress are required to lend support for this questionable initiative.

More importantly, as a result of the current economic crisis confronting our Nation, we must pay close attention to all new proposals which have the effect of increasing Federal spending. In addition, we must be wary of any new proposal which appears to have a minimum impact on short-term outlays but can be extremely expensive in the longer term outlay picture. IDA VI is just such a creature. Projected outlays for IDA VI in fiscal year 1981 are only $18.8 million, but by fiscal year 1983 they are projected to swell to $269 million. For the 3-year period of fiscal year 1984 through fiscal year 1986, IDA VI will cost the United States in outlays approximately $1.43 billion. In this regard it is important to keep in mind that the Reagan administration's most critical period for gaining control over the Federal budget by bringing it into balance is not the fiscal year 1981–82 period, but rather it will be the fiscal year 1984 to fiscal year 1986 period.

There are others who argue that we should support IDA VI because it is good for American business as a result of IDA procurement contracts being awarded to American firms. I do not accept this view. In the first place, while the United States has provided cumulatively 33 percent of all IDA resources, we have received only 15 percent of all IDA procurement of goods and services. In fact, over the last year the United States only received 10.8 percent of IDA's procurement contracts. By way of comparison, Japan provides only 9.9 percent of IDA's resources yet receives nearly 16 percent of all IDA contracts. West Germany provides 12 percent of IDA's resources and receives in return nearly 14 percent of IDA procurements. The United Kingdom provides 12.2 percent of IDA resources and receives 13.8 percent of IDA procurements. In the second place, there are many more cost-effective ways for our Federal Government to assist American business in promoting exports than having to borrow money in order to give it to IDA in the hope that some of our firms will receive procurement contracts.

There are others who would argue that we should support IDA VI because it represents an effective form of cost sharing in assuming the responsibility for helping developing countries. In part this is true because the U.S. share of IDA VI represents a reduction as other countries assume greater roles. However, I would hasten to point out that no other nation comes close to either the U.S. share of the IDA VI replenishment or our historical support for this institution. The truth is that the United States has done far more than its fair share in helping countries less fortunate than our own. In addition, I must point out that while the United States is being asked to provide $3.2 billion, for IDA VI, all of the OPEC countries combined will be contributing less than $700 million to IDA VI. These are the same OPEC countries which are expecting an annual surplus from oil sales in excess of $120 billion in 1980 alone. These are the same OPEC countries whose continued policy of price increases for petroleum is bringing about untold hardship to the governments in the least developed countries. While OPEC's price gouging is doing severe damage to our own economy, it is doing far greater harm to the fragile economies of these developing countries. For this reason alone, I believe it would be a wise and prudent course of action for the United States to insist on renegotiation of the IDA VI replenishment with the expressed purpose of obtaining a reduction in the U.S. contribution and a significant expansion of OPEC financial support for IDA VI.

Another argument frequently heard in support of IDA VI is how critical this replenishment is to the foreign policy of the United States. Clearly, continued U.S. participation in IDA is in our interest. Both Dave Stockman and myself agree with this view, however, that is not the issue. What we are arguing for is a much needed reduction in the level of U.S. support for this particular institution. In terms of promoting U.S. foreign policy through IDA, one has to look carefully at who receives IDA funding. Approximately 41 percent of all IDA lending has gone to one country—India. IDA has provided soft loans to India totaling over $8.3 billion. When you add in Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Indonesia, you can account for nearly 60 percent of all IDA lending worldwide. One has to ask whether 60 percent of the U.S. contribution—$6.4 billion not including the $3.2 billion for IDA VI—going to these four countries is in the foreign policy interest of the United States? In addition, what have we gotten in return for this investment in terms of improved relations with these countries? The fact is that IDA recipients do not consider it U.S. assistance. In the case of India, they seem to go out of their way to distance themselves from U.S. foreign policy. One example of this is in the area of nuclear proliferation—India has already exploded a nuclear device but is unwilling to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Finally, one should be aware that these same countries receive substantial amounts of additional aid from not only other multilateral institutions, to which the United States is invariably the largest single contributor, but from our many and varied bilateral programs as well.

Any discussion of IDA is not complete without reference to the growing body of evidence that all of the IFI's, including IDA, are expanding far too rapidly. Over the past 4 years I have addressed this issue repeatedly. I have highlighted the concerns expressed in the House Appropriations Committee's investigative staff report on the international financial institutions which was completed in March of 1979. There are a number of other reports which essentially deliver the same message. The quality of the project being funded by IDA is suffering due to the insistent demand for moving projects regardless of need or absorptive capacity of the loan recipient countries.

There is absolutely no question in my mind that IDA can and should do with far less resources. OMB Director Dave Stockman has signaled a willingness on the part of the new administration to fight for restraint in IFI growth, I only hope that we in the Congress have the courage to stand with him in the face of the cries from special interests.●

UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to participate in this special order to commemorate the 63d anniversary of independence for the Ukraine. As many of you know, the Ukrianian State was founded on January 22, 1918, and survived for several years before the totalitarian regime of the Soviets succeeded in overrunning the Ukraine and imposing on the Ukrainian people the same oppressive and ruthless control that exists today in so many other captive nations.

I have lived in the Soviet Union and observed firsthand some of the abuse and persecution that is heaped upon the Ukrainian people by the Soviet Government. I have observed their independent and indomitable spirit and their strong will to survive, hoping that one day they will truly be free people.

It is very appropriate today to pause and reflect on the condition of these brave people of the Ukraine, to realize that in spite of enormous adversity, there exists deep in their hearts a spirit of independence and freedom. We must help keep that spirit alive and do all we can to speed the time when these people will truly be free. We must insist and keep insisting that the Soviets adhere to the letter and spirit of the Helsinki accords and provide the basic human rights guaranteed by that agreement. We must continue to draw attention to the world community of the persecution and abuse and harsh treatment these captive nations receive at the hands of their oppressors.

Through us, we must insure that the Ukrainian spirit of freedom never dies, that the hopes and dreams of freedom for that nation will be fulfilled. It is not only our responsibility but our duty to do what we can to help them.●

VETERANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, last week, Congressman HAMMERSCHMIDT and I introduced H.R. 1400 which would establish a veterans' education and training assistance program for certain individuals serving in the Armed Forces.

This proposal is in response to the apprehensions of many Members regarding the failure of the military to achieve its recruitment quotas, and to recruit and retain quality personnel. If approved, the bill will enhance the capability of the Armed Forces to recruit and retain quality personnel, and at the same time, provide education and training assistance to all high school graduates who serve a minimum period of at least 3 years in the Armed Forces. H.R. 1400 also has a number of provisions to enhance recruitment and retention of personnel for the Selected Reserve and National Guard.

As I indicated in my statement when H.R. 1400 was introduced, President Reagan told the delegates to the National Convention of the American Legion on August 20, 1980:

> We must provide the resources to attract and retain superior people in each of the services. We should take steps immediately to restore the G.I. bill, one of the most effective, equitable, and socially important programs ever devised.

Hopefully, the budget amendments for fiscal year 1982 to be submitted by President Reagan next month will include funds to establish a veterans' educational assistance program which will be part of President Reagan's legislative program for fiscal year 1982.

Available information indicates that the best of all possible worlds is one in which the recruit and service member can avail themselves of preservice, inservice, and postservice benefits and provisions for certain eligible service members to transfer their unused educational benefits to their dependents. I believe the provisions of H.R. 1400 will accomplish these purposes, and will provide a tremendous boost to the Armed Forces in its efforts to recruit and retain the kind of personnel the military forces needs to carry out its mission all over the world.

It is anticipated that there will be hearings on H.R. 1400, and similar proposals, in the near future. All Members are invited to join with me in cosponsoring this most important legislation.●

STATEMENT ON JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION PROCESS

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

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to many of us that our Presidential nominating process is out of control and badly in need of reform. Last year we endured primaries in 37 States and hundreds of district and county caucuses in the remaining States.

The length of the preconvention campaign has been exhausting for both the candidates and voters. Aside from the preprimary campaigning, which actually began almost 2 years ago, we have had primaries running from New Hampshire in February to the last set of elections in June. The money involved greatly benefits the wealthier, well-known candidates. The early primaries have taken on an exaggerated importance and as a result, people in California, Ohio, New Jersey, and other late primary States were unable to choose from the full range of candidates. The decreased choices in the late primaries is a major fault with simultaneous, but geographically scattered, primaries that are staged through a 6-month period.

I am introducing a resolution to establish a Commission on Presidential Nominations to provide an urgently needed review of the Presidential nomination process. A similar resolution in the 96th Congress received broad bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate.

The Commission would analyze the current and alternative methods for the nomination of Presidential candidates, the selection of delegates to national nominating conventions, campaign financing, the selection process for Vice President, the effects of the news media, voter participation laws and regulation, and races by independent candidates for President.

The 20 members of the Commission would be appointed—6 each by the President pro tempore of the Senate—on the recommendation of the majority and minority leaders—the Speaker of the House, and the President, and would include the chairpersons of the two national parties serving ex officio. Members of Congress, elected and appointed State officials, and other citizens would be eligible. Its findings and recommendations would be reported within a year of the resolution's enactment in order to allow the Congress to act well in advance of the 1984 elections.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans go through this handwringing with regularity. After each Presidential election, the media, the voters, and the candidates all sag a bit and complain wearily that: First, something ought to be done about it or, second, ask why nothing has been done about it. This is always as far as it goes.

We can change all of that with this resolution that Congresswoman SNOWE and I have introduced today. It merits the attention, and support, of every bone-weary voter, reporter, and candidate who has ever gone through an American Presidential campaign.●

ASSASSINATION OF FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE JOHN W. WOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise because it has been said that the reason I have gotten up repeatedly on several subject matters in the last 2 years almost has been possibly because I would get some political mileage and particularly last year being an election year.

Of course, I never worry about it because you will always have that attitude, particularly about politicians that seek reelection every 2 years. And the truth, anyway, eventually, comes out. But I certainly would find very little political mileage in seeking this forum, with television cable coverage such as it is, when my district does not benefit from that kind of cable television service; in other words, my district is not one of the beneficiaries of it, so I would be a mighty poor politician to think I could use this as an instrumentality.

What motivates me is the fact that this is the only forum and the only tool that can effectively be used in registering the voice that one has here as a Member of the House.

I spoke out on what continues to be, in my opinion, the No. 1 issue confronting our Nation. That is the murder and assassination of the Federal District Judge John W. Wood in

San Antonio, Tex., 2 years ago on May 28.

□ 1400

Now, I have spoken out, as I have said repeatedly before, before the assassination of Judge Wood. Just 6 months before that almost to a day, there was the attempted murder of Assistant District Attorney James Kerr. And the murder of Judge Wood is unprecedented in the annals of American judiciary. We just simply have not had that kind of crime committed before.

The murder of Judge Wood is a clear declaration of war, insolence on the part of organized crime, which says that it can commit this kind of crime, flout the law, flout the enforcement officials, and challenge the whole structure of our U.S. Government, from the legislative to the judiciary to the executive, particularly the law enforcement branch, in the most serious way. So, we find that even up to this point the judiciary and the officers thereto are under U.S. marshal surveillance. It has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars to provide that while those who perpetrated the crime, as I have said, walk the streets with their heads insolently held high and feeling some protection and safeguard from prosecution, much less conviction.

I spoke out in a sort of a summation, in a very discouraged way, late in the summer; in fact, almost the beginning of autumn, on this floor. I had circulated a dear colleague letter with respect to a resolution expressing the sense of the House that we would urge the President to declare a priority in this crime by giving notice to the Justice Department that he would approve up to $3 million as reward money for information leading to the arrest and the conviction of those who attempted to kill James Kerr and those who had killed Judge Wood. The reason I did that was not because I felt that that amount or that approach was something I was cooking up, but I have had intimate contact with law enforcement level officials on all levels—local, State, national, for many years; even before I thought I would be in politics. I myself have been in law enforcement. I was chief juvenile probation officer for Bexar County for several years a long time ago, and I have nothing but sympathy and a sense of showing the problems and the degree and extent of the tremendous insoluble problems that are thrust upon our policemen and law enforcement agents to solve cases when actually we are making it almost impossible for them to do so.

