

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 18, 1981

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Reverend Leonardas Andriekus, St. Casimir's Monastery, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of nations and source of compassion, justice, and strength, we humbly bow our heads before Your Majesty.

Praised be Your name for the benefits, showered upon this great Nation and its leaders, so ardently working for a better world.

You have inspired them to be compassionate to the Lithuanian people, who have been suffering oppression on the shores of the Baltic Sea for over 40 years.

Lord, praised by Your name for inspiring the House of Representatives to commemorate the independence of Lithuania and giving to its people the hope to be free again.

Finally, we ask You to protect the United States of America as a fortress of justice and strength—to Your glory and to the joy of all freedom-loving humanity. 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.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Wednesday, February 18, 1981, to receive a message from the President of the United States.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 97-3, appointed Father Ishmail Vincent Gromoff, from private life, to be a member of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.

## REV. LEONARDAS ANDRIEKUS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to welcome to our Nation's Capital Rev. Leonardas Andriekus, who offered the opening prayer today. It is fitting that he joins

us here today, for February 16 marked the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Father Andriekus was born in Lithuania and after joining the Franciscan order he studied at universities in Austria and in Italy, where he received his doctorate in canon law. Since 1964, he has been provincial of the Lithuanian Franciscan Fathers in the United States and lives in Brooklyn, N.Y.

Father Andriekus is also an accomplished poet, has published several volumes of poetry in the Lithuanian language, and an English translation of selections from his work was published in 1968 with the title "Amens in Amber." He was awarded the annual prize of the Lithuanian Writers' Association in 1961. I want to thank Reverend Andriekus for being with us today and to wish him continuing success in his dedicated work in the church.

## NINE-DIGIT ZIP CODES—A FOLLY WE CANNOT AFFORD

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to prohibit the U.S. Postal Service from implementing a nine-digit ZIP code system, a plan which would cost both the Postal Service and the mailing public over \$1 billion each. This extravagant plan will most likely not result in either increased efficiency or significant savings. If it is put into effect, taxpayers will pay more for absolutely no improvement in service.

The postal system needs improvement in many areas, and must be improved if it is to remain a viable enterprise in the competitive mail market, as a Postal Service task force concluded 5 years ago. But the nine-digit plan is not the answer.

As now projected, the Postal Service investment of \$1 billion for the new system would include new automation and mechanization of the existing mail sorting process and the division of the country into approximately 20 million ZIP areas—up from the current 40,000 such areas. The Postal Service claims that the plan could save some \$500 million in labor costs. But the facts, presented last year to a Government operations subcommittee hearing, flatly contradict this contention.

In that hearing, the Postal Service revealed that the \$500 million figure is

based on two expected events, both of which are unlikely to occur: Almost immediate public acceptance of the new nine-digit system, and deployment of massive new amounts of new equipment. Public acceptance of the current five-digit system was anything but immediate, as postal officials know. And the equipment to be deployed is simply not available, and as the Postmaster General admits, will not be available for some time.

Even if the plan would save money, the savings must be balanced against the estimated \$1 billion in additional costs that will result from the required overhaul in mail files maintained in Government, private industry, and private organizations. This estimate, I must add, does not even include the increase in postage rates that will be needed just to offset the additional costs being incurred by the Postal Service. In the end, it will be the individual taxpayer and stamp purchaser who pays the additional costs.

Perhaps the added costs could be justified by a vast, clear improvement in mail delivery. But even the Postal Service admits that the four extra digits will only aid in sorting the mail, not speed it up. Even more likely, the new nine-digit ZIP could result in the creation of a new class of mail—business first-class—which would be given priority over individually addressed mail or business mail without the nine digits. It is entirely possible that the net result for most people would be slower, not faster, delivery.

In this time of inflation and Government cost cutting, there can be no excuse for the folly of the nine-digit ZIP. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this plan.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing is as follows:

## H.R. 1929

A bill to prohibit the use of funds to establish a nine-digit ZIP code

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2003 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:*

*"(g) None of the funds available to the Postal Service from the Fund shall be expended to implement a nine-digit ZIP code system."*

## BUDGET CUTS IN SYN-FUELS SUBSIDIES

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

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

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of criticism of President Reagan for his proposed plan to cut back some of the direct Federal subsidies for commercial development of synthetic fuels.

While many people here disagree with his plan, I do not. If we are serious about cutting the Federal budget and turning over to private enterprise many of the efforts which have been handled in the past directly by the Government, then certainly the commercial development of synfuels is one area that ought to be considered.

The record profits of the past 2 years, and even higher ones forecast over the next 10, should certainly provide ample capital for investment by big business and the oil companies in synfuels production.

With decontrol of oil, and possibly natural gas to follow shortly, there should be more than enough incentives to encourage the private sector to develop new energy technologies without Federal subsidies.

Certainly the Mobil Oil Corp., which earned almost \$5 billion in the past 2 years, can afford to give up the \$25 million it is asking the Federal Government for to help it study coal gasification.

If the President cuts Federal spending for that kind of a program in a carefully crafted way, I for one look forward to supporting him on it.

#### WE NEED HASTE WITHOUT WASTE—NOT BUSINESS AS USUAL

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to read this morning that you intend to take a business-as-usual approach to the President's new economic package. You were quoted as saying legislation passed in haste makes an awful lot of waste.

I get very nervous when you start talking about business as usual. Business as usual in the last Congress put us a month late adopting the first budget resolution and 2 months late on a second budget resolution. We failed completely to adopt 4 of 13 appropriation bills. We had to waive the Budget Act dozens of times and actually violated our own laws. We put off major reforms in a number of areas and ended up in a lameduck session doing what we should have done months earlier. That was when your party had total control over this House, the Senate, and the White House as well.

Business as usual in the last Congress meant we sat idly by, fiddling away while the economy burned. We

cannot afford more business as usual. We need the haste without the waste, and I am confident our President will take care of the waste if we oblige him by making haste.

□ 1510

#### CONGRESS MUST LEAD THE WAY IN BELT TIGHTENING

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, this evening our President will deliver an address which may well prove to be an historic address. The President has set the right tone when he, President Reagan, recommended no pay raise for top Government officials and for Members of Congress.

Congress must lead the way in the national belt tightening that is needed to get inflation under control. I wish the President had gone even further and had seen fit to hold up pay increases for Federal judges.

Mr. Speaker, we here in Congress must set the example if we expect the American people to follow us.

#### DEMOCRATS THREATEN TO TORPEDO WHITE HOUSE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the President has not even been heard on his economic plans and yet the Democrats are already vowing to torpedo his program.

Mr. Speaker, you are quoted by the Washington Post as saying, "We're not going to go forward and ram through everything that he's asking for. Haste makes waste."

Further, Mr. Speaker, you are quoted by the New York Times as saying, "We're not just going to let them tear asunder the programs we've built up over the years."

In other words, the Democratic program seems to be to do nothing and do it slowly. That is a prescription for economic ruin. It is a slap in the face at the mandate of the people rendered just a short 15 weeks ago.

Economist Paul Samuelson wrote recently in *Newsweek*:

Reagan's goals are economically feasible, but few in Washington think his scenario is politically possible.

The Democrats have evidently decided to ignore economic need and go with political expediency, but that is a national tragedy.

#### SIXTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENT LITHUANIA

(Mrs. FENWICK asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, Monday, February 16, 1981, marked the 63d anniversary of the establishment of an independent State of Lithuania. Lithuanians throughout the world, including a large number of Lithuanian Americans, remember this date as a milestone in their brave nation's struggle for independence and self-determination.

The democratic State of Lithuania adopted a constitution preserving freedom of the individual, but it was shortlived, for in 1940 the country was invaded by the Soviets and declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. This was carried out despite the explicit provisions of the 1920 peace treaty signed by the Soviets, recognizing Lithuania as a free and independent state and renouncing any rights of sovereignty over it.

The past 39 years of Soviet domination have not wiped out the spirit of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. The Helsinki accord of 1975, signed by the Soviet Union, guaranteed them certain rights, and on this 63d anniversary of the founding of their republic we must renew our faith that these rights and pledges will someday be honored, and we must remember, too, the other Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia.

Mr. Speaker, our country does not recognize Soviet rights to rule these countries, and I hope the world will note that and long remember it.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE PAUL C. JONES, FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to advise my colleagues of the passing of former Representative Paul C. Jones last Tuesday, February 10, 1981.

With Congressman Jones' passing, the people of southeast Missouri have lost an old and dear friend—a friend whose lifetime was, in every sense, devoted to public service. As mayor of his hometown of Kennett, Mo., as a member of the Missouri General Assembly, as chairman of the Missouri Highway Commission, and as a U.S. Representative from the 10th District of Missouri, Paul Jones set an example of which all of us who hold public office should take note.

Throughout his 20 years in this House of Representatives, Mr. Jones gained an admirable and well-deserved reputation as one whose opinions, words, and actions were determined by conviction, not by political winds or

fear of opposition. He was not known as a conciliator, but as a courageous and honest advocate of the best interests of his constituents.

Among his colleagues in this House, Paul Jones was regarded as one always ready to speak his mind, and respected as one whose words were based on thorough knowledge and genuine understanding of the subject at hand. His diligence and expertise in the area of agriculture not only distinguished him as an invaluable member of the Committee on Agriculture, but served as a constant tribute to the tremendous agricultural resources of his district.

Likewise, Paul Jones' renowned advocacy of a strong national defense and for fiscal responsibility in our Government represented values that he did not merely express, but that he exemplified as both citizen and public servant. He did not just talk about national security, he served as an outstanding commanding officer of the Missouri National Guard. He did not just complain about waste in Government, he actively sought its elimination at every opportunity. In short, Paul Jones conducted himself with such sincerity that, even when in disagreement, his colleagues universally held his integrity and conviction in the highest regard.

Perhaps one of the greatest tributes ever given Paul Jones was delivered by one of his colleagues upon his leaving the House of Representatives in 1968. In remarks entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 12, 1968, Congressman Poage of Texas said of Paul Jones:

I do not believe we could operate this House with 435 Members like Paul Jones. But I do not believe that this House will operate as well without Paul Jones. I believe that he has rendered a service which very few men can render, and I do not know of anyone who can take his place in the coming sessions of this Congress.

He has had a unique ability and a unique courage of character. I admire Paul Jones greatly, even when we are in violent disagreement.

To those words, spoken by a close friend and colleague of the late Congressman, I can only add that the greatest tribute that we here today can pay to Paul Jones is a pledge to hold his example as the standard by which we, ourselves, serve in this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I will seek a special order at an appropriate time in the near future so that Members who wish may join in paying tribute to a highly respected late Member of this body.

#### INTRODUCTION OF CIVIL SERVICE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1981

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Civil Service Authorization Act of 1981. It is nearly identical to H.R. 5138, which passed the House on December 3, 1979. Unfortunately, it never received attention in the other body.

What this bill does is to place the civil service agencies of Government on 2-year expiring authorizations. Currently these agencies are permanently authorized. I see three advantages for establishing expiring authorizations.

First, an expiring authorization forces Congress to act affirmatively to perpetuate these agencies. I cannot foresee a time when these agencies will be abolished. Yet, the discipline of justifying these programs on a periodic basis is crucial to keep the size and budget of Government under control.

Second, an expiring authorization sets a schedule of oversight. It forces the authorizing committee to return to the program at the end of a fixed period of time and see what changes are needed. With basic legislation as profound as the Civil Service Reform Act, conscientious oversight is imperative.

Third, the mechanism of an expiring authorization permits the authorizing committee to communicate its views to the Appropriations Committee on the appropriate level of funding for programs within its jurisdiction.

From now on, we can no longer sit back and assume that Government programs will roll along perpetually. We must frequently appraise the programs we create. We must state the need which forced creation of the program, see whether that need still exists and see whether the program is meeting that need. And, we must be willing to end programs if they are no longer needed or running astray.

The Civil Service Authorization Act of 1981 will help meet this goal.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF THE ARMENIAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK) on the very excellent speech she just gave with regard to Lithuania and the Baltic States.