This is the case with organized crime, as I have said—King Crime, as I call it.

Now, I have been told that the meager amount of reward available now—not public money, but private money subscribed to by some business elements in the San Antonio area, was insufficient; that there was one case in Houston, the neighboring city, in which there was an individual who, in exchange for absolute protection and more than the reward money that up to now has been available, would provide definite information, but was very fearful of his life. In fact, he said bluntly that he was not about to risk his life for $75,000 or $50,000.

The $3 million figure was a figure that we felt and that these law enforcement agents felt would be realistic, and if we did not appropriate it—and my resolution did not call for an appropriation but just said to the President, "Look, Mr. President, we think you ought to give this national priority, this crime. It has reached that point. Will you please let the Justice Department know that if they can effectively do so, you will have available to them up to $3 million for that purpose; namely, leading to the arrest and the conviction of those responsible."

Well, as I was talking, three of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle got up and very magnanimously said, "We did not know about this even though you circulated a letter, but we want to pledge to you support. We will be glad to do anything we can."

Well, that lifted my spirits because, for the first time, I saw that maybe I could get an effort to get a simple House resolution to a vote, because I am convinced that if we bring it to a vote, it will pass, because we are not appropriating money, but just a sense of the House. Well, a few minutes after that these same gentlemen looked me up and said that they would have to withdraw their support because they received a call from a colleague who, incidentally, represents the area in which the killing and the attempted killing took place. These gentlemen said, "You know, we would like to but we do not want to get into any kind of political fight. We do not know why he is calling us in very, very angry tones for us to disassociate ourselves from you."

I cannot to this day understand why either, for I had, and certainly at that time did not have, any kind of quarrel, or difference, particularly on this level where I have always gone on the basis that I am here to legislate. I am not here to fight. I do not duck a fight, but I do not look around for fights. I came up here to legislate, and it takes all my available strength and knowledge and ability, with all its limitations, just to try to perform as a legislator. So, I still do not know why.

It discouraged me, but I want to report to the House that I am ready to resume, and I am going to start asking for support on this money because in the meantime there has been no break in the case. It has been exactly where it has been all along. We had a lot of newspaper publicity because we had some news stories about some would-be culprits who are in jail in Houston and have been making statements and charging all kinds of violations of constitutional rights. But there is no breakthrough in either one of the cases.

I say to you that our whole system shows its clear vulnerability. I have said and charged before that organized crime has taken over completely from the highest level in our governmental circles and business circles to the lowest; from the national to the local. It is just a fact, as I see it, and the murder of Judge Wood is so unprecedented, so outrageous, that to think that almost 2 years later we do not even have an indictment; we do not even have an arrest; we do not even have a viable lead, is absolutely incredible; and I think is something that I should not cease to talk on.

Second, I also spoke out on the matter of the expulsion of former Representative Myers, and all in its wake, the Abscam procedures, in which again we have the first threat to the independence of the legislative branch, the first branch, by the executive. If the tactics used in Abscam fail to escape the minute attention, the thoroughgoing review by either the House or the Senate, let me tell you that the days of the independence of the legislative body are gone, gone if they have not already. I think they have.

No such thing could ever have happened in England with the Parliament having passed a resolution of contempt against that branch of the Crown's government had they attempted such a thing the way the thing was done. Now, the reason that there is so much confusion, and because we are all against corruption, we are all against dishonesty, and Americans take it for granted that we are honest. At least when I run, I have taken it for granted that my opponents and everybody else are honest because we take it for granted, and therefore we should react violently and with the greatest of indignation to wrongdoing, but the issue here is not wrongdoing. The issue now is the independence of the representative branch of government.

The third thing I spoke out on was more recent, and again unfortunately I could not make any points with the Carter administration. It has to do with the thing that I think is going to trip this country up in the Western Hemisphere in the worst possible way, namely, El Salvador. I spoke out on April 1 for the first time. I was concerned about the safety of our diplomatic mission. Since then, Americans have been killed. Fortunately, it has

not been the Ambassador, but the chances are that that too will happen rather than that it will not. In the meanwhile, we are being jockeyed into a position that no matter what this Government does, it is going to be wrong.

I suggested on April 1 to President Carter that he immediately exert American leadership collectively in the Western Hemisphere through the OAS, the Organization of American States. I feel now that that may be too late, but it is the only way because even if the right thing to do is to intervene unilaterally, it will be wrong from a historical and a practical purpose.

So, I am sorry that whatever I spoke out on that was to no avail. I will speak out on that again in the future because I think there are still points I want to make.

The last thing I want to speak on is a resolution I introduced. It has to do with Iran. I think it is absolutely unbelievable that on both sides, neither the Senate nor the House has looked to the clear constitutional duty imposed under the express powers conferred on the Congress by the Constitution in article I, section 8, clause 10—the last half of clause 10. Everybody has looked at the first half, and especially when the Government started, because piracy and the question of litigation of prizes was the big thing, but everybody has overlooked the second half where clearly the men who wrote the Constitution visualized this unprecedented act of outlaw and brigandage by Iran when they imprisoned our diplomatic personnel. That has not happened since before the Middle Ages, but the duty is on us under the Constitution to define that crime and to provide the punishment therefor.

You might say, "Punish how?"

There are many ways. The President did the right thing. He went to the United Nations; he went to the International Court of Arbitration and Justice, the World Court. All of them said that we were right, and so now to sit by because the hostages have been released and say, "That's it," I think is an egregious error and one that invites rather than diminishes a chance for future occurrences of this type.

Iran must be made to pay. By war? No. There are other means, but we have got to define it because otherwise even those actions taken thus far are questionable under international legal interpretations. But, if we define them, we will be right.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 43—A RESOLUTION OF THANKS FOR THOSE WHO HELPED IN THE RELEASE OF THE HOSTAGES

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

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr Speaker. I am sure that every resident of the 15th District of Michigan joins me in welcoming home 52 great Americans. I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Resolution 43—a resolution of thanks to some of the individuals who worked relentlessly until the final peaceful solution was reached. This resolution pays appropriate tribute to former President Jimmy Carter, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, and former Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher. Without their efforts, especially in those final few days, we might not have had a solution.

This resolution also offers our appreciation to the Algerian negotiators who played such an important role. They helped us prove that there are peaceful methods of solving international conflicts. Their commitment to negotiate brought this serious situation to a conclusion, and allowed our fellow citizens to come home.

Our sense of pride must be tempered, however, as we remember with sorrow those who lost their lives in the attempted rescue of our former hostages. Eight brave Americans died in a faraway hostile country, in a sandstorm. There is not a person in this country who is going to forget their heroic efforts.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of such a special resolution. I am happy that this measure welcomes the former hostages back to freedom in the United States. May their lives and those of their families be filled with peace.●

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET, THE TIME HAS COME

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, I am reintroducing legislation which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the budget be balanced. I have been fighting for a balanced budget ever since I came to Congress over 6 years ago.

At first, calling for a balanced budget was like a voice in the wilderness. Now, that voice crying in the wilderness has become a roar because it has become the collective voice of the American people, the administration, and, I believe, a majority of our colleagues.

The American people know that you cannot continue to outspend your income year after year without at some point reaching the day of reckoning. We have reached that point, and we have the support of the public to balance the budget.

We must now balance the budget in order to create a psychological climate which repudiates the past irresponsible spending habits of our Government and sets the stage for dealing with our most serious domestic problem, inflation.

What makes inflation such an intractable problem is that there are a number of causes, and we must deal with each of them—Federal deficit spending (which we are now attacking); excessive Federal regulation of the private sector that drives up costs and prices; price increases which do not reflect production costs; wage increases without increased productivity; price increases for basic and vital commodities such as oil, over which we have no control; and the inability to increase our productivity which may well be the most important factor in our inflation rate.

Let us remember who inflation hurts the most when we come to the hard choice about making spending cuts. Sure, it inconveniences the wealthy because they have to spend more for goods and services. But it strikes harder at the middle class who are struggling to make ends meet. And it is the poor and the elderly, those on fixed incomes, who are devastated by inflation. The very poorest people rarely even benefit from the social programs we have to cut. The poor have no elasticity in their budgets. They cannot make the "sacrifice" of a second car or a third television set. When food prices go up, they eat less. When transportation costs go up, they stay at home. When heating fuel prices jump, they are cold.

Remember those people and remember the hard-working, unsubsidized middle-income people, who pay most of the taxes, when you are confronted with the hard choice of voting for spending cuts called for by a balanced budget.

The balanced budget will strengthen the economy because only with a balanced budget can we reduce the national debt and eliminate Government deficits which means less Government borrowing in the private money markets. That, in turn, will mean more money will be available to private lenders and borrowers, and that translates into more housing starts, more capital expansion, more credit for farmers.

Here we begin to boost productivity and attack one of the root causes of inflation. If we are going to stimulate productivity in the private sector, we have got to put an end to Government competition for the limited funds available for private sector investment.

The Federal Government is also in competition with the private sector for goods and services. If the standard

definition of inflation is "too many dollars chasing too few goods," then the excessive Federal spending of the past years has contributed to that inflation. It is time to put an end to inflationary programs which increase the amount of money in circulation, but do nothing to stimulate the investment cycles which improve productivity in the business sector and result in jobs and greater balance between prices and costs of production. A balanced budget will mean a cut in real spending by the Federal Government and a decrease in these nonproductive programs.

Further to stimulate investment and productivity, a balanced budget with reduced spending and reduced deficits can and should be tied to tax cuts. A tax cut, tied to a balanced budget, means that people will have more money to spend and invest—again, another boost for productivity.

We have not had a balanced budget since 1969. Since that time, the Government has spent like a drunken sailor, money that we did not have to spend.

We were, in effect, charging fur coats to our grandchildren. We are paying the price for our recklessness now in astronomical interest rates, double-digit inflation, swollen governments at all levels, and a regulatory morass created to administer the spending of the money we did not have.

Some people have said that Congress alone is the cause of increasing Federal spending. Congress certainly has played a role in the sad history and now that is being changed this year. But I think it important to point out that each and every year since 1970, the Congress has appropriated fewer of the taxpayers' dollars than the Presidents have requested. I repeat, in each year Congress spent less than the President requested and that goes for President Nixon and President Ford, as well as President Carter.

A balanced budget means that we are finally putting a stop to the spending spree. We are creating a psychological climate which repudiates the past and says to ourselves, to the stock and bond markets, to our trading partners, to the rest of the world, that we will put our fiscal house in order, that we will restore faith in the value of the dollar, that we will increase productivity, that we will decrease our national debt, that we will begin to act in a fiscally, monetarily, economically sound way. We will begin to set a climate of careful management of our income, careful husbanding of our resources, careful planning and tighter control of our budget.

We must send the message to the spenders in Congress and to the American people that a balanced budget is essential and attainable, and is the only way to restore fiscal sanity to our economy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to balance the budget.●

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR DISABLED SPOUSES, WIDOWS AND WIDOWERS

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

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, we have been cautioned that social security commitments may be greater than the willingness or ability of future workers to support the program. As a result, the 1977 Social Security Amendments sharply reduced future retirement benefits. Last year, disability benefits were reduced by as much as 30 percent for young disabled workers. This year there has been talk about eliminating the minimum benefit and denying benefits to children of retired, disabled, or deceased workers who wish to go to college or vocational school after they are 18 years of age.

In this atmosphere, it is somewhat like rowing against a tidal wave to continue to call attention to unfairness in present law. Nevertheless, I believe any review of the social security program must include a reexamination and a restatement of program principles. My own review has led me to the introduction of H.R. 1266 to amend the Social Security Act to provide benefits for disabled spouses of annuitants, full benefits for disabled widows and widowers, and to remove the recency of work test for all fully insured individuals.

The premise of the Social Security Act is that workers who are aged or disabled are entitled to a wage replacement benefit. An additional benefit is added for aged spouses or for a younger spouse if there are young children to be cared for. Survivors' benefits are payable to dependent children and to the parent providing care if the children are under 18. A spouse who is not yet retirement age or who is not caring for children is not eligible for a benefit as he or she is expected to be able to enter the labor market. This expectation is neither realistic nor in keeping with the principles of the act if the spouse is disabled.

My bill provides that the disabled spouse of any annuitant will be treated under the law as if he or she had reached age 65. That is, unreduced spouse benefits would be payable from the first month the wage earner was entitled to a benefit.

A second provision similarly authorizes unreduced benefits to disabled surviving spouses at any age.

In 1967, when widows' benefits were first provided to women over age 50, the drafters of the legislation took a cautious approach. Questioning the ability of vocational experts to judge the wage earning potential of persons who had never been a part of the work force, the bill decreed that widows would be judged by medical critieria alone. If the experience of wage earner claims is applicable, approximately 25 percent of severely disabled widows are rejected because their age, education, and experience are not considered.

The irony of this stricter test of disability is twofold. First if a widow is found so severely disabled as to qualify for a benefit, her annuity is still actuarially reduced for each month she is under 65. Second, if on the basis of medical impairments alone she is not considered disabled, she can exhaust all her resources and then qualify for SSI because since 1974, the same State agencies which, presumably, are unable to apply vocational factors to disabled widows have been applying those factors to SSI applicants whether or not they have ever been a part of the work force.

The final provision of my bill eliminates the requirement that disability benefit applicants must be insured in 20 of the 40 calendar quarters ending with the onset of disability. This so-called recency of work test unfairly discriminates against women who are in and out of the labor market due to child care and homemaking responsibilities. It penalizes persons whose work careers alternate between public employment and employment covered by social security. It also discriminates against persons with chronic or degenerative diseases who are often denied the opportunity for employment long before they are able to meet the strict disability criteria of the law.

Disability benefits are based on average indexed earnings over a working lifetime. Under the new disability law, fewer years of low or no earnings can be dropped out of the computation when averaging wages and no dependents benefits are now paid to disabled individuals with a significant number of years with zero earnings. Under these circumstances, I believe it is time to change the insured requirement for disability from one-quarter out of two to one out of four, which is the measure for fully insured status.●

BOB GIBSON INDUCTED INTO THE BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

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

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of January 1981, the Baseball Hall of Fame inducted into its league of legends one of the greatest pitchers in the history of the game—Bob Gibson. I think it a tribute to the man

and his achievements that not only was he an overwhelming choice for induction, he received this honor in his first year of eligibility—a distinction shared by only 11 other players. Elected by 84 percent of the total ballots cast, Gibson's competition included such greats as Don Drysdale, Gil Hodges, and Harmon Killebrew.

I am privileged to call this to the attention of the House and to share with my colleagues a brief synopsis of his career.

Gibson pitched just over 3,884 innings in his 17 years with the St. Louis Cardinals. He struck out 3,117 batters, making him one of only four pitchers to retire more than 3,000 batters. He amassed 251 wins while losing only 174 and attained a remarkable earned run average of 2.91.

In five seasons he distinguished himself by winning 20 games. Of the nine World Series games he pitched, seven straight victories are to his credit. He is the only pitcher to have won the seventh game of the World Series twice.

In the 1968 World Series opener against the Detroit Tigers, Bob Gibson struck out 17 batters—a record that still stands. He has received the Most Valuable Player Award and is a two-time recipient of the Cy Young Award. Now, as a fitting tribute to a brilliant baseball career, Bob Gibson is immortalized in the Hall of Fame.

Ron Fairly once said of Bob Gibson:

> There are players that play the game of baseball that attempt to live up to standards. This man sets them.

Mr. Speaker, the House is not just a Chamber privileged with legislative authority. It is also privileged to recognize true excellence across the Nation. In my mind, the name Bob Gibson is synonymous with excellence. I ask the entire House to join in honoring Bob Gibson upon his receiving the crowning award of his profession—induction into baseball's Hall of Fame.●

LEADING THE WAY IN PROTECTING AMERICA'S FARMLAND

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

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, America's farmland is a natural resource of profound national and international importance. This land enables our people to be among the best fed in the world and, at the same time, to contribute more than any other nation toward fighting world hunger. It is no secret that our agricultural economy is the envy of the world, and American farmers through their productivity make the biggest contribution toward redressing our serious balance-of-payments problems. But forces are at work within our society and isolated decisions about agricultural lands with potentially grave consequences are actually being made now at a time when the crucial importance of this resource is practically invisible to most Americans. Consider the following:

Secretary of Agriculture Bob Bergland said:

> In my lifetime, we have paved over the equivalent of all the cropland in Ohio. Before this century is out, we will pave over an area the size of Indiana.

One million acres of prime American farmland has been converted to nonagricultural use per year during the past decade.

Three to five million acres per year is the rate at which all U.S. farmland is being converted to nonagricultural use.

Since we are a largely urban society, many of us may ask: "In a country as big as America, why should we be concerned if the total acreage of farmland is declining?" The seriousness of the threat posed by current trends of vanishing farmland was graphically illustrated by Washington correspondent George Anthan in a series of articles published last July in the Des Moines Register:

> Everytime a baby is born in the United States, agriculture loses 1⅛ acres of cropland. The connection isn't direct—it's a mathematical comparison of population and land-loss trends—but it dramatizes a problem; our population is growing, our available farmland is shrinking, and our per-acre crop yields are leveling off.

Anthan lists the following projections for the year 2000 if current farm land losses continue:

All food produced in the United States will be consumed here;

Consumer food prices will be pushed sharply upward. This will be a real price increase, not just an inflation increase;

Food exports no longer will be available to help offset massive trade deficits, such as payments for foreign oil. This almost certainly would have a major negative effect on our national economy, and

The hungry people of other nations will be on their own for food supplies.

To make matters worse, foreign investors are buying more and more American farmland. They even get a break on capital gains taxes that Americans do not get. A GAO report issued last July found that in a survey of all land purchases in 55 counties between January 1, 1977, and June 30, 1978, of the 3 million acres that changed hands, 248,146 acres—8 percent of the total—was purchased by foreign investors from at least 30 countries.

Many other countries do much more than America to preserve ownership of land among their own citizens, particularly farmland. For example, most of the OPEC countries have laws prohibiting foreigners from buying any public or private lands within their borders. I am including with this statement a chart demonstrating how much easier it is for foreign investors to buy American farmland than is the case in many countries including our allies, such as Japan.

Concern for our shrinking farmland is growing. Unfortunately, as is too often the case, some U.S. Government agencies are working at cross purposes. Although the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act, an August 1976 memorandum by the President's Council on Environmental Quality, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's current land-use policy all ask Federal agencies to analyze the effects of their activities on prime farmland and to make a special effort to protect these lands from conversion to other uses, the General Services Administration (GSA) has not gotten the message. Even now, while the national agricultural lands study which was initiated in June 1979 with 11 Federal agencies participating, under the cochairmanship of the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, is underway and due to be released very soon, the GSA has continued to sell prime farmland for nonagricultural uses.

Specifically, in 1979, GSA sold at public auction or transferred to local governments and nonprofit organizations approximately 14,340 acres of land valued at $165 million—some of it prime farmland—with little regard for returning to agricultural use surplused Federal land. As you might imagine, those Americans who were farming the land prior to its acquisition by the U.S. Government find it very difficult to reacquire the same land when it is surplused and they have to compete in public auction with foreign investors and/or commercial developers.

At this juncture, when the Federal Government's role in support of State and local government efforts aimed at retaining farmland is still evolving, it makes sense for the Congress to take a qualified step to encourage returning farmland no longer needed by the U.S. Government to farm production in American hands. I have prepared a bill to achieve this limited and timely purpose.

My bill amends the Federal Property Act of 1949 to state that, with respect to surplus Federal lands to be disposed of by GSA which were in agricultural use at the time they were acquired by the U.S. Government, prior owners or tenants who lease from prior owners would be given first right of refusal to buy back their farmland at fair market value as determined by independent appraisal. In simplest terms, under my bill persons who were farming certain lands and who sold their property to the U.S. Government would be given the right to buy their land back prior to it being

auctioned in public, provided they agree to return the land to agricultural use for the lifetime of the prior owner or tenant, whichever applies.

This legislation will insure that the U.S. Government protects our vital interest in keeping prime American farmland in agricultural use and primarily in American hands. It is fair and prudent that the U.S. Government set an example by giving American farmers the right to buy back their land at fair market value once the U.S. Government no longer has a use for it.

GSA should have no difficulty in administering this bill should it become law, since there already exists legal precedence for granting first right of refusal on farmland surplused by the Federal Government. Throughout the 1940's, such a priority was established under Federal law by the Surplus Property Act.

Finally, to underscore the importance of the Federal Government taking the lead in addressing the problems resulting from vanishing farmland, I am inserting the following for the RECORD:

First, a list showing how several other countries regulate the use of their public and private lands; and

Second, a compelling article from the July 1, 1980, edition of the New York Times by M. Rupert Cutler, the former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment, in which he calls attention to our need to act to avert a crisis developing because of the rapid loss of agricultural land.

COMPARATIVE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS GOVERNING PURCHASES OF LAND BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN SEVERAL DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Iraq, Kuwait, Qatar, Libya, and Saudi Arabia: These nations prohibit foreigners from purchasing public or private land.

Portugal, Belgium, and United Kingdom: No restrictions are placed on aliens who wish to purchase public or private land.

Argentina: Aliens are required to register with the government if purchasing public or private land.

Austria: All Austrian states restrict foreign ownership of agricultural and forestry land, and the majority of them restrict alien ownership of all public or private land. Aliens must obtain a permit from the state government to purchase public or private land that is available to foreigners.

Brazil: Aliens are not allowed to own land along national borders. Aliens are not allowed to own agricultural land without permission from the government. Foreigners are allowed to purchase all other public or private land that is for sale.

France, West Germany: Aliens are allowed to purchase public or private land if there exists a reciprocal relationship with the country the alien is from.

Guatemala: Foreigners must obtain a permit from the government before purchasing public or private land. Aliens cannot buy land within 3 kilometers of oceans, lakes, or rivers. Foreigners cannot buy land 50 kilometers of a border line, unless they obtain special permission from the government.

Mexico: Foreigners can purchase public and private land with permission from the government. Under no circumstance may an alien acquire direct ownership of lands or waters within a zone of 100 kilometers along the frontiers and 50 kilometers along shores of the country.

Japan: Foreigners may acquire public and private land after obtaining the approval of the government.

Canada: Strict screening procedures are used by the government to check aliens who wish to buy public or private land. The Canadian provinces also impose their own restrictions on foreigners who want to buy public or private land.

Switzerland: Aliens must obtain a permit from the government. Foreigners are not allowed to buy land near military installations.

Sources: "Foreign Investment in U.S. Agricultural Land—How it Shapes Up." G.A.O., July 30, 1979. "Land Ownership by Nonresidents in Certain Foreign Countries," Carleton W. Kenyon, Law Library of Congress, November 28, 1979.

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1980]

THE PERIL OF VANISHING FARMLANDS

(By M. Rupert Cutler)

WASHINGTON.—America is on the brink of a crisis in the loss of agricultural land that may soon undermine our ability to produce sufficient food for ourselves and other nations of our hungry world.

Every day in the United States, four square miles of the nation's prime farmland are shifted to uses other than agriculture. Visualize a strip of land a half-mile wide stretching from New York to California. That's a million acres—the amount of prime farmland irreversibly lost to agriculture every year through urban sprawl.

Florida, producer of half the world's grapefruit and one-fourth of the world's oranges, will lose all of its unique and prime lands in less than 20 years if the current conversion rate continues. New Hampshire and Rhode Island also are destined to lose all of their prime agricultural land.

The status and availability of our agricultural lands are being examined in the National Agricultural Lands Study, being carried out by a Federal inter-agency task force led by President Carter's Council on Environmental Quality and the Department of Agriculture. Ten other Federal agencies are participating.

The study's projection for an imminent wipeout of unique and prime farmlands in Florida, New Hampshire and Rhode Island is based upon its analysis of the Agriculture Department's 1967 conservation-needs inventory and the Soil Conservation Service's 1977 national-resource inventories, which showed acres converted to urban, industrial, transportation and water uses in every state.

If conversion continues at the 1967-1977 rate, grave losses are foreseen in other states. West Virginia will lose 73 percent of its prime farmland in less than a generation; Connecticut, 70 percent; Massachusetts, 51 percent; Maryland and New Mexico, 44 percent; Vermont, 43 percent; Utah, 35 percent Virginia, 24 percent; Washington, 23 percent; and Pennsylvania, 21 percent. New York and California, both top agricultural producers, will lose 16 and 15 percent, respectively, and New Jersey, 9 percent.