I would like at this time to remind my colleagues that not only in the Baltics have we captive nations but in the Middle East there is the Republic of Armenia which was established following World War I, which subsisted for 2 years, which was recognized by the Government of the United States of America, and which was subsequently partitioned between the

Soviet Union and the present Government of Turkey.

Armenia as a nation is still here. We have about 4 million Armenians in the world, of which about 500,000 live in the United States. But the sovereign State of Armenia has been overrun, and it, too, is a captive nation. But we here in America are not going to forget them because we still believe in the self-determination of nations.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE ALIEN CREWMEN BILL

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

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting to the House of Representatives a bill to allow alien crewmen serving on U.S. fishing vessels to debark temporarily on Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

This is admittedly a most controversial measure. My bill would amend a section of the Immigration and Nationality Act originally instituted to protect American jobs on American ships. Guam and the other offshore areas included in my measure are in a unique position, however. We have no large pool of fishing crewmen to staff U.S.-owned or based fishing vessels. The economic advantage to the people of Guam would be tremendous if U.S. companies could begin using the territory as a transshipment center. They will take their business elsewhere, however, if Guam and the other areas cannot accommodate the rest and recreational needs of the crews.

Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa are isolated U.S. areas in the far western Pacific. Guam is over 6,000 miles from the mainland. The special needs of the territories must be considered carefully, which is why I am introducing this bill today to address this particular situation. Thank you.

#### OLDER AMERICANS ALTERNATIVE CARE ACT OF 1981

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone would dispute the fact that there is a tremendous need for services which allow older Americans to remain independent in their homes and their communities as long as possible. My colleagues in both bodies and on both sides of the aisle have indicated that a change in current Federal policy toward the elderly is essential. The legislation I am introducing today, the Older Americans Al-

ternative Care Act of 1981, would take the first steps toward making a comprehensive range of services available to older Americans and their families who are attempting to delay or avoid inappropriate institutionalization.

The need for comprehensive, coordinated, cost-effective alternatives to entering an institution has never been greater, and recent demographic research and analysis adds a dimension of urgency to today's situation. The 65-and-over population, which now comprises over 11 percent of the entire population, continues to grow faster than the younger population. By the year 2000, there will be almost 32 million elderly, and after that time, the numbers and proportion of the elderly will rise sharply as the "baby boom" population matures. These demographic trends will require us to rethink and restructure current policy toward the aging.

Institutional care, while expensive, is clearly appropriate and necessary for a number of our older citizens; however it makes no sense at all, either in humanitarian or fiscal terms, to emphasize institutional care for all older Americans. I believe we can develop cost-effective, compassionate alternatives through a range of services, including utilization of healthy elders in the effort to help their peers remain independent as long as possible.

Review and investigation of the status of programs designed to keep older Americans out of institutions by the General Accounting Office (GAO), the Department of Health and Human Services, and others, all point to the need for a coordinated, comprehensive approach which pulls together the disparate services of a number of programs into a coherent whole. The legislation I am introducing today is an attempt to begin to develop a comprehensive approach to dealing with the needs of older Americans, and it recognizes that older Americans are a diverse group, with many different needs and preferences as they strive to maintain their independence.

My bill would address this situation on three fronts by: First, expanding and liberalizing the home health benefit under medicare; second, by strengthening and expanding the Senior Companion program, an already existing, highly effective program of peer assistance to frail elders in the community; and third, by offering a \$500 refundable tax credit for individuals who care for their parents in their home.

Title I of the Older Americans Alternative Care Act of 1981 would continue the efforts made in the last Congress to expand the home health benefit under medicare. As my colleagues are well aware, many of this Nation's elderly do not need and cannot afford costly institutionalization, yet the current orientation of the medicare pro-

gram is still weighted in favor of institutional care. Recent studies show that if adequate home health services were available through medicare, approximately 2.5 million elderly people could be kept out of institutions. GAO also reports that there is a consensus among health care authorities that approximately 25 percent of the patient population is treated in facilities excessive to their needs. According to GAO, until elderly people become extremely impaired, the cost of nursing home care exceeds the cost of home care. It is obvious then that current Federal policy is costly both in fiscal terms and in terms of the quality of life for older Americans. Title I of my legislation would remove the home-bound requirement, include periodic chore services, allow provision of covered home health services in certain adult day care centers, and allow reimbursement for respite services which are necessary to provide incentive and support to the primary caretaker of the person receiving home health services. I believe it is important to encourage people to take care of their loved ones by letting them know that respite services are available for the patient should they need a short break in order to tend to other responsibilities.

Title II addresses itself to strengthening and expanding an existing, effective alternative to institutionalization, the Senior Companion program. The Senior Companion program is one of the smallest programs administered by the ACTION agency. The program is a model of cost effectiveness, which serves not only the frail elder but also utilizes low-income healthy elders as the deliverers of client services. The approach of peers helping one another is beneficial to both and provides the Senior Companion with a small, protected stipend as well as the opportunity to serve others in a meaningful way. The Senior Companion budget request for fiscal year 1982 is \$16.3 million, which would provide 6,000 companions serving 30,000 elders nationwide. Rather than creating another expensive program based on expensive professional intervention, I believe it makes a great deal of sense to expand this program, which channels 90 percent of its Federal funding into direct client services. There are few, if any, Federal programs which can make such a claim. The fact that Senior Companions are peers rather than professionals means that they have a special kind of insight and encouragement to offer those whom they are assisting.

A preliminary analysis of the effectiveness of the Senior Companion program in one project found that 62 percent of its clients had impairment levels similar to persons living in nursing homes. This finding is buttressed by others studied which have shown

that the medical conditions of nursing home residents are shared by other persons residing in the community; it is the social situation of the nursing home residents which is different. It is the social situation of the frail elderly in which the senior companion intervenes. By providing companionship and support, help with the daily responsibilities such as food shopping, keeping medical appointments, assistance with meal preparation, minor household assistance, and a number of other important functions, including referral to other community services and professional help if necessary, the companion provides vital assistance in maintaining independence.

A number of approaches to avoiding institutionalization have been explored in the recent past. Clearly, it makes a great deal of sense to utilize an existing, cost-effective program with a proven track record. Thus, my legislation would increase the authorization level of the senior companion program to \$100 million and codify many of the administrative provisions which make it so effective. This sum would provide 36,780 companions nationwide who, using the formula contained in this legislation, could serve 735,600 older Americans, a significant portion of the at-risk population.

As a complement to the Senior Companion program and the expansion of home health benefits, my legislation would also offer a \$500 refundable tax credit to a taxpayer who kept the parent in the taxpayer's home. This provision recognizes that there are many situations where it is most desirable for all concerned to have the elderly parent reside in the children's home. This provision would create an incentive for families to arrange for this type of care.

The need to get control of the Federal budget is certainly a priority and one which will receive a great deal of congressional and public attention in the days to come. Nevertheless, it is important that we remain vigilant against false economies. President Reagan has said that medicare and other programs affecting the elderly will not be cut. This is an opportune moment to reevaluate current Federal policy toward the aging, which, although well intentioned, is inadequate, horrifyingly expensive, and does not emphasize the dignity of humanity of those it is pledged to assist. I believe we can get the job done, if not for fewer dollars then for the same amount of dollars, but in a way which once again makes old age something to look forward to rather than dreaded because of the specter of institutionalization and dependence.

A copy of the bill being introduced follows:

H.R. 1890

A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the homebound requirement for home health services and to include additional types of services as home health services, to amend the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to clarify the purposes, goals, and administration of the senior companion program, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish an income tax credit for maintaining a household for dependents who are 65 years of age or older

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Alternative Care Act of 1981".*

#### TITLE I—MEDICARE AMENDMENTS

##### REMOVAL OF HOMEBOUND REQUIREMENT FOR HOME HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 101. (a) Section 1814(a)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "is or was confined to his home (except when receiving items and services referred to in section 1861(m)(7)) and".

(b) Section 1835(a)(2)(A)(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "is or was confined to his home (except when receiving items and services referred to in section 1861(m)(7)) and".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to items and services furnished on or after the first day of the month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

##### INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL ITEMS AND SERVICES AS HOME HEALTH CARE

SEC. 102. (a) Section 1861(m) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, such term also includes periodic chore services (as defined in subsection (dd)) in the case of any individual with respect to whom there is in effect a plan for furnishing such services (to that individual) which has been established and is periodically reviewed by the appropriate health professional under regulations, and respite care services (as defined in subsection (ee)) for not more than 52 days in any calendar year as determined by the Secretary taking into consideration the need for such services with respect to the individual for whom they are provided and the person who normally cares for the individual".

(b) Section 1861 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

##### "PERIODIC CHORE SERVICES

"(dd) For purposes of the last paragraph of subsection (m), the term 'periodic chore services' means services which are performed in the home of an aged, blind, or disabled adult individual to help such individual remain in or return to such home, maintain or strengthen his capacity for self-care, and maintain or raise his level of functioning in the areas of personal care and household management, when such individual is unable to perform such services by or for himself, whether or not such individual also requires the services of a home health aide or other specialist. Such term includes the performance for an individual of household tasks, transportation for medical visits, and essential shopping and transportation to and from multipurpose senior centers (as defined in title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended) and nutrition projects (such as those funded under part C of

Title III of such Act), essential shopping and simple household repairs, assistance in outdoor walking, and other services furnished to an individual which are reasonably necessary (as determined under regulations) to maintain him outside of a hospital, skilled nursing facility, or intermediate care facility.

"(ee) For purposes of the last paragraph of subsection (m), the term 'respite care services' means services for an individual who is unable to care for himself or herself on a full-time basis, which are provided on a temporary basis to such individual because of the absence of the person who normally cares for such individual, but only if such individual is a dependent of such other person for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Such services must be provided by persons who have been trained to provide homemaker-home health aide services, and such services must be provided in the home of the dependent individual under the supervision of a registered nurse who is employed by a certified home health agency, homemaker-home health aide agency, or local public health department. Such services shall, when necessary and appropriate, be provided in addition to other services under this title to ensure that such individual receives a coordinated system of services designed to help the individual reach his or her maximum level of independence."

(c) Section 1861(m) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "individual's home", in the material which precedes paragraph (1), the following: "or in an adult day care center which is a nonprofit center eligible for funds under title XX of this Act and which meets standards prescribed by the Secretary and applicable State and local health and safety requirements".

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply to items and services furnished on or after the first day of the month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

#### TITLE II—SENIOR COMPANIONS PROGRAM

##### ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 201. (a) Part B of title II of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 5011 et seq.) is amended by redesignating section 212 as section 213, and by inserting after section 211 the following new section:

##### "SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM

"SEC. 212. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants or contracts to carry out the purpose described in section 211(a) through the establishment of senior companion programs. Each senior companion program—

"(1) shall be designed to encourage older persons receiving assistance under such program to participate actively in the affairs of their communities, to help themselves to the extent possible in order to lead independent lives outside of institutional settings, to take advantage of services and activities available to older persons under the senior companion program, and to reach out to their peers for companionship and assistance to the extent possible; and

"(2) shall be administered by a public or private nonprofit community-based organization of proven ability in providing services and assistance to older persons, except that such program may be administered under the auspices of a hospital in the community involved in any case in which administration by a public or private nonprofit community-based organization is not feasible or appropriate in such community.

"(b) Each organization is responsible for the administration of a senior companion program—

"(1) shall take such action as may be necessary to minimize costs associated with the administration of such program;

"(2) shall train senior companions through the use of available community resources, to the extent practicable, in order to minimize administrative costs and in order to coordinate the operation of such program with the activities of other community agencies and organizations; and

"(3) shall organize personnel participation in such program in the manner specified in subsection (c).

"(c)(1) The personnel administering each senior companion program shall consist of individuals serving as directors, supervising senior companions, and senior companions. Each director shall be responsible for overall administration of such program and for the supervision of approximately 10 supervising senior companions participating in such program.