Why should we be concerned?

Prime farmland is the best land for farming. It is flat or gently rolling, and susceptible to little soil erosion. It is our most energy-efficient land, producing the most food with the least fuel, fertilizer and labor.

Prime, flat acres are also the easiest, least expensive to build upon. Despite soaring costs, the land is still a speculator's bargain in many regions. But the nation and the world may pay a devastating price for today's quick profits on development dollars.

Consider this observation by Allen Hidlebaugh, resource inventory specialist in the inter-agency task force: "Even in America's agricultural heartland—the Corn Belt states—there is cause for concern. We anticipate a total of 3.2 million acre prime farmland loss in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Missouri combined if present trends continue to the year 2000. The annual loss will equal 480 million bushels of corn—at $2.50 a bushel a permanent loss of $1 billion a year every year by the century's end."

Florida's State Commissioner of Agriculture, Doyle Connor, says: "Every time a highway or retirement homes are built on Florida farmland, we increase the likelihood of our dependence on other nations for food. Already the U.S. is importing vegetables from Mexico and South America. Today we are experiencing deprivation because of our dependence on foreign oil. Is the next deprivation food?"

What is the solution? With varying success, 48 states are attempting to protect their agricultural land. Sophisticated and effective farmland-retention programs are under way in Oregon and Wisconsin. New York is the first state to have organized agricultural districts, thereby protecting more than six million acres—well over half the state's best agricultural land. At high cost, Connecticut, Massachusetts and New York have purchased the development rights of prime farmland. Zoning and preferential taxation are in effect in many states; usually this merely delays rather than prevents conversion.

Because there is no national policy to protect prime farmlands, some Federal agencies have recognized a need for action. In 1978, the Agriculture Department and the Environmental Protection Agency adopted policies limiting the adverse impacts of their actions on prime farmlands. Other Federal agencies are developing similar policies.

An approach worth serious consideration may be a requirement that a Federal project include the cost of acquiring the development rights of agricultural lands that are equal in productive capacity to land lost through the project's action. In all likelihood, this would result in the selection of project sites with little or no adverse impact on prime farmlands.

Perhaps the greatest need of all is for public education. People must fully understand the irreplaceable value of prime farmlands, and the ominous meaning of the war between the bulldozer and the plow. When farmland goes, food goes. Asphalt is the land's last crop.

[M. Rupert Cutler is Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.]●

ESTABLISHING PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION AS AN AGENCY WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Iowa (Mr. BEDELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish the Packers and Stockyards Administration as an agency within the Department of Agriculture. According to the language in the bill, the Packers and Stockyards Administration will, as an agency within the Department, be responsible for enforcing the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, and be supervised directly by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, to those of my colleagues who are aware that already a unit of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service exists as "Packers and Stockyards," my bill may appear unnecessary—in fact, even undesirable given our general concern that the number of Government agencies be reduced. However, I believe that the establishment, by specific legislative mandate, of the Packers and Stockyards Administration, is essential to assuring that the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, are effectively enforced.

From enactment of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 until 1958, responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the act was delegated to an enforcement unit as USDA which assumed different names and different positions within the Department of Agriculture's hierarchy. With passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act Amendments of 1958, however, the Secretary of Agriculture was instructed to "maintain within the Department of Agriculture a separate enforcement unit to administer title II of this act." Unfortunately, this language proved insufficient to assure that the act would be properly enforced by an agency with a measure of independent status, yet supervised by the Secretary, rather than one relegated to the depths of the Department's layered bureaucracy.

After nearly a decade of prodding by the Congress and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. WHITTEN, the Department of Agriculture, in 1967, recognized the importance of maintaining an effective enforcement body and established the Packers and Stockyards Administration. The Packers and Stockyards Administration, as a separate enforcement unit, effectively and responsibly carried out the provisions of the act during a period when significant changes in the livestock industry tested that agency's authority and resources.

However, to the dismay of many of us concerned with the well-being of the livestock industry, the Department of Agriculture in 1977 took action to strip the Packers and Stockyards Administration of its title and stature and instead ordered it to its present position as a subsidiary of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

I can understand, Mr. Speaker, that in his zeal to streamline the organizational chart for the Department during a period of renewed emphasis on responsible Government management, a USDA bureaucrat probably felt the shifting of this small but important agency was wise and prudent. Unfortunately, I do not feel that this move proved to be in the best interests of the livestock industry. At a time when challenges facing the industry demanded more effective enforcement of the 1921 act than ever before, Packers and Stockyards was, without reason, made part of a larger agency with which it shares no common purpose.

The bill I am introducing today contains language identical to legislation I introduced in the last Congress in an attempt to get the Department to move on its own accord to establish Packers and Stockyards as a separate enforcement body. The intent of that legislation was supported by both the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Cattlemen's Association.

In the course of several meetings with USDA officials on this matter during 1980, I was told that the Department agreed that Packers and Stockyards should be independent and that the necessary steps would be taken administratively to effect this change. In fact, all the necessary paperwork was drawn up and approved at the various administrative levels and was sent to the Secretary for his signature. Unfortunately, final approval did not come before the election and it was decided by the outgoing administration that the matter should be left up to the new Secretary. However, I am hopeful that the intent of this legislation will win the support of Secretary Block and the new officials at the Department.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my legislation is simple and direct—to create a separate Packers and Stockyards Administration that is closely supervised by the Secretary of Agriculture. I am confident that my colleagues will recognize the need for this legislation, and I urge that they lend it their full support.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 1575

A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to establish the Packers and Stockyards Administration

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 407(b) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 228(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall establish and maintain as an agency within the Department of Agriculture the Packers and Stockyards Administration which shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed and supervised by the Secretary. The Secretary shall enforce and administer this Act through the Packers and Stockyards Administration.".

"IF THE FLYING PUBLIC KNEW ABOUT THIS!"—A WMAQ RADIO NEWS SPECIAL REPORT

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, WMAQ radio in Chicago recently aired a special report entitled, "If the Flying Public Knew About This!," which focuses on some of the major problems that remain unsolved within our aviation system.

Though much of the material in this documentary pertains to O'Hare Field in Chicago, the problems are by no means restricted to that airport—deficiencies in the air transport system abound nationwide, and daily endanger the lives of unsuspecting Americans traveling the "friendly skies."

The intention of this documentary is to lay the facts before the public, and they are scary indeed. Alleged discrepancies in temporary certifications of FAA technicians; the continuing computer outage problems; the alleged failure of the FAA to keep up with state-of-the-art advances in increasing both air worthiness and crash worthiness for the Nation's air carriers; and the alleged lack of top professionalism within the FAA itself.

Not only do I frequently fly in and out of O'Hare Field, but it is part of my congressional district. I am shocked and angry that conditions exist that could bring about a major air or ground collision that would endanger the lives of hundreds of innocent victims.

I think it is imperative that Congress and the public be aware of the major problems outlined in this documentary, and that immediate steps be taken to rectify them.

I am pleased to share this outstanding documentary, and strongly commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

"IF THE FLYING PUBLIC KNEW ABOUT THIS!"—A WMAQ RADIO NEWS SPECIAL REPORT

(Written, researched, and produced by: Harry Mantel. Reported by: Walt Hamilton)

INTRODUCTION

"If the Flying Public Knew About This!" closely examines some serious charges against the Federal Aviation Administration for its failure to provide maximum safety for the flying public. Essentially, the FAA is accused by the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board of failing to keep up with "state-of-the-art" in air crash worthiness, or, the ability to minimize crash impact and fire casualties.

This special report examines charges of FAA technicians that the Federal Aviation

Administration at O'Hare Airport, in Chicago, has approved the scheduling of untrained personnel in key positions of responsibility. The final part of this radio documentary centers on an issue of air safety still unresolved at O'Hare Airport, that is said to be a potential hazard for aircraft landing in instrument flying conditions.

The intention of this report is to bring current and new charges of FAA mismanagement into sharper focus. People heard in this report, in order of their appearance, are:

Tom Couch, FAA Electronics Technician, O'Hare Airport.

Dan Wood, FAA Radar Technician, O'Hare Airport.

Howard Johannsen, President of Professional Airways Systems Specialists (PASS).

Jim O'Connor, FAA Controller, O'Hare Airport.

Warren Zentz, FAA Computer Technician, O'Hare Airport.

Congressman Elliott Levitas, Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Review of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, House of Representatives.

James King, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board.

George Low, Chairman, Committee on FAA Airworthiness Certification Procedures, National Research Council.

Congressman Robert Whittaker.

Ken Patterson, FAA Chief of Great Lakes Traffic.

Senator Birch Bayh, Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation.

Congressman Norman Mineta, Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Review.

Del Mott, Director of Safety, Association of Flight Attendants.

Jean Griffen, Flight Attendant.

Anthony Broderick, FAA Technical Adviser to the Associate Administrator for Aviation Standards.

John O'Brien, Manager, Engineering Operations, Airline Pilots Association.

(Sound: Jets landing.)

COUCH: "Now I'm the Operations Officer. And I am totally incompetent of handling that job. I have had no training at resetting the radar, resetting the computer. I don't know the names of the systems, I don't know where they are. I'm out of my field. If the flying public knew about this, wow!"

WALT: That's Federal Aviation Administration employee Tom Couch, an electronics technician, telling of doing a job at O'Hare Field, he knew nothing about.

WOOD: "But the problem is no one has ever questioned the FAA. Everyone has taken the FAA's word for everything as the authority on all of the equipment, on all of their staffing, their training, all their facilities."

WALT: Radar technician Dan Wood; he's another employee of the Federal Aviation Administration.

JOHANNSEN: "The FAA in the past is what I called a 'band-aid' operation. We have seen too many occurrances of problems, and then the rushing after the problem, after the accident, the death and destruction, to find some cure, how can we prevent that in the future. But there's never been that, well let's see what we can do about it now to prevent an occurance."

WALT: That was Howard Johannsen, President of the Professional Airways Systems Specialists, called PASS. His union represents many FAA technicians; the people who maintain the radar, navigational, computer and communications equipment, all so vital to guiding big jet aircraft to and from busy O'Hare Field.

O'CONNOR: "The most critical point is the transition period from the time you lose the computer to the time you revert to the old system. You've got 60 Journeymen here that know how to move airplanes, and you just can't move airplanes under the old system as you did the new system, with the computer. You've also got Journeymen here that have no knowledge of working without the computer."

WALT: That was Jim O'Connor, an FAA controller. Like Couch and Wood, he works at O'Hare International Airport. Known as the world's busiest. I'm Walt Hamilton. What you've just heard are some major complaints against the FAA. Not all the complaints were made by FAA employees, or people working under FAA regulations. You'll hear complaints against the FAA . . . in the next few minutes, from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board and from a Committee of the National Research Council. Its 'blue ribbon' investigation followed the crash of flight 191 at O'Hare, in May, 1979. We began looking into the complaints from FAA technicians and others the following January. What we found might startle you, or make you angry . . . That you're not as safe as you think.

Warren Zentz is a computer technician at O'Hare, and President of his PASS union local:

ZENTZ: "The worst possible failure of any equipment at O'Hare is a total radar failure. O'Hare has a large amount of traffic—even on Christmas Eve—the most recent failure. There were many, many airplanes in the sky. Perhaps 7 on final, or 7 being vectored for final. During a power-power outage, our radar site did fail, both channels failed. The controllers immediately—they have procedures—they really went into their radar failure procedures. They had to rely upon only memory where these aircraft were. They had no eyes, so to speak. They did not know exactly where these aircraft were."

WALT: This was Christmas Eve, 1979. About a month later, in February, a report critical of the FAA was released by the General Accounting Office. That report was requested by two Congressmen a month after the San Diego mid-air collision in 1978. 137 people were killed in both aircraft, and 7 on the ground. The GAO report concluded: The American taxpayer and the flying public were not getting full value from the Federal Aviation Administration. In June 1980, Congressman Elliott Levitas of Georgia told a congressional subcommittee the GAO report was a "scathing indictment of FAA".

LEVITAS: "The conclusion of the GAO was that the FAA does not have an effective system for identifying safety hazards, does not have a comprehensive planning process to address safety issues, does not have an adequate system for planning and approving individual safety programs, does not have a proper system of controls to govern the implementation phase of safety program nor does it have a sufficient evaluation of safety programs and projects. I have previously suggested that's a scathing indictment of FAA."

WALT: That same month, Chairman Phillip Handler of the National Research Council sent a report to the Secretary of Transportation. He said the "blue-ribbon" committee formed to investigate aircraft safety, found significant faults in a system that has operated with a good safety record. One major criticism in the report was "increasing technical domination of the FAA, by the industry it regulates, or . . . the industry has better people. It urged the FAA to upgrade the technical quality of its staff as soon as possible. A few weeks earlier the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, Jim King, in a rare public attack by the NTSB Chairman, told a congressional sub-committee that a nylon escape slide had melted from radiant heat, given off by a burning jetliner that was aborted on takeoff at Los Angeles a year earlier. 186 passengers and 14 crew members evacuated the burning plane, but 2 people were killed. King said better fire-resistant materials were available long ago . . .

KING: "Why did it take a fatal accident for FAA to learn that emergency slides failed in common emergency conditions and that better products have been available for years. Why doesn't the FAA keep abreast of the state-of-the-art and then incorporate research and new improvements as they become available?"

WALT: Those nylon escape slides that melted from the radiant heat still are used on aircraft today. The National Transportation Safety Board can only recommend to the FAA, it cannot order the FAA to act on its recommendation.

George Low was chairman of the committee of 13 national aviation experts which was established following the flight 191 crash in Chicago. Low has "blue-ribbon" credentials; he directed man's first flight to the moon when he worked for NASA. He now is President of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

LOW: "What has happened over the last 5, 10, 15 years, is that the cost of serving our government has become enormous, and therefore, at all levels, whether it's the beginning level, the middle level, the upper level, at all levels, the government no longer attracts the best technical people, probably also not the best business people, non-technical people, into its own ranks. That needs to be changed."

WALT: So it appears that safety can suffer . . . without competent people. Case in point: The total radar failure we've mentioned, that occurred at O'Hare Field in Chicago, on Christmas Eve, a year ago. Technicians Tom Couch and Warren Zentz told us what they believe happened:

COUCH: "Well, this particular radar failure, you're talking about, was an FAA supervisor pushed the wrong button. Did he not?"

ZENTZ: "The radar did not come back the way it was supposed to come back. We have procedures for power failures. The radar is supposed to come back after a power failure. We do have an engine generator at that site. The engine generator did start. Something happened. Something major happened to that radar and it did fail."

COUCH: "If you could see the look on the controller's face—if the flying public could see what the controller goes through when the radar fails. . . ."

ZENTZ: "The operations officer sits at a console with the radar remote control buttons at his fingertips. The tower did experience the power outage as the radar site did. It was three minutes later—I was the person that finally pressed the button to bring the radar back up. As Tom says, the controllers were very, very excited about this because O'Hare is a dual-input site. We did have another radar—we have one radar display in the I.F.R. room which is orientated approximately 14 miles south of O'Hare Field. And the controllers—every controller in the

I.F.R. room at the time rushed to that scope."

WALT: Radar technician Dan Wood told us nothing was wrong with the equipment. We were told the man who was supposed to bring the radar back, after the power failure, with an emergency generator was not properly trained to do it. Wood, as vice President of his union, complained to FAA management, that they had temporarily certified a technician improperly. This is what his management told him:

WOOD: "It is their prerogative to give certifications to whoever they think is qualified. Well, in this case they said that this man was indeed qualified, and the next day they gave him a certification exam to prove it. Well, he failed the certification exam the following day. So that didn't prove it."

WALT: Dan Wood claims that technicians are intimidated by the FAA management into accepting temporary certification, to avoid paying overtime to a certified technician. All this was Christmas Eve, 1979. Just 2 weeks later, a meeting emptied important O'Hare control points of supervisors. Warren Zentz and Tom Couch told us what happened:

ZENTZ: "On January 15th, they had a management by team action meeting and there wasn't a supervisor left in the house. Technicians were appointed to be operations officers, the same position that was responsible for the radar outage."

COUCH: "I was one of them."

ZENTZ: "Tom Couch was one of them."

COUCH: "I am no more capable of resetting that radar or that computer than I am of performing brain surgery. January 15th is the day they had that meeting, that I was appointed to be one of the operations officers. And of course if you turn this down, you're a bad guy. So off I go between midnight and eight in the morning, now I'm the operations officer. And I am totally incompetent of handling that job. I have no training at resetting the radar, resetting the computer. I don't know the names of the systems, I don't know where they are. I'm out of my field. If the flying public knew about this, wow! If an instrument landing system would have failed I don't believe I would have known how to reset it. I could have punched a lot of buttons. There are 12 instrument landing systems at O'Hare. That's an insurmountable figure. And there is a monitor panel for each one. Well, if I would have had to call an ILS technician from the field, sometimes that could take 20 minutes, it's a big airport. Now picture the pilot making an ILS approach and the glide slope fails. And here I am trying to punch buttons, and I punch them at random."

WALT: The FAA at O'Hare responded to what you just heard, saying, individuals are asked to fill the position of maintenance operations officer and are not appointed, and that Couch could have turned down the request if he didn't feel qualified. The FAA added that qualified technicians are on duty 24 hours a day to advise the operations officer. It denied technician Dan Woods charge that technicians are intimidated into taking on responsibilities beyond their capability. The individual can refuse temporary certification, if he or she doesn't feel qualified.

(Sound: Controller Voices.)

WALT: We've heard some serious complaints against the FAA. Others accuse our air traffic control system of mismanagement. Congressman Bob Whittaker of Kansas:

WHITTAKER: "I began to get interested in the reliability of the air traffic control system back early November of last year when we had the near miss over the Leesburg Center just outside Washington, and at that time in order to get better briefed on the background, I requested the opportunity to tour the Leesburg Center and which I did. And the outcome, the outgrowth of that tour, was that I was told, I was given information that simply did not measure up to what I knew the facts to be."

WALT: Congressman Whittaker made a very serious attack on the FAA's ability to safely control air travel in the United States, when he addressed a convention of airways technicians in Chicago last May.

WHITTAKER: "I became convinced in looking back over committee testimony that FAA has for a decade at least enjoyed the reputation of whatever they say is accepted as gospel. They have never been questioned about the reliability of their equipment, or what they're telling the American public or the Congress of the United States. And they have been able to sidestep the really hard questions that have been posed to them, and avoid answering in documented form."

WALT: Congressman Whittaker asked the Attorney General to investigate the FAA for falsifying documents. He claimed the number of computer outages or failures at air traffic control centers was as much as four times what the FAA had testified to Congress; the computers used to prevent mid-air collisions. Whittaker claimed he had documents that showed at least one computer failure every 63 minutes in the United States.

WHITTAKER: "There have been near misses that have occurred just within the last week that have been denied by the FAA, until we have forced them to admit it. Back in March there was a near miss over San Diego that at first, when we asked about it, they said it didn't occur. When we persisted in it, they finally said that 'Well, yes there was a computer outage at the time, but there was no incident,' and only when we asked for the voice tape and the computer profile of that specific time, did they finally admit 'Well, yes, Congressman, there was in fact a near miss that did occur,' and then they have the audacity to thank me for pointing out a near miss."

WALT: Congressman Whittaker's charges were denied by the FAA's chief of Great Lakes Traffic, Ken Patterson. Patterson said the Congressman was misinformed and that the FAA never falsified documents given Congress on computer outages.

PATTERSON: "What the Congressman apparently is doing here is lumping together actual failures or outages with what are known as unscheduled startovers. The latter is a self-correcting action by the computer to rid itself of incorrect data. These generally last less than 10 seconds or less time than it takes the radar scope to make one full sweep. Each center averages about six startovers and one outage a week. And we're talking about 20 centers in the United States."

WALT: But the rash of public attacks continued. Last October, Indiana Senator Birch Bayh, who was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Sub-Committee on Transportation, said the FAA would not get the 2.8 billion dollars it requested to replace its computerized traffic control system. Not, Bayh said, until the FAA improved the management of its present system.

BAYH: "We feel that the FAA has a real management problem and in order to address this we asked some rather specific questions to the FAA, which seemed rather elementary, but the answers were not forthcoming. For example, since I happen to be a Senator from Indiana, we asked why it was the Indianapolis center had one of the highest computer outages of all the centers for last year, some 17 hundred minutes."

WALT: Senator Bayh said the FAA told him that was not the case. But it turned out the Indianapolis Center's computer outages ranked third behind New York's La Guardia airport and Chicago's O'Hare.

BAYH: "We have been suspicious about the amount of homework, the foundation work the study work that's gone into what they really do need. And I don't think we should short change dollars and end up with two or three hundred people being killed out here in a sudden ball of fire. By the same token, if we're going to invest this kind of money, it seems to me we ought to know we should invest it and that when we invest it we get a safer system that can be efficiently managed, not the kind of system we have right now that is inefficient."

(Sound: Jets taking off.)

WALT: Let's move on from the dangers of computer breakdowns, to surviving an airliner crash.

MINETA: "I suppose the big thing that got us started was the crash of the DC-10 in Chicago. And so out of that then came some specific interest about this whole issue of not only crash prevention, but also crash survivability because those are the two broad areas that we have to deal with in transportation safety."

WALT: That was California Congressman Norman Mineta. He says Congress is interested first in preventing airline crashes, and second, if a crash occurs, what can be done to reduce the chance of injury or death. Mineta is Chairman of the House sub-committee that is investigating the FAA's progress in improving aircraft cabin safety regulations.

MINETA: "Just as they feel they are about ready to go with a new piece of equipment after having gone through testing, getting the issue in the Federal Register, and doing a lot of things, someone will say hold it, there's a new device that's better than the one you're about to market, or about to put out in the field and we think you ought to hold up on this thing. And this kind of stop and go is a problem that does plague FAA."

WALT: Congressman Mineta told us only last week that FAA's "stop and go" research is still not working. He said the FAA may never get the ultimate answer for crash survival. He said his four years working for aircraft safety have met sharp resistance from the FAA.

MINETA: "But it's this kind of thing that I think the Oversight and Review, which is the investigative committee for Public Works and Transportation— it's this kind of leverage that the O and R committee has on the FAA. Because they will then be able to direct their attention and, so to speak, put the heat on the FAA regarding a certain subject matter."

WALT: One of the major frustrations with the FAA, Mineta said, is the strengthening of the passenger seats. (The G forces he talks about here are multiples of human body weight.)

MINETA: "And I pointed out it seems a little ludicrous that for automobile seats you have 20 G's forward and for airline seats its 9 G's. Now, the FAA had been looking at that, but I had written a letter to them indicating that this is the area I wanted to get into. They all of a sudden started cranking-up their engineering and

regulatory people to take a look at that before the hearings I held in June."

WALT: Another sharp critic of the FAA's lack of progress in improving aircraft cabin safety is the National Transportation Safety Board. Its batting average for getting its recommendations adopted runs about 80 percent. While the Board cannot force the FAA to do anything, it can create the climate for the Congress to order the FAA to account for its progress. In 1974, the Safety Board was specifically authorized to conduct independent accident investigations. The Board's members are appointed by the President and report only to the Congress. At last June's hearing, the Safety Board's Chairman, Jim King, ripped the FAA's failure to update seat strength standards, which, he said, were for an old airplane of the forties and early fifties, the DC-3, much slower than a jet aircraft.

KING: "When these work standards were promulgated, the DC-3 was the workhorse of the US air transport fleet with an approach speed of about 90 mph. Today our jets have an approach speed of about 140 mph and . . . keep in mind that the speed and weight are geometric in the equation in a crash impact. Well, we have seen many technological changes as over the past 30 years, there have been virtually no improvement in passenger seat strength."