"(2) Each supervising senior companion—

"(A) shall be responsible for the supervision of approximately 15 senior companions;

"(B) may participate in such program for not more than 40 hours during any work-week; and

"(C) shall devote 50 percent of such work period to the provision of services and assistance to older persons as a senior companion, and shall devote the balance of such work period to coordinating the activities of individuals serving as senior companions in such program.

"(3) Each individual serving as senior companion—

"(A) shall participate in the senior companion program as a part-time volunteer for not more than 20 hours during any work-week; and

"(B) shall be responsible for the provision of services and assistance to approximately 20 older persons.

The number of older persons which may be served by a senior companion shall be based upon the needs of such older persons, distances which the senior companion is required to travel in order to serve such older persons, and other factors present in the community involved (such as the provision of services and assistance in congregate housing programs and in ethnic communities). The director of any such program, in determining the number of older persons which may be served by each senior companion participating in such program, shall ensure that the nature and quality of service provided by each senior companion is not adversely affected by the number of older persons for whom such senior companion is responsible.

"(d) Each individual serving as a senior companion—

"(1) shall work primarily with homebound older persons, except that such senior companion may enter into cooperative agreements with nursing home officials for the purpose of identifying older persons who are able to return to their homes if support services are made available to them in their homes;

"(2) shall make an initial assessment of the needs of each older person to whom such senior companion is assigned, including an evaluation of—

"(A) the availability and quality of food at the home of such older person;

"(B) whether such home is safe, clean, and sufficiently heated or cooled;

"(C) the ability of such older person to care for personal hygiene needs with appropriate assistance and encouragement from such senior companion;

"(D) the availability of needed medical and rehabilitative supplies;

"(E) the ability of such older person to manage financial resources and affairs; and

"(F) whether such older person requires any immediate professional assistance, as the result of despondency, drug dependence, or other similar factors; and

"(3) shall provide such older person with a variety of personal care services, nutritional services, social and recreational services, home management services, and information and advocacy services, which may include (A) shopping assistance; (B) transportation for medical or other appointments; (C) letter writing; (D) maintaining contacts with family and friends; (E) bill payments and other financial matters; (F) meal preparation assistance; (G) minor housekeeping chores, sewing, minor home repairs, and personal hygiene services and other personal care services; (H) companionship and socialization; and (I) initiating contacts with social service providers, including providers of (i) mobile meal services; (ii) chore or homemaker services; (iii) nursing services; (iv) income assistance services; (v) transportation; (vi) social and recreational programs; (vii) medical services; and (viii) income tax assistance.

"(e) Not more than 10 percent of any funds received by any public or private non-profit organization under this section may be expended for administrative services which are not directly related to the provision of services or assistance to older persons."

(b) Section 211(b) of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 5011(b)) is amended by striking out ", and as" and all that follows through "companionship".

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 202. Section 502(b)(2) of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 5082(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "There is further authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the purpose of carrying out programs under section 212."

#### TITLE III—INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR MAINTAINING HOUSEHOLD FOR OLDER DEPENDENTS

REFUNDABLE CREDIT FOR MAINTAINING A HOUSEHOLD FOR DEPENDENTS WHO HAVE ATTAINED AGE 65

Sec. 301. (a) Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by inserting before section 45 the following new section

Sec. 44F. MAINTAINING A HOUSEHOLD FOR DEPENDENTS WHO HAVE ATTAINED AGE 65.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual who maintains as his home a household any member of which is a qualified dependent of such individual for the calendar year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year \$500.

"(b) QUALIFIED DEPENDENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified dependent' means, with respect to any household maintained by a taxpayer, any individual—

"(1) for whom such household is the principal place, of abode for more than 9 months of the calendar year,

"(2) who is a dependent of such taxpayer (as defined in section 152) for such year, and

"(3) who has attained the age of 65 before the close of such year.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES FOR MAINTAINING A HOUSEHOLD.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual shall be treated as maintaining a household for any period only if over half the cost of maintaining the household for such period is furnished by such individual (or, if such individual is married during such period, is furnished by such individual and his spouse).

"(2) MULTIPLE SUPPORT AGREEMENTS.—For purposes of determining under subparagraph (A) whether the taxpayer furnishes over half the cost of maintaining a household, any support of any qualified individual with respect to such household, treated as received from the taxpayer under section 152(c) for any period, shall be treated as a cost of maintaining such household furnished by the taxpayer for such period."

(b)(1) Subsection (b) of section 6401 of such Code (relating to excessive credits treated as overpayments) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and 43 (relating to earned income credit)" and inserting in lieu thereof "43 (relating to earned income credit), and 44F (relating to maintaining a household for dependents who have attained age 65)", and

(B) by striking out "39 and 43" and inserting in lieu thereof "39, 43, and 44F".

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 55(b) of such Code (defining regular tax) is amended by striking out "39 and 43" and inserting in lieu thereof "39, 43, and 44F".

(3) Sections 44C(b)(5), 44D(b)(5), 44E(e)(1), and 56(c) of such Code are each amended by striking out "39, and 43" and inserting in lieu thereof "39, 43, and 44F".

(c) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 45 the following new item:

"Sec. 44F. Maintaining a household for dependents who have attained age 65."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1980.

#### SUPERTANKER BAN

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, over our recent recess, I made a visit to my district in Washington State. During that visit, I had the pleasure of attending the dedication of an expanded vessel traffic safety system, or VTS, for the waters of Puget Sound.

I was pleased to see the Coast Guard complete the Puget Sound VTS. But I stand here before you today because I am concerned that the VTS alone may not do enough to protect the waters and shores of Puget Sound. At that dedication, I made a pledge to the people of Washington State to act here in the Congress to protect the marine environment of the sound.

The Port and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 charged the Coast Guard with two duties: The protection of marine

traffic; and the safeguarding of the marine environment.

The VTS is the fulfillment—and I might add, a major fulfillment—of one part of that act.

But what about the other part—the part which charges the Coast Guard with protecting the marine environment? Mr. Speaker, that is why I am here today.

We have witnessed much activity on this issue in the past 9 years, since passage of the original act. But despite State legislation, Federal legislation, proposals, and counterproposals by the concerned people of this body and the State of Washington, 9 years later, there are still no comprehensive tanker safety regulations for Washington State waters.

My reason for concern at this particular juncture is the now-infamous memorandum from Rear Admiral Wallace to Vice Admiral Scarborough, recommending "that a regulation be added to continue in force in 125,000 deadweight ton limitation of the size of tankers operating in Puget Sound until the VTS improvements are implemented." I repeat: "Until the VTS improvements are implemented." It is in light of this statement that the need for prompt action becomes clear.

And I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that special interests—big special interests—will pressure the Coast Guard to rescind the regulations now that the VTS is in place.

In my opinion, this would be a major mistake. While the VTS is impressive and will serve its tracking function well, it can do very little in preventing a catastrophic oil spill. And it seems to me, the larger the tanker, the greater the spill could be.

There is nothing in the VTS which could prevent mechanical failure. Recently, the Coast Guard conducted supertanker-tug maneuverability tests in the Strait of Juan de Fuca. When rudder failure was simulated, it took two tugs 17 minutes to attach their lines to the tanker. In those 17 minutes, the 188,000-deadweight-ton tanker traveled 4.4 miles. There is a lot of damage which could be done in 4.4 miles.

The Coast Guard says that fewer ships traveling through waterways will mean fewer accidents. I say, larger ships mean larger spills, if an accident should occur. Studies to determine the potential risk factors involved can only go so far. How do you place a value on Washington State's fishing and shellfish industries, its tourism industry, and its recreational opportunities? Should even one spill occur, irreparable damage could be done to the marine environment which fosters the Puget Sound way of life. Along with protecting the marine environment goes protecting the region's marine-related economy. Just one spill could

have devastating effects. Just ask the oysterman in Brittany whose livelihood was virtually destroyed by the *Amoco Cadiz* disaster.

So we have some idea of what the effects of a major oil spill in Puget Sound could be—and they could be terrible, and they must be avoided.

Because of my grave concern, I am here today to take action. I am introducing legislation to mandate a 125,000-deadweight-ton limitation on tank vessels entering the waters of Puget Sound. And my colleagues from Washington State, Congressmen Lowry and Swift, whose districts also border on the sound, are joining me in supporting this bill.

Put simply, the issue of tanker safety is too important to be ignored any longer—we have already waited 9 years; 9 long years since the Congress passed the Port and Waterways Safety Act of 1972. How much longer can we chance a spill before our luck runs out?

In closing, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter I received in 1977, when we passed the Magnuson amendment to the Marine Mammal Protection Act. The letter says simply, "Thank you \* \* \* someday, when my kids have heard how Puget Sound was saved, they will say 'tank' you, too."

The real issue here is our future. Will we leave it to chance, or will we act to insure that our posterity has some choices?

I, for one, feel that the time is ripe for action.

Why leave it to Lady Luck when we ourselves can act to reduce the possibilities of human error and mechanical failure? Tanker standards are not unreasonable. Size limitation will reduce the chance of a major oil spill.

I hope you will join me in supporting this legislation. Let us not wait until our luck runs out.

□ 1520

#### EL SALVADOR: THE POLITICAL DIMENSION

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

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, according to the Washington Post, Secretary of State Haig met yesterday with congressional leaders to discuss U.S. policy toward El Salvador. We also know that the State Department conducted a Members only briefing on Capitol Hill yesterday, and that the Department has sent top officials to a number of countries to brief foreign leaders on U.S. policy toward that nation.

In short, after some indecision and delay, the Reagan administration is now focusing on this sensitive issue, and appears to be engaged in a cam-

paign to build support for increased levels of military assistance to the present Government of El Salvador. As justification for such an increase, the administration cites certain evidence that the Communist bloc has increased military assistance to the leftist guerrillas fighting the present regime.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has closely followed the tragic developments in El Salvador for more than 1 year, I am very concerned that the administration appears to be defining the fundamental issues in El Salvador in a manner that obscures rather than illuminates the choices we face.

No doubt the guerrillas are getting support from outside the country. This has been true for some time. However, in overly dramatizing the military threat to the present Government, a threat that Government security forces have thus far been able to contain successfully with relatively little military assistance from the United States, the administration now appears to be defining the issue solely as one of external intervention in the affairs of El Salvador. In the process, the administration is downplaying those internal political issues that should be fundamental in shaping U.S. policy toward El Salvador.

The fact is that the struggle in El Salvador is primarily a political struggle that has taken on military overtones, not a military conflict in which the political issues are subsidiary. While the present government may be able to win the military struggle with or without U.S. military assistance, it could still lose the political struggle and thus lay the seeds for its own collapse.

The fundamental problems facing the present government of El Salvador are associated with satisfying the aspirations of the Salvadorean people for justice, peace, and economic progress. And those aspirations cannot be satisfied by the present government unless it moves vigorously to undercut the appeal of the left by implementing more rapidly the land reform program it announced last spring, and by curbing the excesses of its own security forces, elements of which have engaged in the indiscriminate murder of the civilian population.

To be sure, both of these tasks would be difficult under the best of circumstances, and thus are even more difficult in the face of an active guerrilla movement. However, without pursuing internal reforms and controlling indiscriminate violence by its security forces, the government will never secure the support of the people and will not survive politically regardless of how much U.S. military aid it receives.

If the administration really wants to avoid a radical leftist government in El Salvador, it must press the present

government to take these initial political steps. Military aid, in the absence of political action, will have no effect. Indeed, it will only assure ultimate defeat and a growing perception that the United States is incapable of effectively dealing with the forces of change in the hemisphere.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our policy should encourage the present government in El Salvador to broaden its base by seeking a negotiated solution with those elements of the left that are committed to a democratic future for El Salvador. While it would be foolish to believe that all elements of the left would be willing to participate in such a resolution, I believe that important elements of the left would be willing to do so if the government of El Salvador and our Government were prepared to invest the time and energy needed to bring it about. This would in turn ease military pressures on the present government and allow it to deal more effectively with those political issues that are fundamental.

Unfortunately, it is this political dimension of the problem that the Reagan administration appears to be ignoring. Yet, as the Washington Post points out in its lead editorial today, the administration's best chance of preventing a victory by the left "is to show itself open to the political dimension as well."