WALT: Chairman King testified the Safety Board had recommended strengthening aircraft seats since 1969. And he said the FAA consistently rejected the Board's recommendations. He said during their accident investigations, "it was often apparent that aircraft occupants could have survived the impact if their seats had remained attached to the cabin floor." And, "time after time," King said, "we discover that the most fragile participant in the accident is not the human body, but the seat." He said most of the passenger seats failed in the crash of a turboprop carrying 45 passengers that landed on a street in Albany, New York eight years ago (March 3, 1972). King said most of the seats, with their occupants still belted in them, were thrown forward into the cargo compartment, all piled on top of one another. Fourteen passengers died. King went on to attack the FAA's failure to improve cabin fire safety. He charged the FAA's research lagged years behind the Air Force:

KING: "We believe that several solutions are available for the implementation rather than for further research, for instance there are fireproof materials available that can serve as fire blocking layers in seat cushions. Some 4 or 5 years ago the Air Force developed a modified apoxy resin canopy for fighter aircraft which protects the pilot from external fire for at least 5 to 10 minutes. Only now, is the FAA going to research the application of this material for cabin windows, to prevent melting of the windows and allowing flames to penetrate the cabin."

(Sound: Jets landing at O'Hare.)

WALT: Safety Board Chairman King also attacked the FAA for inadequate cabin lighting in a smoke-filled burning aircraft.

KING: "We know that lighting is more effective closer to floor level and that the technology is now available, and by the way, has been for many years, to provide lighting directional indicators at floor levels to guide passenger exits. Let me pause here Mr. Chairman, when you talk about a fire in a aircraft, what happens is the smoke goes immediately to the ceiling so that you lose virtually 100 percent of the lighting including the emergency markers. So that if you stand up and try to exit in smoke, you're going to be lost. So that having the lower lighting actually serves two purposes. It brings your head down so you can see it (the difference in my height, if I stand up in a cabin fire can be 400° between my head and my knees). So if I am stooped over, my chances of survival are actually enhanced. And now I have a legitimate guidepost to go along and there is no reason why this can't be done and couldn't have been done some time ago. Similarly, technology is available to provide adequate breathing and vision devices for both crew and passengers. An important and longstanding recommendation which the FAA is not even considering."

(Sound: Jets landing at O'Hare.)

WALT: Chairman King flew to Chicago at our request last week to elaborate on his complaints against the FAA's lack of progress in improving aircraft cabin safety. We sat with Chairman King in an empty wide-bodied jet aircraft at O'Hare Field. He is concerned about the lack of a safe seat for flight attendants.

KING: "FAA for years resisted giving the flight attendants what I call a good safe seat. Now, for us at the NTSB what we wanted to do was to create an environment for that person who's a flight attendant, to quite frankly survive the accident, optimize their chance of surviving an accident uninjured. Why? They, most people don't realize that the flight attendants are highly trained professionals in relation to emergency procedures, and more than likely they'll be the only people helping the passengers, because the flight crew has got all kinds of things they're going to do in evacuating an aircraft. And it's critical that the plane be evacuated within 90 seconds."

WALT: Chairman King emphasized that "off-the-shelf technology" has been available for years to provide stronger aircraft seats.

KING: "They're giving them a seat that doesn't fail downward . . . many of us have gotten on planes that seem where they have these bench type seats that fold down . . . we wanted those strengthened so they didn't fail very readily . . . now I don't view that as unreasonable . . . I don't view that as something that's pie in the sky . . . we're talking about off-the-shelf technology that's years old . . . and yet the battle for these seats for flight attendants went on for years . . . and it's a philosophical attitude we're struggling with, not the products, not the design, and not necessarily even the financial aspects . . . it's just that there's been a resistance philosophically to change."

WALT: Chairman King said the human body can withstand much more force than the passenger seat. Only recently, he said, has the FAA agreed to strengthen aircraft seats.

KING: "The question we have is when we know that the body tolerances go to 45 G's, we know that the aircraft . . . most of our new aircraft . . . will take in excess of 20 G's . . . why can't we have the seats somehow permit people to survive when the shell of the aircraft can survive? And we're concerned about that . . . for example, our most recent accident with an air carrier was in Nebraska Valley, Nebraska, where 13 people died . . . of the 13 people, eleven of them died because their seats failed."

WALT: Were they thrown out of their seats or . . .

KING: "The seats collapsed . . . the seat went with them . . . some, the belts let go because they were attached to the seat, but in every case they died of secondary impacts . . . hitting against other things in the aircraft. So, if those seats had stayed fixed to the floor, most of them would have survived."

WALT: We learned from Chairman King that the FAA has failed to require seats made from other materials than deadly polyurethane.

KING: "The thing about the seat itself, it's the largest potential fire mass in the aircraft, other than the fuel, inside the cabin area. And the present material produces a very substantial smoke, toxic gas and flame. And with the flame of course is heat. So we get all the negative things. And as I suggested earlier, you really have very short time. If you're ever in an aircraft that's crashed, or is having a fire in an emergency, leave everything. That's the one thing we found on a profile, if you want to see who the survivors are, if you want to be a survivor, I'll tell how you can do it: Whatever the sequence is, leave everything. Don't look for a thing and get out of the aircraft."

WALT: Chairman King said a new seat material has just been developed by NASA that resists burning and does not give off toxic gases. King faulted the FAA for lagging behind NASA in research, and for not using available products, for example, that could prevent aircraft windows from burning quickly. He said a melting cabin window enables a jet fuel fire in the wings to invade the cabin. It is critical to evacuate the aircraft within 90 seconds, and some of these products that could delay the fire are already on the shelf, he said, but are not required by the FAA.

KING: "There are products available. As I've said they've been around for five years. We're now, quote, in the final stages of FAA looking at tests by the way that NASA has done, and my question is with a very large research and development program that FAA has, why can't we stay at the state-of-the-art? And we shouldn't have to wait for a major tragedy or a near tragedy to say, alright, let's start our research. When we see the products coming down, many of them from the military, the technology in the military is extremely helpful in civil aviation. And so what's the applicability of this to our situation? Can we draw some use from it? There's no reason everyone has to go out and reinvent the wheel."

WALT: The problem at FAA, he said, was not with the people who did the research. The problem was getting the research (as he put it) "translated into action".

KING: "The people who do their work in scientific areas are some of the most competent in the world, if not the most competent. They know what the problem is. And they have scenarios that would help. But somehow, as I said, within the organization it doesn't get translated into action. If you ask me why, I don't know. But I'm persuaded that if the American people understand that it is there, they'll create the climate in which change will occur."

WALT: Well, then we asked Chairman King if the FAA Administrator, Langhorne Bond, was the problem:

KING: "Administrator Bond has been responsive, but he's been told one thing by his organization, and it isn't until we get into congressional hearings, and quite frankly, we have some very shrill conversations as we've had over the past few years, that he then goes down and digs it out himself and says, 'you know, you've been misleading me,' that we should have timetables on this re-

search that's been going on, that facts have been known, that studies have been done. Superb studies have been done within FAA, but somewhere it gets lost in the middle of its management scheme."

WALT: Chairman King and Congressman Mineta's subcommittee agree that the results from the FAA's research programs emerge at a snail's pace. King and Mineta both told us they don't want cabin safety programs delayed any longer.

KING: "But you can still build that system one piece at a time and that's been our problem. FAA's position has been we don't fix it piecemeal. If we can't get the ideal seat, if we can't get the ideal cushion material, if we can't get the ideal fabrics and wall panelings, then we don't think anything should be in. The question is where have they moved ahead where they've had known technology? I'm talking about now. It's interesting in crash worthiness. We haven't seen it. Now I must admit they've started to move on all areas. The Congress has become very interested in this, and because of the Congress's interest, the FAA has become considerably more responsive."

WALT: Chairman King's earlier complaints about the attendants jump seat were echoed by the Association of Flight Attendants Director of Safety, Del Mott. She says the organization has been fighting the FAA for years over the jump seat.

DEL MOTT: "There are very few people in the aviation world that have not heard of our problems that are related to the flight attendant jump seat. Yes, in fact, we have taken the matter in writing and verbally to the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Transportation Safety Board, to the Flight Safety Foundation, and to the airlines themselves. I don't think there's anybody that we've missed in the aviation community concerning that one subject. Because we're very concerned about being able to get our passengers off the airplanes. But obviously we have to be concerned about our own lives, too."

WALT: Del Mott has been a flight attendant for 20 years. She told us that she first sat in the closet, then in the washroom, now in the cabin. The flight attendants are also unhappy that the FAA is now permitting carriers to fly greater distances over water without life rafts. Del Mott also said she is upset over the FAA's intention to reduce the number of flight attendants aboard an aircraft.

GRIFFEN: "A little boy who had been sitting in the middle of the cabin had been dragged by some manner all the way underneath all the seats to the last row of seats. We have no idea how he was able to get there, he was alive at the time, and we could not free him. We couldn't get him loose from underneath the seats. In the end 18 passengers survived and 45 were killed. By that time the smoke was so thick that we had to leave."

WALT: By chance we interviewed flight attendant Jean Griffen on the same date eight years after she was nearly killed in Chicago's Midway Airport crash. Today, Griffen still flies for the same airline. As she just pointed out on that day, December 8th, 1972, a little boy without proper seat restraints was dragged underneath the seats and trapped. (We don't know whether he survived.) We do know that the National Transportation Safety Board for years has urged the FAA to provide seat restraints for small children.

GRIFFEN: "In your training, I think that we have a very excellent training program, you are told that in evacuation you have ninety seconds, which isn't a very long time to get everybody out. The sounds that I heard at the time of the crash were the same sounds that we had been—had listened to in training—the sounds of metal and everything. But one thing I hadn't expected was to see the shambles of the interior of the airplane, to see the seats collapse and the overhead bins collapsed. I think that your feeling is that you will have ninety seconds, that you can get to everybody, that everybody who survives the impact will be able to get out, that they're not going to be tangled in the wreckage, that they're not going to be hampered by the cabin interior collapsing on them."

WALT: Jean Griffen and Del Mott were together when we taped this interview. We asked Del Mott if there have been any major improvements in aircraft cabin safety since the crash that nearly killed Jean Griffen.

DEL MOTT: "No there haven't. She made another statement also which concerned the galley components, in other words, pieces of the galley that come out. That is something which is only now—her accident was in 1972, this is 1980—that is only now being addressed in the regulations. Now as far as the overhead racks, it always bothers me when I go out to an accident site and I see what occurs with those overhead racks even though they're closed. Because they do collapse, they do come down."

WALT: As you can see, there is enormous frustration experienced by people in their dealings with the FAA. The flight attendants, the Congress and Senate, FAA technicians, controllers, airline pilots and the National Transportation Safety Board. Chairman Jim King:

KING: "We're a small agency. What we've done is, we take accidents which, by the way, are not usual, and we'll take these rare accidents and say here are some of the scenarios you could look at and examine, and learn from. And one of these problems is that they'll look at them, and as I've said again, the professional staff will look at them, say yes that's a legislative scenario, will work on it, and then we don't see the change. And that's the area that I think is most, most aggravating."

WALT: King's frustration starts in the 1961 crash of a DC-8 in Denver. He testified to Congress the FAA has not delivered the promise it made 19 years ago. That promise, he said, was to act on the toxic combustion of the materials used in aircraft interiors.

KING: "I must say that 19 years after the Denver accident, I just felt that enough promises for studies have been given to us and to the American people. I just feel that someone ought to stand up and say let's have a timetable. I think we've been patient. I think we've been decent. I think we've been responsible. But I think there's a time when people say we've given our money. We relied on the lead agency, in this case the FAA to have basic safety concerns, and they haven't been met. And I don't think it's unreasonable at this stage of the game for someone like myself to be out saying 'when are you going to do it? Let's give us a timetable, and if you can't will you turn it over to someone who can?'"

WALT: Congressman Mineta's subcommittee met again last September and asked FAA Administrator Langhorne Bond what the FAA was doing about aircraft cabin fire safety. Administrator Bond said there were no quick and easy solutions to the problem. He said a special group of aviation experts, called the SAFER Committee, supported his conclusions, saying whatever the FAA was doing was right. Congressman Mineta disagreed. He said he was not impressed with the Safer report.