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those of our colleagues who may not have seen this editorial, I am inserting a copy into the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1981]

#### EL SALVADOR: THE POLITICAL DIMENSION

A military response is necessary in El Salvador, where a Nicaraguan-, Cuban-, Soviet-supported insurgency is attempting to overthrow an army-backed center-right government with a commitment to social reform. But a political response is necessary, too. It has not been in sufficient evidence as the Reagan administration cranks up to make El Salvador a demonstration of its worldwide anti-communist strategy.

A political response means two things. The Salvadoran government must show itself as eager to halt violence directed against civilians by soldiers and the right-wing death squads (often the same people) as it is to halt violence conducted by guerrillas. Precisely here lies the importance of keeping the heat on the government to discover who killed the American church workers. This incident cannot be parked in a "human rights" cubbyhole. It is, for many Salvadorans, the test of whether their government is on their side. The United States would not want to help the government reduce the guerrillas, as could yet happen, only to find that the government's failure to rein in its own forces still denied it broad popular support.

The other requirement is to construct a negotiating framework, of which nothing has so far been heard from Reagan officials. Among the guerrillas and their civilian supporters, some are committed to armed struggle to the point of regarding compromise as betrayal of their revolution. But others appear to be more conciliatory. The code

word "Zimbabwe," meaning talks by opposing forces in a civil war, is gaining a certain currency. The United States may not have the sole duty, or the best opening, to promote negotiations. Mexico, for instance, seems better placed, if it could break through its revolutionary rhetoric and try. Other international parties are standing by. But the American interest in negotiations must be asserted.

There is an undeniable military dimension to the El Salvador crisis, but the crisis remains essentially political. The administration should not oversell the notion that a military showdown, launched essentially for considerations of American global strategy, is everything. Its best chance of being successful and supported in the policy it is now unveiling is to show itself open to the political dimension as well.

#### PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

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

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I brought to my colleagues' attention the plight of Iosif Mendelevich, a Soviet Prisoner of Conscience who has been incarcerated since the first Leningrad trials.

This morning, I was delighted to learn that Iosif Mendelevich has been freed, and by now he is in Israel. I am certain that the expressions of concern on the part of many Members of Congress helped bring about his release.

It is significant that Iosif Mendelevich is the last Jew who was convicted at Leningrad to be released. However, the violations of human rights by the Soviet Government transcend religious bounds. There are two remaining Prisoners of Conscience from the first Leningrad trials, Alexei Murzhenko and Yuri Federov. These men, both Ukrainians and non-Jews, must not be forgotten.

I have been informed that the Long Island Committee for Soviet Jewry and similar organizations around the country, who have worked so hard for the release of Iosif Mendelevich, have pledged to make the release of these two remaining individuals their top priority.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in urging the Soviet Government to recognize its obligation to comply with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all other human rights accords to which it is a signatory.

#### B-1 AIRCRAFT

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post carries an article proclaiming the good news that the manned penetrating bomber is on its way back into the U.S. strategic ar-

senal. The Reagan administration, true to the campaign promises of the past 2 years, intends to include between \$1.5 and \$2.5 billion for development of a variation of the B-1.

I know that Members on both sides of the aisle are delighted to see this development. This House has consistently indicated over the past 4 years its desire that the United States have a long-range penetrating bomber. No fewer than 35 Members cosigned a letter to former President Carter requesting that he restore the B-1 program. Additionally, 297 Members voted against deleting \$200 million from the fiscal year 1981 defense authorization bill for R. & D. of the strategic weapons launcher, another variation of the B-1 capable of long-range delivery.

The past decade has seen our defense posture seriously eroded in terms of manpower, materiel, and readiness. The B-1 is an integral part of the rebuilding of a credible military presence around the world. Our sole long-range bomber right now is the B-52 which was built for service in Korea. It is a crime that this country relies on aircraft designed before most of the pilots who fly it were out of diapers.

Military experts agree that the B-1 aircraft is unsurpassed at long-range delivery of nuclear warheads. No one should doubt the need for this plane. Let us all work together to insure speedy development and rapid deployment of the B-1.

#### THE 63D ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we must not forget that for the past 40 years Lithuania has been the victim of foreign domination. We must not forget who the oppressors are.

The Soviet-Nazi pact set the stage for the destruction of freedom for Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia. We all remember that the Soviet-Nazi pact spelled the end of Polish independence, and it is proper that we remember. But, we should not forget the Baltic States.

Lithuania is a forced and reluctant part of the Soviet Empire. Its plight symbolizes the horrors faced by all of the nations dominated by Communist imperialism; mass murders, deportations to slave labor camps, and Communist indoctrination of children. Lithuanians continue to resist.

Although the local Communist leaders have Baltic names like Petras Griskevicius, First Secretary of Lithuanian

Communist Party Central Committee, the orders come from Moscow and must be obeyed. The Lithuanian Communist Party Congress which ended January 30 unanimously adopted a resolution in support of the decisions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanian love of freedom represents the feelings of all of the oppressed people of the Soviet Empire. The Communist government answers with repression. In the last year over 200 Soviet dissident leaders were imprisoned to add to the tens of thousands already in the slave labor camps. The Baltic States were well represented among the victims.

The Lithuanian people demand freedom of religion for themselves and for the other captive nations. The Soviet Government responds with arrests of clergy and believers.

Word has filtered out of the Soviet Union of student demonstrations in the Baltic States in September and October 1980. The KGB suppressed those students with violence and arrests.

We free Americans look forward to the day when the people of Lithuania and all the peoples of the nations oppressed by Soviet imperialism can join with us in a friendship based on freedom.

I was privileged to join our patriotic, Lithuanian Americans last Sunday in their observance of Lithuanian Independence Day in Cleveland. It was my good luck to be chosen as their speaker at the ceremonies. The following resolution was adopted by those in attendance and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,  
Cleveland, Ohio.

We, Lithuanian Americans of the Cleveland area, gathered at the parish hall of the Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church in Cleveland, Ohio, on Sunday the 15th day of February, 1981, to observe the sixty-third anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania, have adopted the following resolution:

Whereas on February 16, 1918, Lithuania, a sovereign state and a kingdom since the 13th century that came to an end in 1795, rose again after a 123 year occupation by its neighbors and in its ancient capital of Vilnius proclaimed itself an independent republic; and

Whereas on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union broke all existing treaties with the Republic of Lithuania and forcibly and illegally occupied its territory, which fact had been officially confirmed by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the U.S. House of Representatives of the 83rd Congress and condemned by all U.S. Administrations; and

Whereas, while many former African and Asian colonies have become independent, the Soviet Union continues to subjugate, exploit and deny all human rights to the Lithuanian people, which is contrary to the beliefs of the civilized community, and through a program of deportations and colonialization continues to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania,

thereby committing genocide; now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we again demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its armed forces, colonists and its entire apparatus from Lithuanian soil and permit the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereign rights; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we repeatedly express our gratitude to the United States Government for the firm position of non-recognition of Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania and request the Administration to direct the attention of world opinion at all international forums on behalf of the restoration of sovereign rights to the Lithuanian and other subjugated peoples, to specifically continue to demand this at the European Security Conference, and by other means to influence the Soviet Union to stop its genocidal practices in Lithuania and to cease all acts of continued occupation; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, to both U.S. Senators and all Members of the House of Representatives from Ohio and to the press.

Resolution proposed by the Cleveland Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council and adopted by this assembly.

K. ALGIMANTAS PAUTIENIS,  
President.

The best response my speech got was my reference to President Reagan's blunt, honest appraisal of the Communists as liars and deceivers. Lithuanian Americans know that is what Communists are and like a President who tells it like it is.

#### APPOINTMENT AS ADDITIONAL MEMBER 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 an additional member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, to rank after the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. FOWLER.

□ 1530

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

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

There was no objection.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

The Lithuanian Council of Chicago commemorated this 63d anniversary with a program at the Maria High School auditorium on Sunday, February 15, in Chicago. The officers of this fine organization include Euphrosine Mikuzis, president; Dr. Paul M. Dargis, executive secretary; Rimas Sarka, Julius R. Kuzas, Mykolas Pranevicius, and Vincent Samaska, vice presidents; Irena Sankus, treasurer; Antanas Svitra, financial secretary, and Stasys Mankus, recording secretary.

Trustees include Kristina Austin, Teodora Kuzas, Petras Jokubka, and Oskaras Kremeris.

The members of the Lithuanian Council of Chicago are as follows: Ignas Andrasiunas, Petras Bucas, Edvardas Boreisa, Juozas Bigelis, Julie Diksas, Adele Gabalis, Stefanija Janutiene, Jura Jasiunas, Veronika Lenkevicius, Stefanija Kauleniene, Kazys Karazija, Hilde Kuzas, Sabina Klatt, Casimir G. Oksas, Algirdas Puzauskas, Povilas Povilaitis, Donatas Stukas, Vladas Soliunas, Justinas Sidlauskas, Vincas Valkavickas, and Vincas Zemaitis.

The Lithuanians took the historic step of independence in 1918, at the close of World War I, and for 22 years thereafter, Lithuania enjoyed peace and freedom from oppression. During this period the Lithuanian economy stabilized, and there was a great renaissance of national literature and culture.

The text of the national anthem of Lithuania follows as it appears in a booklet entitled, "Lithuania," published by the Lithuanian American Council of Chicago:

#### NATIONAL ANTHEM OF LITHUANIA

Lithuania, our country,  
Land of might you'll ever be;  
Through the ages your fond sons  
Have gathered strength from thee.  
Lithuania, your children  
Paths of righteousness shall tread;

For their native land they'll labor—  
Earth's aspiring aims they've bred.

Fount of light, may your bright sun  
Pierce all that's in darkened sheen,  
Show us Truth's noble way,  
And we'll follow in your gleam.

In our hearts, Lithuania,  
Love for you will dwell fore'er  
Spirit of the world is soaring—  
Caught in your exalted glare.

In 1939, the Soviet Empire began a campaign of intimidation on tiny Lithuania and concentrated its armed forces on the borders. This massive threat was followed on June 15, 1940, by actual occupation of Lithuania by the Red army, and the Communists continue to expand their empire by brute force up to the present moment in Afghanistan.

As soon as Lithuania had been occupied by military force, the Communists began arresting and executing the Lithuanian patriots. Non-Communist political parties were liquidated, and leaders in these parties were imprisoned. Thousands of Lithuanians lost their lives or were forcibly moved in cattle cars to distant parts of the Communist empire in the east. The people were forced to vote in national elections in which only the Communist Party was represented. The Lithuanians, despite these hopeless odds, resisted heroically, but they were overcome by their more numerous invaders.

Despite condemnation by the free world of this unlawful aggression against the sovereign rights of a free people, the Soviet Communists still occupy Lithuania and maintain troops within her borders. The national culture is gradually being destroyed, the language suppressed, and the Lithuanian people are forced to suffer under the harsh yoke of cruel Soviet oppression.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian National Foundation, Inc., has published a memorandum to Madrid participants at the Helsinki Final Act Review Conference, and a copy of that memorandum follows as well as four other documents by the Catholic Committee for the Defense of the Rights of the Religious Believers:

#### MEMORANDUM TO MADRID PARTICIPANTS ON LITHUANIA

##### MASSIVE HUMAN AND NATIONAL RIGHTS VIOLATION CHARGED

A memorandum dated September 15, 1980, on the C.S.C.E. meeting in Madrid and the Soviet occupation of Lithuania, was delivered to the non-communist signatories of the Helsinki Final Act. The memorandum was signed by Stasys Lozoraitis, Chief of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service, and Dr. C. K. Bobelis, President of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania.

The memorandum surveys Lithuania's occupation, the Baltic protest against the Hitler-Stalin Pact (Moscow, August 23, 1939), and the refusal of the great Western powers to recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Contrary

to its pledges as a signatory of the Helsinki Final Act—the memorandum states—the Soviet Union “continues to deny and violate fundamental freedoms and basic human rights” in Lithuania.

The memorandum asks the participating States at the Madrid Conference to seek and promote the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act by:

“1. Requesting that the Soviet Union—  
“a. Withdraw from Lithuania all its military forces, political, administrative and police personnel within the frontiers delineated by the Peace Treaty between Lithuania and Soviet Russia signed on July 12, 1920;

“b. Release all political prisoners of Lithuanian nationality from prisons, labor camps, psychiatric institutions, internal exile, and other institutions of servitude, from enforced Soviet military service and permit them to return to Lithuania;

“c. Halt official harassment of individuals who wish to practice their religion, observe their cultural traditions, or express opinions in defense of basic freedoms and human rights granted by international acts.

“2. Establishing international procedures that will enable the Lithuanian people to hold free elections, following the withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces and other Soviet personnel from their territory, and to reestablish their own sovereign Lithuanian governmental institutions, and thereby also their own independent national life.”

#### CATHOLIC COMMITTEE PROTESTS TO HELSINKI SIGNATORIES ON ARRESTS—FOUR NEW DOCUMENTS OF THE CATHOLIC COMMITTEE

Four new documents (Nos. 31-34) of the Catholic Committee for the Defense of the Rights of the Religious Believers established on November 13, 1978, in Lithuania, were published in issue No. 44 (July 30, 1980) of the Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania.

Document No. 34 of the Catholic Committee, dated July 21, 1980, is an Appeal to the Governments—signatories of the Helsinki Final Act and to All People of Good Will.

In 1974, the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR sentenced Petras Plumpa-Pluirs to 8 years of corrective labor in a strict-regime camp. His guilt consists of the fact that, relying on the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, he multiplied The Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania, a periodical, which recorded factual cases of the discrimination against religious believers.

Petras Plumpa-Pluirs is not a criminal, but a deeply moral Lithuanian, an exemplary catholic, and a father of three children. One can be only proud of such people, and their persecution through the courts is a totally unjustifiable crime against the basic human rights.

At present, Petras Plumpa-Pluirs is serving time in the strict-regime camp VS 389/35, where he lives under inhumanely difficult conditions. His wife, Aldona Pluiriene, has informed us on the basis of the accounts of her husband's friends that because of poor health Petras Plumpa-Pluirs is “unable to fulfill the work norms, but the administration, instead of providing him with medical care, frequently subjects him to cruel punishment” by keeping him in solitary. Since March, 1979, Mrs. Aldona Pluiriene has not received a single letter from her husband; she was not allowed to visit him and to give him the food parcels which prisoners are entitled to receive.

These facts bear witness that Petras Plumpa-Pluirs is imprisoned under unbearable

conditions and suggest a deliberate attempt to ruin his health by the time his sentence has expired.

Therefore, we appeal to the governments—signatories of the Helsinki Final Act, as well as to people of good will in the entire world to defend this noble Lithuanian!

We also take this occasion to inform all concerned that four totally innocent Lithuanians—Povilas Buzas, Anastazas Janulis, Genovaitė Navickaitė and Ona Vitkauskaitė are awaiting trial for a similar “crime,” i.e. for disseminating information about the discrimination against religious believers. The fact of their juridical persecution must be raised in the forthcoming Madrid conference aimed at investigating the realization of the Helsinki agreements.

Document No. 32, dated June 21, 1980, is addressed to the Central Committee of the Lithuanian CP and to the Government:

“This year agents of the Committee of State Security (KGB) have charged four fighters for the rights of Lithuania's believers—Povilas Buzas, Anastazas Janulis, Genovaitė Navickaitė and Ona Vitkauskaitė—with slandering the Soviet system, and arrested them. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against them. It is generally asserted that they will be punished for producing and disseminating the Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania.

“Are the arrested individuals . . . really criminals? No. We have questioned many people who knew them well—they all asserted, that the arrested four were honest Lithuanians and exemplary Catholics, who can only be envied for their moral nobility. It is dishonest and base to accuse such people of slandering the Soviet system.

“If elementary human rights of religious believers would not be violated in Soviet occupied Lithuania, and if there was no effort to acquire executive charge of the Church with the help of the Regulations Governing Religious Associations and various unpublished instructions, then the Chronicle, which records the facts of discrimination against the believers and the Church, would not exist.

“Lithuania's believers constantly encounter various difficulties and it is, therefore, quite logical that certain individuals, who want to defend the believers and have no other means to do so, publicize facts that require correction. Must they be put behind bars, these people who fight for the observation of the Soviet constitution and of the international agreements ratified by the Soviet government, and who insist that human dignity must be respected? Such people deserve the respect of the state. We all must bow our heads before the truth. One must have courage to face the errors that have been committed, however immense they might be. To try to conceal the injuries and the crimes that are inflicted on the believers, and to do this by torturing innocent people—this is a painful illusion. What will the trial of history say about that?

“In the name of God, of the truth, and of the believing nation, we say to you: set free the innocent individuals—Povilas Buzas, Anastazas Janulis, Genovaitė Navickaitė and Ona Vitkauskaitė.”

Document No. 31, dated March 12, 1980, is addressed to Brezhnev and defends several individuals arrested in Russia “for their faith”: Viktor Kapitančuk, secretary of the (Russian) Christian Committee to Defend the Rights of Believers; Aleksander Ogorodnikov, the founder of the Russian Orthodox Religious Seminar; and others.

Document No. 33, dated June 21, 1980, acquaints the Central Committee of the Lithuanian CP with many cases of “discrimination against religious believers” in Lithuania. It says that the “present problems of the faithful and the clergy of Lithuania cannot be solved from the positions of power or by branding certain people as ‘extremists’.” The document states that the faithful and the clergy want “full religious freedom,” whose principles are delineated in the Declaration on Religious Freedom, adopted by second Vatican Ecumenical Council.

Mr. Speaker, on this solemn occasion in tribute to a brave people, I join Lithuanian Americans residing within my own 11th District of Illinois, whom I am privileged to serve, in Chicago and all over our Nation who are commemorating this anniversary and assuring the courageous Lithuanians that our country continues to support their just aspirations for freedom and independence. I express the fervent hope that the goal of Lithuanian self-determination shall soon be realized.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Independence Day comes at a time when the Soviet domination of Poland once again has reminded us of the continuing threat posed by a power intolerant of even the stirrings of freedom.

While the headlines focus on Soviet tyranny in Poland and Afghanistan, many Americans are unaware of the brutal colonial oppression in Lithuania.

That oppression has meant curbs on free speech. It has meant that citizens are not allowed to practice their religion. It has meant imprisonment of ordinary citizens for nonexistent crimes. It has meant travel restrictions.

This subjugation extends back to Russian annexation in 1795. There were many courageous attempts by the Lithuanians to throw off the yoke of Russian domination, but those efforts were beaten down. In the mid-19th century, the Soviets sought to totally obliterate Lithuanian language and culture, and impose a Russian culture. The brave people of this tiny nation resisted this action, retaining their traditions and religions.

World War I brought about an international situation which gave Lithuania a long-awaited opportunity to be a free and independent nation. For more than two decades, beginning on February 16, 1918, Lithuania demonstrated a remarkable capacity for self-government.

Tremendous emphasis was placed on improving agriculture. A land reform program was initiated that led to a sharp increase in the number of small farms. Industrialization progressed.

Labor reforms were instituted, including establishment of the 8-hour work day. A forward-looking education program cut illiteracy drastically. The arts flourished.

This golden age ended abruptly and tragically when Lithuania was engulfed by foreign armies during World War II. It was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union in 1940 after occupation by the Red army. A German attack on the Soviet Union occurred less than a year later, leaving Lithuania in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviets in 1944. Since that time, the U.S.S.R. has kept the nation under its thumb with a brutality that matches any employed behind the Iron Curtain.

Despite this deprivation, hope remains. Commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day is a symbol of hope as well as a salute to the 1918 proclamation of independence.

In conclusion, let the Lithuanian love of freedom be an inspiration so that we remain forever vigilant.

Lithuanian Americans remind us that the peoples living in areas of Soviet domination trust us to champion their cause.

We must share their determination that those people shall again be free.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished friend, also from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOUGHERTY).

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the gentleman from Illinois for taking this special order. I see that the House is not full today, but I think the cause is quite just. I would hope that the people visiting our Capitol, those who are listening today and those who are perhaps watching this on closed circuit TV, would just take a moment to realize what we are talking about.

We here in the United States live at a rather hectic pace. We take so much for granted. We fail sometimes to realize what the word "freedom" really means. We are free people, and so perhaps we cannot appreciate the feelings of those people who are indeed captives of the Soviet Union.

Last Monday, February 16, commemorated the 63d anniversary of the freedom and the independence of the nation of Lithuania. Many of our fellow citizens here in the United States are of Lithuanian heritage. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in 1940 the Soviet Union saw fit to occupy Lithuania and its neighboring States of Estonia and Latvia. Today, these three little Baltic States are but a passing light in international diplomacy.

So few people truly understand the heartfelt feelings that the people of Lithuanian American descent have toward the situation in Lithuania. For so many years we here in this country have failed to properly address this most critical issue; that is, as Americans, do we really believe in freedom?

Are we really interested in the plight of the Lithuanian people? And so, today's special order is significant because, while there is no independence day celebration in Lithuania this year, we indeed today in this special order are commemorating for the people of the United States and for the people of Lithuania a celebration of their independence.

I was privileged, Mr. Speaker, to address the Lithuanian American community of Washington, D.C., last Sunday. I basically said then that we as Americans have an obligation to speak out against Soviet oppression, against Soviet occupation of Lithuania. We have an obligation to speak out on behalf of freedom for the Lithuanian people until indeed, Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is free; until the people of Lithuania no longer know the oppression and the burden of the Soviet Union.

It is my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to serve as the cochairman of a new congressional committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, and I would urge all the Members of this Congress to join us in this committee so that we take every opportunity we have in this Congress to call to the attention of the Soviet Union that we, the Members of the Congress, will not stand idly by; we will not stand silent while Lithuania continues to be occupied. This committee, hopefully, will be a vehicle for Members to participate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman again for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I submit my remarks from last Sunday's celebration as Lithuanian Independence Day held by the Lithuanian American Community of Washington, D.C.:

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

It is both a privilege and a pleasure for me to be with you today to commemorate the Independence of Lithuania.

I bring you greetings from my many friends in the Lithuanian community in Philadelphia on this most significant day!

When I was first invited to be with you today, I wasn't quite sure why you would want a Congressman from Pennsylvania, who has only been involved in the cause of a free Lithuania for about three years to be your guest speaker.

Upon further reflection however, I realized that commitment to a cause cannot be measured only in the length of commitment but also in the intensity of commitment, however short the time of involvement.

As I was driving down here this afternoon, I thought back about how I first got involved in the "Cause of Lithuania" and how much has been accomplished in less than three years—and how much more there is to do!

I stand here today as co-chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Baltic States and Ukraine—as an outspoken leader in the Congress of the United States on behalf of the Republic of Lithuania—as a friend of the Lithuanian-American community.

I stand here in these capacities today because a few short years ago leaders of the Lithuanian-American community in Philadelphia saw an Irish-American State senator—then a candidate for Congress—who they knew cared about the oppression and violence in Northern Ireland; a State senator who had been involved—on a limited basis—in the captive nations movement; a State senator who they thought might share their concerns for the oppressed people of Soviet-occupied Lithuania and who would believe in their cause—that someday, God-willing, Lithuania will be free.

And so whatever I have been able to do on behalf of "our" cause is because of you the people of the Lithuanian-American community. You have kept the faith. You have brought the needs and aspirations of the people of Lithuania to the floor of the Congress of the United States. And I thank you for that!

Sometimes as we gather for different events, as we are today—we get so wrapped up in the preparations for the event; we are perhaps preoccupied with thinking about something that happened yesterday; we find ourselves wondering if we forgot to do something at home; we find our thoughts anticipating something that might happen tomorrow—that we fail to truly understand what today is all about.

We Americans live a hectic life. We have a fast-paced existence. We take many things for granted and we forget the true meaning of a word like "freedom." We find ourselves not truly "feeling" a word like "thank you."