KING: "Again if we're sounding shrill, or sometimes frustrated, it's because we are. And sometimes, as I put it, we're a tiny organization. We're dealing with an agency of 57 thousand. So how does the ant get the elephant's attention? I think sometimes by shouting a little louder maybe than he should. But in this case, child restraints. We go back on the same 19 and 20 year discussion that we had earlier, and that was each time there was an accident we were assured there would be a seat coming forth. And finally, in Portland, Oregon, two years ago, we had more children on an aircraft that came down . . . this was a DC-8 on approach that ran out of fuel, came into a neighborhood and there we are. . .and again the FAA says to us we're going to have to study child restraints. Now at that time, quite frankly, I said, 'when are you going to have a child restraint?' The highway mode has got a child restraint that will stand up under, what, 20 G's. Why can't you just take that and apply the technology? Do you really have to go back to the wheel and figure out the spokes in the hub? Can you take something like that and just adapt it? Well, I must say this month we're looking forward to seeing a proposed rule-making that will finally make it possible to protect young children who are traveling with their parents. Because most parents do not have any understanding. We see this all the time in aircraft; mothers and fathers holding on to their young ones sitting in their lap. There is no way on God's green earth that if you experience anything over 4 G's you can ever hold onto your child."

WALT: Chairman King acknowledged the FAA has finally agreed to provide restraints that could save children's lives. The agreement came under the Safety Board's pressure. The FAA also agreed under pressure of Congressman Mineta's subcommittee that passenger seats will be strengthened. King reported no progress with the FAA in the issue of making the aircraft cabin flameproof.

(Sound: Jet landing.)

WALT: FAA's Anthony Broderick replies to the issue of cabin fire safety by examining the figures on those who die only from post-crash fire. Broderick is Technical Advisor to the Associate Administrator for Aviation Standards.

BRODERICK: "In congressional testimony earlier this year, the Administrator pointed out something which I think is instructive. And that is that the total number of people, for example in the subject of fires, who survive aircraft accidents, but who perish because of the post-crash fire, average something like thirty people a year for the big jet airplanes. Thirty people a year. Now, we can compare that number to virtually any other form of transportation and see that no matter how much research we do and how much research we implement, we are not going to have a large effect on saving human lives. Even, if we had perfect post crash fire survivability. Now, what is the average made up of? Unfortunately, it's made up of a few sensational accidents."

WALT: The FAA's Broderick offered some facts the flying public should know. We believe they are accurate.

BRODERICK: "Aircraft transportation is the safest form of transportation in the world. We transport the equivalent of the entire

population of the United Stats on a round trip from Washington to Boston every year. It's 250 billion passenger miles. The aviation transportation system in this country is so good, so fantastically safe, the people have an amazingly high expectation. It should be perfect. And anytime there is any flaw seen in the system, people are outraged. Now, I don't think that's necessarily wrong, because we are trying indeed for the ultimate goal of no accidents and no injuries."

WALT: It may appear, according to Broderick, that we have been pursuing the wrong story about FAA. That we should have examined the other, positive side of the coin.

BRODERICK: "I guess the point I'm trying to make is that an aircraft accident, unfortunately, is a sensational event. Okay, it receives intense media interest because it appears on every list you'll ever want to see of great disasters because of usually a large number of people are involved. People, however, fail to recognize the incredible safety record involved. And I don't blame them, and we don't in the FAA bemoan that fact."

WALT: Earlier we said that a "blue ribbon" committee of the National Research Council has spent six months investigating the FAA's certification procedures of aircraft. This followed the DC-10 crash at Chicago's O'Hare airport when one engine tore loose from the giant plane. Although the investigation was limited to certification and not crash survivability, the committee did report many deficiencies within the FAA. Chairman George Low said the bottom line was simply that the FAA, like many government agencies, does not attract the best technical people. What Low was saying was that when he directed man's first landing on the moon, his people at NASA were the best. Well, we asked him what about the selection of the FAA's administrator:

Low: "We suggest that the present system of selecting the administrator is somewhat hit or miss. It depends so very much on whether the Secretary of Transportation wants a real professional person or whether he may in the future at some time, without even talking about the past, use that position for a political plum, if you will. We think we should take the job that controls the safety of the flying public of the United States out of the hands of that 'luck of the draw', if you will, and instead, the Secretary of Transportation and the President should have to select the administrator from a pool of candidates suggested by a high level board (we call it, I think, an aviation safety board) established of people with impeccable credentials of all walks of life, of all parties, of labor, of management who will have the interest of that industry in heart only, who will recommend the best possible people for that job. After all, our lives depend on it."

WALT: When we talked with George Low, he was on his way to Washington to serve on President-elect Reagan's transition team for NASA. We asked the former deputy administrator of NASA whether a better working relationship between NASA and the FAA could improve aircraft safety?

Low: "I think NASA is a highly capable agency to do some of the research, not all of it, but some of the research that the FAA needs done. You talked about fire proofing, you talked about seats, NASA is highly capable in all of those areas. I think at the working level it works very well. What we recommend in our report is that there should be more formality in this arrangement so that again, the FAA knows what it is going to get from NASA and NASA knows what it should provide for the FAA."

WALT: George Low said that his committee did criticize the FAA for not organizing its research efforts and for not driving to a conclusion. That was the same criticism made by the National Transportation Safety Board and the House Oversight and Review Subcommittee. Another conclusion for George Low: He's high on the airplane.

Low: "I want to reiterate that the business is very, very safe today. Only 16 fatal crashes caused by the airplane alone in the history of jet aviation. Which is more than 20 years now. We are concerned, I'm concerned, that unless the government agency that controls that safety, the FAA, becomes more streamlined and is able to attract better technical people, we will not be able to retain that safety record. So the bottom line has to be that our recommendation should be looked at very hard, either by the present administration or by the next. And we feel strongly should be adopted as a group."

(Sound: Jet planes landing.)

O'BRIEN: "What is in effect now in Chicago are at least two ILS systems that don't have any glide slope monitors—external monitors—and we are getting into the snow season now, so we could run into what is considered a potentially hazardous situation."

WALT: That was John O'Brien of the Airline Pilots Association. For the past year we have, with O'Brien, looked into that potential danger, caused by the FAA shutting down glide slope alarms, at O'Hare Field. The glide slope, or glide path, alarms protect an aircraft on final approach from coming in too low, on an instrument landing, and crashing into an obstacle near the airport. A former airline pilot, John O'Brien, now manages the engineering operations for the pilots union.

O'BRIEN: "Now the reason there's a monitor there, and the monitor tolerances are set up to certain tenths of a degree, the signal when it's flight-checked is allowed to vary in height by a very small amount. . . . However, once it varies in this case more than four-tenths of one degree . . . you do not have adequate clearance above terrain or obstacles out in the approach path . . . so, indeed you could have an accident . . . an accident involving the airplane flying into an obstacle."

WALT: O'Brien told us it's necessary to have the 'near field monitor' checking the glide path, going out from the ILS (Instrument Landing System) or antenna. Now, bear in mind that the pilot flies his airplane entirely by his glide slope instruments, down through the clouds to the runway, in instrument weather conditions. We asked O'Brien what could cause the radio beam of the glide slope to bend, and endanger the landing aircraft:

O'BRIEN: "In front of the actual ILS antenna itself, there is a clear area out there where the ILS signal is actually reflected off the ground. Now if something contaminates that clear area, for example, snow or water or a vehicle, a truck or whatever, then the signal that's radiating from the antenna becomes disturbed and it may cause it either to be completely blocked or it might change its angle from the desired angle."

WALT: O'Brien says the FAA turned off the glide slope alarms at O'Hare, after huge piles of snow caused many false—nuisance—alarms two winters ago. The false alarms forced the planes to make missed approaches. This fouled up departure and arrival schedules, at the world's busiest airport. O'Brien says that he has not received any satisfactory answer from the FAA in Washington why near-field monitors were not turned back on at O'Hare. We asked the FAA in Washington the same question, and got no answer. We asked the FAA in Chicago for an answer, we're still waiting.

O'BRIEN: "From a pilot's point of view, we believe that the ILS system should have an external monitor and we believe that the FAA program to reduce nusiance warnings is, indeed, a valid program. But we can't feel that the way Chicago is handling it is a safe method at all, since they have their monitors turned off. And we are getting into the snow season now, so we could run into what we consider a potentially hazardous situation."

WALT: Those words, 'hazardous situation,' are typical of what we've tried to point out for the better part of an hour, in this survey of what we believe are major complaints against the FAA, complaints that have a great deal to do with improving the national aviation system. We acknowledge the Federal Aviation Administration for its superior performance and safety record while at the same time we have reported on the alleged deficiencies within the same system. One conclusion of the National Research Council, in its report to the Secretary of Transportation, can be boiled down to this: 'The technical sophistication of the FAA must not stand pat . . . it must keep pace with the advancing state-of-the-art.'

(Sound: Jets taking off and controllers.)

"If the Flying Public Knew About This" was written, researched and produced by Harry Mantel.

Principal Engineering by: Tom Schnecke.

Other Engineering by: Connie Abel, George Adams, Mike Berry, Shelly Flannery, Marvin Goldsher, Jesse Moore, Al Osterhoff, Walt Peters, Bob Petrillo, Mike Pratts, Al Randall, Ken Steininger, Dave Wolfe, and Don Witt.

Our Thanks to Reporters: Bob Roberts, Al Swanson.

And Special Thanks to NBC Washington Stations WRC and WKYS.

I'm Walt Hamilton.●

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

Mr. HYDE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CORCORAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RITTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFRIES, for 15 minutes, February 4, 1981.

Mr. DAUB, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVITAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEDELL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HYDE, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $3,315.

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

Mr. WINN.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. TAUKE.

Mr. PORTER in two instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in four instances.

Mrs. SNOWE.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

Mr. WEBER of Minnesota.

Mr. RINALDO.

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

Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. MILLER of California in 10 instances.

Mr. BRODHEAD.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. SKELTON in five instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. WASHINGTON.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. FITHIAN.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. DASCHLE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1981, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

451. A letter from the Comptroller, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting the company's balance sheet as of December 31, 1980, pursuant to section 313 of title 43, District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

452. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting the third annual report on domestic travel restrictions imposed by the United States and foreign governments, pursuant to section 126(c) of Public Law 95-426; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

453. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, transmitting notice of a delay in the submission of one of the country reports on human rights practices required by section 116(b) and 502B(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

454. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting the first report on the general causes and purposes of travel in agencies spending more than $5 million annually on the transportation of people, certain cost data, and inefficient travel practices, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 96-346; to the Committee on Government Operations.

455. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a followup report on the recommendations contained in the final report of the National Commission on Neighborhoods dated March 19, 1979, pursuant to section 6(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

456. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a report, including financial statements, covering the Commission's operations during fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 1312 of Public Law 96-70; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

457. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the annual report of the Postmaster General for fiscal year 1980, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 2402; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

458. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Economic Development Administration for fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 707 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

459. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing the construction of an annex to the Federal Courthouse in Charleston, S.C., pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

460. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting an interim report on the effects of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act Amendments of 1978 on the Federal civil service, pursuant to section 15(g)(2) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, as amended (92 Stat. 192); jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civil Service.

461. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notice of a delay in submission of the first detailed energy targets required from the President by section 301(a) of Public Law 96-294; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Science and Technology.

462. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Small Business Administration's pilot programs to improve delivery of the guaranty loan program (CED-81-25, Feb. 2, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Small Business.

463. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the feasibility of epidemiologic investigations of the health effects of low-level ionizing radiation, pursuant to section 5(d) of Public Law 95-601, as amended (94 Stat. 792), and section 308(a) of Public Law 96-295; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1553. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit (Rept. No. 97-1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 1553. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 1554. A bill to provide for the development and implementation of programs for youth camp safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1555. A bill to amend section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radios be capable of receiving both amplitude modulated (AM) and frequency modulated (FM) broadcasts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1556. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to prohibit the manufacture for sale in commerce of articles of interior furnishing intended for use in any public facility unless such articles conform with requirements established by the Consumer Product Safety Commission designed to make such articles fire resistant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1557. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury, concerning measures necessary to insure the security of firearms, ammunition, and explosives being transported in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1558. 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, preven-

tion, and detection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1559. A bill to establish a grant program for the acquisition of medical equipment and supplies for the treatment of aircraft accident burn victims; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1560. A bill to provide for certain research and demonstration respecting the disposal of sludge, the reclamation of waters damaged by sludge and sewage, assistance to State and local governments for the removal of sludge and other solid waste from waters and shoreline areas and to provide that grants for waste treatment works shall be made only if such works provide for environmentally sound sludge management; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act to require the Congressional Budget Office, for every bill or resolution reported in the House or Senate, to prepare and submit (along with its regular estimate of the Federal cost involved) an estimate of the cost which would be incurred by State and local governments in carrying out or complying with such bill or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 1562. A bill to amend the Small Business Act or restrict the authority of the Small Business Administration to deny financial assistance to small business concerns solely because the primary business operations of such concerns relate to the communication of ideas; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 1563. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 1564. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain veterans entitled to wartime disability compensation for disabilities and diseases caused by or attributable to exposure to atomic or nuclear radiation during their period of active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1565. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide outpatient dental services and treatment to any veteran who has a service-connected disability rated at 60 percent or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1566. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of supplemental security income benefits, recipients of aid to families with dependent children, and recipients of assistance or benefits under certain other Federal and federally assisted programs will not have the amount of such benefits, aid, or assistance reduced because of post-1974 increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1567. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; and to remove rate inequities for married persons where both are employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1568. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for Federal participation in the costs of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of certain psychologists' services under the supplementary medical insurance benefits program established by part B of such title; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require automatic sprinkler systems in all nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities certified for participation in the medicare or medicaid program, and to provide for direct low-interest Federal loans to assist such facilities in constructing or purchasing and installing automatic sprinkler systems; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 1571. A bill to permit collective negotiation by professional retail pharmacists with third-party prepaid prescription program administrators and sponsors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself and Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland):

H.R. 1572. A bill to establish a Minority Business Development Administration in the Department of Commerce, to clarify the relationship between such Administration and the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Small Business.

By Mr. AKAKA:

H.R. 1573. A bill to compensate those persons who served as enlisted members in the Philippine Scouts and the insular force of the U.S. Navy during World War II for the difference between their actual pay and allowances authorized for other enlisted members of the Regular Army and Regular Navy of corresponding grades and length of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for an allowance of 4 cents per mile to Federal employees for the use of bicycles while engaged on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BEDELL:

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to establish the Packers and Stockyards Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to promote public safety by encouraging the employment of highly qualified air traffic controllers by establishing a salary classification system providing compensation commensurate with responsibility, by establishing a reasonable maximum number of weekly work hours, and by establishing a special retirement plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORRADA:

H.R. 1577. A bill to extend the revenue sharing program to provide fiscal assistance to territories of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

H.R. 1578. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow veterans with service-connected disabilities who are eligible for military retired pay for nonregular service to receive compensation for such disabilities from the Veterans' Administration and to receive such retired pay without reduction in either such compensation or such retired pay; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 1579. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to $10,000 the amount of savings interest which may be excluded from gross income by individuals and to make such exclusion permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage the building and rehabilitation of rental housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself and Mr. SWIFT):

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax-saving incentives for savings accounts established for the purpose of purchasing a home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1582. A bill to provide a bonus payment of $10,000 for each veteran of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend Public Law 94-400 to require that the Secretary of the Interior maintain the confidentiality of information gathered from victims of the Teton Dam disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1584. A bill to provide for certain benefits for the U.S. citizens held hostage in Iran; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Utah (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BENEDICT, Mr. LEBOUTILLIER, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. GREGG, Mr. DUNN, and Mrs. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1585. A bill to reduce the pay of Members of Congress by 8 percent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 1586. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to prepare an economic impact analysis in connection with the promulgation of occupational safety and health standards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1587. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions, to lower certain age limits from 21 years to 18, and to eliminate certain recordkeeping provisions with respect to ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1588. A bill to exempt the exchange of certain technological information relating to motor vehicles from the application of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1589. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration medical center in Indianapolis, Ind., as the "Richard L. Roudebush Veterans' Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1590. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a minimum pension of $600 for veterans of a period of war who have permanent and total non-service-connected disabilities and who are entitled to receive pension and for the surviving spouses of such veterans who are entitled to receive pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1591. A bill to provide a program of emergency unemployment compensation for areas experiencing high rates of unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIS (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1592. A bill to amend the adjustment assistance programs under the Trade Act of 1974 in order to impose fees on articles causing injury to domestic workers, firms, and communities sufficient in amount to reimburse the Federal Government for the cost of such programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUCKABY:

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to limit the moving of the principal offices of district banks from certain cities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.R. 1594. A bill to provide survivors' annuities under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to certain widows and widowers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

H.R. 1595. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for individuals a refundable tax credit for amounts paid or incurred for television subtitle equipment for use by hearing-impaired individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. SABO, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. SMITH of Alabama):

H.R. 1596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals a deduction for certain expenses paid or incurred in connection with the adoption of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 1597. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to require, prior to disposal, that notice and first right of refusal be given to certain previous holders of surplus real property suitable for agricultural uses; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ROE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide comprehensive elementary school guidance and counseling programs for elementary students through States and local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself and Mr. HANCE):

H.R. 1599. A bill to repeal the crude oil windfall profit tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHULZE (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MARKS, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. DANNEMEYER):

H.R. 1600. A bill to aid in the creation and expansion of American small business enterprise through the enactment of tax reform and relief amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 1601. A bill to authorize the President to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to the eight servicemen who died in the attempt to rescue the Americans who were held hostage in Iran; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 1602. A bill to require aircraft manufacturers to remedy design and manufacturing defects in civil aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MARLENEE (for himself, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 1603. A bill to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to provide that the provisions of such act shall not apply to surface sand, or gravel mining operations, stone mining operations, clay mining operations, or certain surface construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 1604. A bill to improve the operation of the adjustment assistance programs for workers and firms under the Trade Act of 1975; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1605. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce social security taxes and apply the proceeds thereof exclusively to the financing of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, with the medicare program being hereafter financed from general revenues (earmarking a portion of Federal income tax receipts for that purpose) rather than through the imposition of employment and self-employment taxes as at present; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SNOWE:

H.R. 1606. A bill to encourage public participation in rulemaking by Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 1607. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain Federal lands in the State of Oregon and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating November 30, 1981, as "National Postal Workers' Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 8 of each year as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the first Sunday in September after Labor Day as "National Grandparent's Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 3 through May 10, 1981, as "Jewish Heritage Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution designating the 20th of January as "Freedom Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEVITAS:

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SNOWE:

H.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution requiring the President to call a Convocation on American Federalism; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. BUTLER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DWYER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. COELHO, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PEASE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ERDAHL, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. HEFTEL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. NELSON, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DICKS, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. YATES, Mr. SIMON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BEARD) Mr. MINETA, and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.J. Res. 159. Resolution to establish a Commission on Presidential Nominations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution requesting Securities and Exchange Commission to report on foreign acquisitions of U.S. firms; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. FENWICK, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEBOUTILLIER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHAMANSKY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER of Ohio, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the

Soviet Union should provide proper medical care for Dr. Viktor Brailovsky and permit him and his family to emigrate to Israel, urging the President to protest the continued suppression of human rights in the Soviet Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to persons fleeing Eastern European countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITHIAN:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the support of other nations for the establishment of an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the Secretariat of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution to seek the resurrection of churches and religious freedom in the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution expressing the deep concern of the Congress about the deprivation by the Soviet Union of the right of Christians to freedom of religion and, in particular, about the situation of the seven Pentecostals now living in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, and their families; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINN (for himself, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BARNES, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. BONKER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. DUNN, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to implementing the objectives of the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

8. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the release of the American hostages held by Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 1608. A bill for the relief of Frieda Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIP BURTON:

H.R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Lum Mei-Kum Moy and Hoi-Ping Moy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1610. A bill for the relief of Sing Chuen Yuan Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Antonio Pino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1612. A bill for the relief of Andreas Pluemer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Kai Hung Pun, also known as Wah Poon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1614. A bill for the relief of Barry David Tombs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Norman Tam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1616. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Rodriguez-Munguia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Wu Feng Jun Yu, and Kinh Quoc Ngo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Romeo Sanchez Vita (also known as Romeo Sanchez Perez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1619. A bill for the relief of Anastacio Tortona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Chan Chee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1621. A bill for the relief of Rose Fu (also known as Chung Lok); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1622. A bill for the relief of Marie Georgette Claire Danielle Bouchard Bihr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1623. A bill for the relief of Maria de Jesus Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1624. A bill for the relief of Theresa Macam Alcalen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Philip Patrick Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Roberto Santiago Galos, his wife, Flora Justina Borjas de Galos, and their children, Giselle Sofia Margarita Galos, Denise Rinee Galos, and Leonie Desiree Claudia Galos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Kornelia Stakiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Ralph Lafi Alisa Toelupe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1629. A bill for the relief of James A. Ferguson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Ammara Deitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H.R. 1631. A bill for the relief of Lee R. Gilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAMANSKY:

H.R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Ms. Delphi Panisa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Ms. Daana Alyarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Ms. Clarita Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIRTH:

H.R. 1635. A bill for the relief of the Jefferson County Mental Health Center, Inc., and of certain current and former employees thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Missouri:

H.R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Dr. Noel F. and Maria L. Villanueva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Karl Josef and Karoline Steinbrecher; 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. 15: Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. HINSON, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. GUYER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ROE, Mr. HUCKABY, and Mr. CARMAN.

H.R. 247: Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. GREGG, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BENEDICT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. MORRISON.

H.R. 556: Mr. STARK, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. KEMP.

H.R. 713: Mr. KEMP, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. COATS, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GUYER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 911: Mr. FOWLER and Mr. ROUSSELOT.

H.R. 1100: Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HEFNER, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.R. 1138: Mr. SPENCE and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1139: Mr. SPENCE and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1141: Mrs. HOLT.

H.R. 1147: Mrs. HOLT.

H.R. 1177: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. HINSON, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATES, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1325: Mr. STUMP, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. WINN, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. KRAMER, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. EMERY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BETHUNE, and Mr. MARRIOTT.

H.R. 1373: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 1400: Mr. SPENCE and Mr. HEFNER.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GINN, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MINISH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FISH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BAILEY of Missouri, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. MARKS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SMITH of Alabama, Mr. DWYER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ATKINSON, and Mr. SUNIA, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. GEJDENSEN, Mr. SHAMANSKY, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GORE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. STANTON of Ohio, Mr. DAUB, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. SANTINI.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MOTTL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. NEAL.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

22. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, New York, N.Y., relative to declaring January 15 as a national holiday in honor of Martin Luther King, Jr.; which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1553

By Mr. RHODES:

—Add the following new section:

SEC. . (a) Section 1011 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (31 U.S.C. 1401) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) 'rescission resolution' means a concurrent resolution which only disapproves, in whole or in part, the rescission or reservation of budget authority proposed to be rescinded or reserved in a special message transmitted by the President under section 1012, and upon which the Congress completes action before the end of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the President's message is received by the Congress;".

(b)(1) Section 1012(b) of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (31 U.S.C. 1402(b)) is amended by striking out "Any" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (c), any".

(2) Section 1012 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (31 U.S.C. 1402) is amended by adding after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) DISAPPROVAL OF RESCISSION OR RESERVATION.—Any amount of budget authority proposed to be rescinded, or that is to be reserved, as set forth in such special message transmitted to both Houses of Congress on or after October 1, 1980, and before October 1, 1981, shall not be made available for obligation unless, within the prescribed 45-day period, the Congress has completed action on a rescission resolution disapproving the rescission or reservation of such amount of budget authority.".

(c) Section 1017 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (31 U.S.C. 1407) is amended—

(1) by inserting "or resolution" after "rescission bill" each place it occurs in subsections (a) and (b)(1), in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (c), and in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (d);

(2) by inserting "or resolution" after "such a bill" both places it occurs in subsection (d)(2); and

(3) by striking out "concurrent" in the second sentence of subsection (d)(3).

(d)(1) The fourth sentence of section 211(h)(6)(A) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (45 U.S.C. 721(h)(6)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "section 1011(5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1011(6)"; and

(B) by striking out "(31 U.S.C. 1401(5))" and inserting in lieu thereof "(31 U.S.C. 1401(6))".

(2) The third sentence of section 216(c)(2) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (45 U.S.C. 726(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "section 1011(5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1011(6)"; and

(B) by striking out "(31 U.S.C. 1401(5))" and inserting in lieu thereof "(31 U.S.C. 1401(6))".