Let us, for a few brief moments, sit back, cast aside yesterday and tomorrow, and think about what this ceremony really means. Let each and every one of us for a few brief moments be touched by the real meaning of "oppression"—not to be free; "oppression"—to be denied the right to self-expression; "oppression"—to have the very heart of a people—a culture, a heritage, a tradition—denied and suppressed by a foreign dictator.

Let us for a few brief moments be touched by the real meaning of "republic"—that government should be of the people—of the people; "republic"—that government should be by the will of the people; "republic"—that government should be for the well-being of the people.

Let us for a few brief moments be touched by the real meaning of "freedom"—to be treated as an individual human being with dignity and respect; "freedom"—to be free to study, to grow, to love my culture, my heritage, my traditions; "freedom"—as a nation, as a people to set our own destiny without foreign occupation or intrusion.

Our cause then is to use this coming together today—this sharing—to thank God for our precious gift of freedom; to remember, to recall that our fellowmen in Lithuania are today oppressed, that the Republic of Lithuania is occupied! That our people are not free! To drive deep within our hearts, our minds, our bones, our emotions—to rededicate ourselves to the principle that we shall not rest, that we shall not truly be free until the people of Lithuania are free—until the Government of Lithuania is of the people, by the people, and for the people—until the maps of the world read—until the rollcall of the nations of the world reads—until the banner of the Embassy in Washington reads "The Republic of Lithuania"! Until then our cause must go forward.

We have done much. There is so much more to do. Free Lithuanians chained themselves to the gates of the Soviet Embassy in Washington and had their cause taken to the floor of Congress. The symbol of a free Lithuania in America—the legation in Washington—will not pass from the scene—as some in the State Department would like—because we won't let it happen. The representative of the free Government of Lithuania in our Nation's Capital will not pass from the scene because you and I have forced the State Department to recognize the need for the legitimacy of a line of succession at the legation. The celebration of Lithuanian independence may not be held in occupied Lithuania this year but it will be held on the floor of the Congress of these United States—this year and every year until Lithuania is free! The cause of Lithuania has grown throughout the free world, as was recently noted at the Madrid Conference where the cause of Lithuania and the activities of six members of the Lithuanian resistance received high visibility. Much has been done. So much more still has to be done!

Let us today by our work, by our actions, by our prayers, send a message to the people of Lithuania: "You are not forgotten for we are keepers of your trust . . . until you are free! The culture, the heritage, the tradition of the Lithuanian people live on here in America . . . until you are free!"

The cause for which so many of you have suffered—for dignity, for respect, for self-determination—is a cause we shall carry—until you are free! Your struggle against oppression and occupation is our struggle—until you are free!

The torch that burns deeply within you burns deeply within us—the torch of a free people that can never be extinguished by oppression, by fear, by imprisonment, by those who know not the beauty, the determination, the commitment of a free people—the torch of a free Lithuania we will carry in our hearts—this we promise—until you are free!

● Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to join once again with my colleagues in Congress and with Lithuanians, and Lithuanian Americans throughout the world in commemorating the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Congress has long shown its understanding of the struggle of the Lithuanian and other Baltic peoples for freedom, self-government, and release from Soviet domination. But the recent events in Poland and Afghanistan have heightened our sense of the plight of nations under Soviet rule.

The history of Lithuania is the story of people on a political faultline. Lithuania has long been a victim of German and Russian imperialism, yet under adversity the people have maintained a strong sense of culture and tradition—and with independence, Lithuania has flourished.

Lithuanian history reaches back almost 1,000 years. But in 1795, as the United States was building a republic, Lithuania came under foreign rule during the partition of Poland, and was annexed by Russia. Although unable to throw out their hostile government, the people resisted attempts

to replace Lithuanian language and culture with Russian, and remained faithful to their religion, language, and traditions.

During World War I, German armies invaded Lithuania and took it from the Russians. The German Government submitted to Lithuanian pressure, however, and authorized the formation of an independent state based on democratic principles. Today we commemorate the date of that proclamation, February 16, 1918.

The Red army invaded Lithuania again in 1919, but following the settlement of World War I on the Eastern Front, Lithuania retained her independence until the German attack on the Soviet Union in June 1940.

As an independent nation, Lithuania made great strides in improving its agricultural production, land distribution, and establishing an industrial base. The Lithuanian people also made great progress in the fields of labor and education, for example, doubling the number of elementary and secondary schools during their 30 years of freedom.

For the last four decades Lithuanians have again lived under Soviet domination, one more captive nation. Many Lithuanians managed to flee from their homeland because of political oppression, and today there are many strong, vital Lithuanian-American communities in the United States. But Lithuanians here and elsewhere in the world have not forgotten their historic struggle for genuine freedom and independence.

The Lithuanian World Congress of 1958 called on the free world "to reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom," and to "not being a party to any agreement or treaty that would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly sovereign Lithuanian State."

So we gather here today to do just that, to express our support for individual freedom and self-determination in Lithuania, and the other Baltic States. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that the brave resistance now being put up by the Polish labor unions will in time set the pattern for a new measure of freedom from Soviet control coming not only to Poland but to Lithuania and other captive nations as well. Let us hope that that will indeed occur.●

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today we proclaim that more than 40 years of Soviet domination has not extinguished the fire of freedom that burns in the hearts and minds of the proud people of Lithuania.

We are here to proclaim to all the world, free and captive nations alike, that that spirit will never die.

The brutal and criminal annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet

Union has not broken the desire of the people of Lithuania for self-determination. Instead, that fervent yearning grows even stronger with each passing day.

The degree of personal liberty enjoyed in our great country must be difficult to comprehend for Lithuanians who suffer under the confines of continuing Soviet occupation of their homeland.

Our attention to the situation in the Baltic States, coupled with active support for these brave peoples' quest for freedom must remain a solemn responsibility of our Government. Remembering that their cause is the same cause that ignited our forefathers' revolt against foreign domination, let us voice our admiration and pledge our untiring support for their sacred struggle.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to join with my colleague, FRANK ANNUNZIO, in directing special attention to the 63d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Baltic State of Lithuania. The largest of the Baltic States, the Lithuanians have withstood centuries of Russian domination and political persecution.

Although the Lithuanian people are not allowed to celebrate the anniversary of their independence which was declared on February 16, 1918, it is especially significant that a country whose people have not been allowed to govern themselves for 41 years still have a strong national spirit. They enjoyed independence from the Soviet Russian Empire for only 22 years. In June 1940, the Soviet Union invaded and occupied the Baltic States, and Lithuania was forcefully annexed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

As we look at the Soviet invasion and expansionism into the Baltic States, we must continue to condemn these transgressions as morally, ethically, and politically wrong. We, as a nation, must consider the plight of various peoples around the world who face a deprivation of basic human rights, and consistently voice our objections to all Soviet violations of the rights of those held captive under Soviet domination.

As we are painfully aware, the Soviet Union has denied religious freedom as well as ethnic and cultural development in Lithuania. The Kremlin continues to persecute and suppress the Roman Catholic Church, which has played a major role in Lithuanian history and is symbolic of Lithuanian nationhood. The cultural genocide and the denial of their basic human rights continues in Lithuania against the will of the Lithuanian people who are subjected to blatant political repression. However, the consistent and deliberate "Russification" of their culture and ef-

forts to eradicate their historic nationalism has not dimmed their determination to preserve their unity and strong sense of national consciousness.

It is most appropriate that on this occasion of the 63d anniversary of their declaration of independence, we pay tribute to the devotion by the Lithuanian people to resist "Russification." Their indomitable spirit will one day, I predict, overcome Communist suppression, and their ideals of personal liberty, national independence, and human dignity will again be restored. These brave people have struggled to preserve their heritage, national language, and historic religious faith in face of Soviet totalitarianism.

As we mark this anniversary, we must also recognize the many contributions made to our country by Lithuanian Americans. Here in the United States, the Lithuanians are a well-organized and a hard-working ethnic group who are deeply interested in maintaining their cultural background. When the time comes for the restoration of freedom for their homeland, they will be in a position to make a positive contribution to the progress of that nation.

That is why it is especially important for us to preserve the diplomatic representation in the United States of the Lithuanian people. The Lithuanian Legation located in Washington, D.C., faces extinction because of the small nation's monetary assets frozen in the United States at the Soviet takeover are almost gone. As a visible sign to the more than 1 million people of Lithuanian descent living in the United States, it would be most significant that we would guarantee the legality and legitimacy of the Lithuanian Legation.

The United States must continue to support the aspirations of freedom, independence, and national self-determination of the people of Lithuania and the others held captive. Until that day, we salute the brave Lithuanian people for reminding us through their struggle of how precious and valuable freedom is, and how costly its loss. ●

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1981, marks the 63d anniversary of the reestablishment of the independent State of Lithuania.

Lithuania's first historical recognition as a nation was in 1009. For centuries after its recognition, this nation experienced domination by foreign powers and fought off efforts by Germany and Russia to replace Lithuanian culture with that of their own.

Lithuania was finally able to regain its status as an independent nation in 1918. This newly independent nation joined the League of Nations and established diplomatic relations with other nations around the world. The year 1920 marked a turning point in the history of this proud nation when the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty

with Lithuania, recognizing it as an independent nation. A permanent constitution was adopted and a democratic government was formed, preserving the people's rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and religious expression.

During World War II, foreign powers once again invaded Lithuania, resulting in an end to its independence in 1940, when the Supreme Soviet in Moscow declared Lithuania a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

Lithuania's 20 years of peace, progress, and freedom created a strong sense of Lithuanian nationalism which is still very much alive among these people. They continue in their fight for self-determination and resist russification efforts by the Communist Party in Moscow. While they are politically incorporated into the Soviet Union, they remain culturally and socially a race apart. The Lithuanians greatly improved their standard of living during their 20 years of independence. Their economy flourished and they developed a lifestyle similar to that of Western Europeans, rather than that of the Soviets. Unfortunately, they do not presently enjoy a full return on their achievements, since a good portion of the fruits of their labor is channeled to other parts of the Soviet Union.

Let us join other freedom-loving peoples throughout the world in support of the successful efforts of the Lithuanian people in resisting russification policies imposed by the U.S.S.R. Let us celebrate February 16, Lithuanian Independence Day, in the spirit of these proud people in their fight for self-determination. ●

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, with the recent return of the hostages from Iran, Americans were able to share renewed feelings of patriotism and happiness. We watched them come home to enjoy and treasure what citizens of the United States believe to be the birthright of all men—freedom. February 16 marks the 63d year since the declaration of Lithuanian independence in 1918 and yet these people continue their struggle for the reestablishment of complete independence and self-government. For over 40 years the Soviet Union has managed to suppress any dreams of freedom for the people of Lithuania and her neighboring states, Estonia and Latvia.

There was a brief period—the years of the twenties and thirties—following Lithuania's declaration of independence when it appeared she would continue as an independent nation. She entered into diplomatic relations with the major European powers. Beyond this, the people demonstrated a capacity and ability for self-government through noteworthy social progress in the areas of land reform in addition to improved transportation and education. This period of great renaissance

in national literature and culture was to end all too quickly in disappointment and sorrow.

World War II quickly dissipated the spirit and momentum of progress. The occupation of the Baltic States was carried out after a secret agreement was reached by Hitler and Stalin. The defeat of Hitler's forces left the struggling Lithuanians in Soviet hands. Russian troops were quick to suppress the ill-fated citizens.

While the 1975 Helsinki accords have provided a vehicle for addressing human and national rights within the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union has repeatedly violated these rights in Lithuania. For 63 years the Lithuanians have been engaged in a struggle to practice the freedom their declaration of independence gives them—freedom to appreciate their own culture, literature, art, and religion. Yet they live in constant fear of Soviet retaliation for these efforts.

The lesson of Lithuania must be heeded by all the free people of the world. Our recent experience in Iran has served to remind us how essential and precious freedom truly is, and what its loss can signify. As we pay tribute to Lithuanians on their independence day, it is an opportune moment to express our unwavering support for restoring to the Baltic peoples their right to freedom and self-determination. ●

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians and Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorated the 63d anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania's independence from the Russian Empire. Although the Lithuanian people currently live under Soviet oppression, this special day provides us with an opportunity to acknowledge and applaud their national pride and their courageous struggle for freedom and self-determination.

This small Baltic country, which enjoyed independence between the two World Wars, has suffered from flagrant violations of human rights since it was annexed illegally by the Soviet Union in 1940. In the years following the war, guerrilla resistance to Soviet occupation was repressed ruthlessly. Even today, illegal searches, interrogations and harassment by Soviet security forces are commonplace, especially among those who are active members of the Catholic Church. In spite of this persecution, the Lithuanians have remained devout in their faith and vigilant in their hope for freedom and independence.

One of the most inspiring examples of bravery in the face of Soviet oppression may be found in the person of Viktoras Petkus. A historian and devout Catholic, Mr. Petkus was imprisoned in 1977 for his role as leader of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, which sought to monitor and promote

Soviet compliance with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki accords. Even in prison, Mr. Petkus has continued his religious observances, and has been sentenced to 6 months in an isolation cell for his defiance. Other examples of courage amidst persecution abound. Petras Plumpa, Romas Ragisis and Justas Gimbutas are among those who are serving prison terms as a result of their opposition to Soviet rule in their homeland.

As the Lithuanians celebrate their independence day, those of us who take our religious and personal freedoms for granted may reflect upon the plight of the oppressed peoples of the world. And we can look to the perseverance and faith of the Lithuanian people, both as an inspiration and as a reminder that vigilance is the price of freedom.●

● **Mr. VANDER JAGT.** Mr. Speaker, at a time when the people of Poland are threatened with the possibility of Soviet intervention, and the people of Eastern Europe live in constant danger of being slapped by the paw of the bear on their border, it is appropriate that we remind ourselves of the cruel enslavement of their neighbors to the north—the Baltic countries illegally annexed by the Soviet Union nearly four decades ago.

I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in drawing attention to the 63d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, and to add my voice to that of the Lithuanian people and free people everywhere in calling for freedom and self-government for this tiny state.

The implications of the Polish situation and the reality of Afghanistan forcefully reminded us during these past months of the true nature of life in Soviet satellites. The blatant subsuming of Lithuania cannot be forgotten in the rush of dealing with international crises which face us daily. That the people of the Baltic region continue to struggle for freedom and independence is an inspiration to all people and we must never fail to draw attention to their plight.

Lithuanians in exile around the world have a right to call out for self-determination for their people in accord with the Helsinki agreement, and to draw attention to the continuing denial of fundamental rights in contravention of the continuing human rights discussions in Madrid.

We all pray that the day will come when Lithuanians at home and abroad will see true freedom in the land of their heritage.●

● **Mr. HOWARD.** Mr. Speaker, today is the commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day and it is also a reminder of the hope that all Lithuanian-Americans have for those working to gain independence for Lithuania.

Of all the European countries, Lithuania, along with Latvia and Estonia, were the only ones to lose their sovereignty during World War II. While East European nations such as Poland and Bulgaria had Communist governments imposed on them by the Soviet Red Army, the three Baltic countries were incorporated forcibly into the U.S.S.R. after the Russian armies invaded them in 1940 as a result of the Hitler/Stalin agreement.

This Soviet aggression terminated Lithuania's independence and led to genocide and deportations by the Russians. Many citizens were relegated to collective farming communities in Russia and further separated from their families.

Due to this injustice, the United States and most Western nations have not accorded diplomatic recognition to the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Presidents from Franklin Delano Roosevelt through Jimmy Carter have emphasized the right of the three Baltic nations to sovereignty. To this point, a fully accredited and recognized diplomatic mission of independent Lithuania operates in New York City.

It is my hope that Americans of all ethnicities will remember the hopes and determination of the Lithuanian people to strive toward the beacon of freedom.●

● **Mr. DORNAN** of California. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate the 63d anniversary of the independence of the Baltic State of Lithuania. The radiant lamp of liberty, which clothed its sons with strength and its daughters with beauty, shone but for a moment before being savagely extinguished by the black night of totalitarian tyranny. In 1940, 22 years after its declaration of independence, the Baltic State of Lithuania, along with the sovereign States of Latvia and Estonia, were brutally annexed to the Soviet empire. A brave people were forced to undergo a baptism of blood on the altar of raw Soviet power. What lack of nobility or heroism, Mr. Speaker. The largest nation on Earth simply annihilated one of the smallest nations by means of brutal military force. To this day, 41 years later, the men, women, and children of Lithuania remain under the iron heel of foreign despotism.

But, while darkness may have its hour, Mr. Speaker, truth and liberty will have its day. Hope gives courage to the heart. The Almighty who holds in his hands the destiny of nations will not be mocked forever. Men of high religious faith, who put their trust in heaven, will have their glorious moment of vindication. Even now, a candle of hope is lighted in Poland; the glow of which will be multiplied a millionfold until all of Eastern Europe and the Baltic States once again are

ablaze with the resplendence of the light of liberty.

Faithful to our own hallowed traditions of liberty and self-government, we salute the Lithuanian people today. We pledge our continued support until that hoped-for day when the last Soviet soldier has left Baltic soil, and the sun of liberty once again smiles upon the lovely land of Lithuania.●

● **Mr. FISH.** Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in observing the 63d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, an occasion on which we are once again reminded of the Soviet Union's repression of individual rights of freedom-loving peoples.

When centuries of Russian imperialism and attempts at domination came to an end after World War I with the declaration of independence on February 16, 1918, Lithuanian culture, language, and religious faith enjoyed a freedom and creativity unsurpassed in its history. Unfortunately, that blossoming of Lithuanian contributions to the free world ceased just 22 years later.

Lithuania's brief independence was brutally curtailed by the Soviet occupation in 1941. Thousands of Lithuanians and citizens of the neighboring Baltic States of Estonia and Latvia were shipped to Siberia. When the Nazis invaded Russia, gross violations of human rights continued. These guiltless people, who had so recently enjoyed freedom, were sent to labor in slave camps, mines and forests, to die far from their native land. It is estimated that nearly 10 percent of the population of Lithuania was murdered or deported by the Communists and the Nazis.

The United States has never and will never recognize the forcible Soviet annexation of this great nation. We must continue to protest in the strongest possible terms the oppressive measures of the Soviet Union against the Lithuanian nation and the gross violation of human rights perpetrated upon these proud people.

The Lithuanian struggle is an example for all people who are denied basic liberties. Although the Soviet Union has refused to recognize political rights as well as religious freedom, and has restricted economic and cultural development, Lithuanians have continued to preserve their national unity and strong sense of national consciousness. Here in the United States, Lithuanians retain an ethnic identity as evidenced by the continued existence of a native Lithuanian legation. These people have contributed greatly to our country and their indomitable spirit will enable both they and those still living in Lithuania to make an invaluable contribution to the progress of their nation and the freedom of all

people who suffer under Soviet repression.

Let us not forget our commitment to aiding the Lithuanian people to one day regain that which is rightfully theirs, a free and independent nation. We must continue our concerted effort and remain firm in our recognition of Lithuania, its people and their culture.●

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride and honor that I take this opportunity to note the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania on Monday, February 16, 1981. This day holds significance to all Americans of Lithuanian descent as well as all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

The world community should join today in recognizing that the rights and dignity of the Lithuanian people and the citizens of the Baltic nations are being trampled upon and ignored as a result of 40 years of armed occupation by the Soviet Union. The strength and will of the Lithuanian people are being tested by this illegal occupation of a sovereign nation. Yet, the great determination of the Lithuanian people will in the end prevail over the storm of Soviet tyranny.

Recently, we have seen another nation, Afghanistan, swallowed in a manner much like that in which Lithuania was devoured 40 years ago. It is time that all of us join the cry of the Lithuanian people and call on the free world to demand that the illegality of the Soviet occupation be recognized, and that the Lithuanian people be allowed to vote on a referendum to decide the future of their own state.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from the State of Illinois, FRANK ANNUNZIO, in commemorating the 63d anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

The nation of Lithuania enjoyed but a brief 22 years of freedom in this century, when in 1918 it proclaimed its independence from Russia and Germany, and established a democratic government after more than a century of domination by both these countries. The Soviet Union shortly thereafter signed a peace treaty in which it recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania. However, in 1940 Hitler and Stalin disregarded all former treaties and again subjected Lithuania to foreign dominance, along with other Baltic nations.

Having endured more than 40 years of domination by the Soviet Union, the proud people of Lithuania are subject to constant infringement upon their most basic human liberties. There is a continuing pressure to abolish their native tongue, a concerted effort to discourage learning of Lithuanian history and literature, and constant effort to eliminate the ties of

centuries of close affiliation with the Catholic Church.

The Soviet Union, having cosigned the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, continues to ignore, blatantly, many of the provisions guaranteeing basic human rights. This was brought before the Helsinki accords review meeting in Madrid last year. Members of Lithuanian citizens groups, who have tried to monitor Moscow's violations of the Helsinki accords, have been harassed and persecuted. One of its members, Victoras Petkus, was tried and sentenced to a prison term of 15 years.

However, I am encouraged to see that despite overwhelming odds, the Lithuanian people have not abandoned their struggle for freedom and self-determination. They continue to fight for national autonomy, freedom of speech, and freedom of worship. I am also encouraged that the expressions of support by my colleagues today will serve as notice to Moscow that this country supports the struggle for independence and freedom of the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

At a time when we watch with interest the continuing efforts of Lithuania's neighbor, Poland, for concessions of basic freedoms from Communist dominance, we take heart that the people of the small but proud nation of Lithuania will prevail and live as free people once again. I pray this day may arrive soon.●

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1981, marks the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This anniversary serves to remind us of the unextinguishable spirit of a people who have enjoyed but a brief period of real peace. After only 20 years of independence, the Soviet Union illegally invaded Lithuania, and have occupied it since. The United States has never recognized the Soviet annexation of Lithuania. We must continue to support the fight for that country's right of self-determination. We must not let that goal fade.

On this historic day of memory for the proud people of Lithuania, I think we should remember the 30,000 freedom fighters who died in resisting the Soviet invasion, as well as those who currently are subjected to Soviet rule today. We should never forget that every state bordering the Soviet Union exists in the constant fear of invasion.

Finally, I hope that the patriotism and undying spirit of Lithuanians everywhere in the world will serve as an inspiring example to all of us that freedom is not always a right, but a privilege which not all people in this world enjoy.●

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day. It was February 16, 1918, that the Baltic State of Lithuania declared its autonomy from the

long period of Russian hegemony and German occupation it had suffered during World War I. This tiny state was again destined to fall under Soviet domination; Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. in 1940. Having fallen into Nazi hands, Lithuania was reoccupied by the Soviet Union in 1944, and has been considered a component republic by the Soviet Union ever since.

Soviet policy implementation during the Stalin years forced a dramatic change in the composition of the Lithuanian population. Some 80,000 Lithuanians fled to West Germany when the Soviet Union took over the Baltic region in 1944. An additional 60,000 were found in East Germany and deported during 1945 and 1946. Their passive resistance to the collectivization of agriculture brought the deportation of some 60,000 Lithuanians in 1949. The death of Stalin eased the suffering of these displaced people, and about one-third of those who had been deported were permitted to return to their homeland. Yet, this cannot erase past cruelties committed by the U.S.S.R., nor the continuing efforts by the Soviets to destroy the Lithuanian national spirit.

Despite all the hardships suffered, the strength and dignity of the Lithuanian people have survived. The Lithuanians continue their resistance to Soviet occupation. In their fight, they look to the United States as a source of moral support and strength. In our attempt to promote the respect for and freedom of the people of Lithuania, I endorse the continuation of the present U.S. policy of refusing to recognize the Soviet occupation of Lithuania and the maintenance of our independent diplomatic relations with them. I urge a renewed effort in seeking to enforce the principles agreed upon by many nations in the Helsinki agreement in 1975.●

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the 63d anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence is a chance for all Americans to reflect on the strength of the Lithuanian people to retain their social and cultural heritage in the face of Soviet suppression.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanians gained their independence from the Soviet Union and emerged as a sovereign and self-governing state. The history of Lithuania, with its emphasis on educational and religious tolerance, became a model and an inspiration to oppressed people everywhere. Unfortunately, in 1940 the Lithuanians were once more under Soviet domination and control. For the last 41 years the spirit of the Lithuanian people has been in a constant struggle with Soviet oppression.

Mr. Speaker, the Helsinki Act, passed in 1975, and signed by the United States, the Soviet Union, and

over 30 other countries, recognized the principles of national sovereignty, equality, and independence. The Soviet Union has completely disregarded this document in dealing with the Baltic States. The recent statement given in Madrid by Warren Zimmerman, the deputy chairman of the U.S. delegation reviewing abuses of the 1975 act, makes it clear that the United States is encouraging the fulfillment of the ideals and commitments made in Helsinki. It is a tribute to the will of the Lithuanian people that they have not buckled under to the brutal attempt by the Soviet Union to destroy their national heritage. The strength and perseverance of their spirit should be an inspiration to our own. ●

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the special order taken by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) to commemorate the 63d anniversary of the Proclamation of Lithuanian Independence.

February 16 marked the 63d anniversary of the day on which Lithuania became a free and independent nation, founded on democratic principles. The commemoration of that day is a symbol of great hope for all Lithuanian Americans and for freedom-loving men and women the world over who struggle to free present-day Lithuania from Soviet oppression.

I give my fullest support to the cause of independence for Lithuania. May the time come when its people are again free. ●

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today, the people of Lithuania will celebrate the 63d anniversary of their independence. However, this day will not be celebrated in the joyous fashion that we Americans observe each Fourth of July. Instead, the brave, struggling people of Lithuania will endure this day as they do all others, as the repressed victims of the Soviet Union's wave of expansionist policies. The inherent freedoms that we so confidently assume in our country have never been experienced by most Lithuanians. They are prisoners in their own homeland, a part of the 1 billion people suffering under Soviet oppression.

As long as the right of self-determination is denied the people of Lithuania and her fellow Baltic countries, free people throughout the world cannot rest. Just as a chain is as strong as its weakest link, we must strive to strengthen the chain of freedom among all peoples. The Soviet's latest invasion into Afghanistan only further emphasizes the menace they pose to peace-loving nations. It is our moral obligation to continue our support of the Lithuanians' struggle, in word and in deed.

Therefore, I join my fellow Congressmen to honor the fine people of

Lithuania. We must never forget their daily struggle against the stifling rule of the Russians. Let us take this occasion to renew our commitment to the fight for liberty in the finest of American traditions, that someday the Lithuanians' Independence Day will be as joyous as our own. ●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, within a week we Americans commemorate the champions of our independence and liberty, Washington and Lincoln. In that same week, on February 16, the Lithuanian people commemorate both the 730th anniversary of the Lithuanian state and the 63d of its Declaration of Independence after the First World War. For the Lithuanians, whether in their native land or around the world, this is a melancholy occasion because, although theoretically and legally theirs remains a sovereign nation, it is in fact dominated by the Soviet Union, which forcibly incorporated it during the Second World War and which occupies it to this day.

We admire these brave people in their efforts to keep alive their national identity and to secure basic individual rights within their homeland. The least we can do here is to lend our support to their indomitable spirit, which has survived four decades of efforts to extinguish it. Let there be no mistake that, whatever our administration or its current priorities, the American people do not forget their commitment to the rights of others all over the world.

On this anniversary, then, we salute the Lithuanian nation in the confidence that they will endure and prevail in their relentless pursuit of their rights and liberties. ●

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join with my colleagues today in celebrating the 63d anniversary of the declaration of independence for Lithuania. My parents are from Lithuania, and they were forced to escape the brutal occupation of their country when the achievements and aspirations of the Lithuanian people as a sovereign nation were crushed by Nazi and Soviet occupation during the Second World War.

After more than a century of struggle against imperial Russian and German occupation, the Lithuanians, on February 16, 1918, restored their national independence. In the following 22 years, Lithuania adopted a democratic constitution, implemented equitable land reforms, and, from 1929 to 1939, almost quadrupled its industrial output. Tragically, however, on June 15, 1940, the Red army invaded the country. The Soviets imposed a puppet regime and terrorized the population with executions and mass arrests. When war began between Germany and the Bolsheviks, the Lithuanians seized power from the Communists and for over 2 months main-

tained an independent government. In August 1941, the Nazis imposed their Fascist rule. After Germany's defeat in 1944, the Soviets once again invaded the country.

Until 1952 the Lithuanians led an armed struggle against their Communist oppressors. About 30,000 Lithuanians died during that period of time. The 3,290,000 ethnic Lithuanians now under Soviet control have fought and suffered in their struggle against Soviet oppression ever since. About 350,000 others were forced into exile.

We have observed during the last months how the people of Poland, a nation bordering on Lithuania, have made progress in their efforts to gain human rights in the face of Soviet domination. That progress is still overshadowed by fear of a Soviet invasion. Had it not been for the encouragement and moral support rendered to the Polish workers by the peoples of democratic nations, Red army battalions might already have moved into Poland. So far they have not; but let us not forget that Poland might still suffer the same fate as Afghanistan, the Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, and let us extend our sympathies to these nations.

America has a responsibility to support the efforts of peoples to achieve national self-determination everywhere. We therefore should protest the full membership now accorded to captive lands by the United Nations, as they are only puppets of Moscow. The plight of the Lithuanians deserves the recognition of the United States and all other free nations in the world. We shall honor their struggle by commemorating, today, the celebration of Lithuanian independence. ●

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in marking the occasion of the 63d anniversary of the reestablishment of Lithuanian independence and the 730th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state. More importantly, however, I speak today as one who recognizes the overriding commitment of Lithuanians, as well as all peoples in the Baltic region, to pursue a life free from outside constraints on speech, religion, and national identity. On this day, we must stand united in our firm support of Lithuanian independence from Soviet oppression. Our words must be heard around the world, for if the United States cannot serve as a beacon of strength for all those that cherish freedom, then indeed we will have failed to meet the ideals of our great heritage.

Lithuania embodies those very ideals itself. For decades, the Soviet Union has attempted to destroy the grass-roots nationalism of Lithuania, yet she has stubbornly resisted. Evidence of her determination abounds. More samizdat—underground publications—

emerge from Lithuania than anywhere else in the Soviet Union. The study of national heritage has become so popular with the young that Soviet authorities have felt compelled to supervise all such classroom activity. As a consequence of continuous and widespread dissatisfaction with Soviet oppression, dissidents in Lithuania have come under heavy attack and constant surveillance.

It is also in Lithuania that the Soviet Union has focused its efforts to weaken the enduring strength of the Roman Catholic Church. Despite persistent Soviet repression, many priests have reported that as much as 60 percent of the population are churchgoers and that more than 500 parishes still function. As a result of the heavyhanded attitude of the Soviets on religion, it is not uncommon for young students to be forced to attend lectures on atheism, and for seminars to be closed. But the desire to express one's religious views is so important a part of Lithuanian life, that the church has flourished nonetheless.

Soviet attempts to russify the Baltic States have encountered their greatest resistance in Lithuania. Efforts to force the Russian language on students, dominate the media with Soviet ideology, and pursue a policy of oppression have failed miserably. Only roughly 9 percent of the Lithuanian population is Russian, and the Lithuanian peoples have clung to their strong nationalistic desires and flourished as a growing industrial state.

Through our words here today and our efforts in the future, Mr. Speaker, we must deny the Soviet legal claims over Lithuania and continue to encourage the dream of Lithuanians around the world that someday their nation will achieve the independence it longs for and so rightly deserves.●

● Mr. MARKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of Lithuania's Independence Day.

The struggle of the Baltic people for freedom for so many years remains a symbol to the rest of the world—a symbol of a people's determination never to let their quest for freedom, for self-determination, for self-government be dampened. We in the United States and other free countries on this globe will never cease in our admiration for this struggle, or in our understanding of why it must continue.

When our hostages were released, the American people took stock of the meaning of our freedom. We saw 52 Americans, who previously may have taken freedom for granted, appreciate what it meant to have freedom, and we, too, all paused to give thanks that we live in this country. Let us not forget that for the brave people in the Baltic States, freedom is still just a dream and a hope. I hope that their

knowledge of our support will help sustain their dream.●

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I commend our friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) for once again bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives the desires of the Lithuanian people to be free and independent. My colleague and I have long shared interest in and concern for the many people who are literally in chains under oppressive dictatorships behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join the rest of my colleagues and the Lithuanian-American community in commemorating the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is my wish that one day Lithuania will again join the ranks of the free nations of the world. Not many peoples of the world deserve it more. After four decades of occupation the spirit of the Lithuanian people has never withered, but has instead grown stronger with each passing year in captivity. The Lithuanian heritage of heroism, bravery, and dedication to the right of freedom has become a source of inspiration for all oppressed peoples around the world.

It was in 1918 that Lithuania first emerged as an independent nation after centuries of German and Russian domination. In the mere 20 years of independence that followed the Lithuania people proved themselves truly capable of achieving tremendous social and economic strides. The 1940's found Lithuania occupied in turn by the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, and again the Soviet Union, under whose dominance she has remained for the last 37 years without any opportunity for the self-government she once enjoyed. Proof that continuous efforts by the Soviets to destroy the Lithuanian sense of unity and identity have failed can be found in the way the people steadfastly adhere to their cultural heritage which embraces the value of freedom. It is deplorable that the Soviet Union continues to deny Lithuanian citizens the right to exercise the principle of self-determination and continues to suppress their human rights. As Lithuanians struggle to practice the freedom their declaration of independence once gave them, they must live in constant fear of Soviet retaliation for these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, as the citizens of Lithuania look toward the United States for the concepts of liberty and freedom, let us show them our compassion and support. Let us demonstrate our belief that one day they will again be a free people living in a free nation.

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

● Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was declared

an independent republic. Throughout the next 22 years, that government enjoyed the realization of freedom which came only with its own political identity.

Lithuanian independence came to a tragic end in June 1940, with the entrance of Soviet troops into Lithuania and the neighboring countries of Latvia and Estonia.

Following this takeover the Lithuanian people struggled for 7 years to repel Soviet domination. An incredible 30,000 Lithuanians died in direct confrontation; hundreds of thousands more were shipped to Siberia to work in labor camps under severe conditions. Many workers suffered horribly or died as a direct result of this brutal treatment by the Soviets.

For 41 years Lithuania has suffered repression under totalitarian Soviet rule. The Soviet Government has attempted to destroy all vestiges of Lithuanian culture and independent political thinking.

Undaunted by Soviet oppression, the people of Lithuania still refuse to capitulate to "Russification." Lithuanians continue to use their own language, maintain their religious preferences, and celebrate their unique cultural heritage. The reacquisition of freedom and independence remains a priority to which the people of this proud nation are dedicated. Lithuanians will not rest until their national identity is restored.

We must support Lithuanian independence and condemn Soviet actions which violate principles of human rights and individual liberties. Let us remain committed to aiding the Lithuanian people in regaining the independence which rightfully belongs to them.

We hope that someday soon, Lithuania will join those nations which can freely celebrate the anniversary of an independent people.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, like other Eastern European peoples, the Lithuanians have great national pride that recalls their days of independence and expresses the hope for future freedom.

Lithuania was a great imperial power in the 14th century, later merged with Poland, was annexed by Czarist Russia in the late 18th century, declared her independence in 1918 and defended herself against attacks by Russian Bolsheviks, then was overrun by the Russian Red Army and incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940.

Thousands of Lithuanian patriots have disappeared into the Gulag Archipelago, and she remains under Soviet rule by the ruthless use of Soviet arms and police agencies.

Estonia and Latvia have suffered the same fate, but the people of the three Baltic republics have not lost their

love and hope for independence and freedom.

We must not forget these people, although their territory was incorporated into the Soviet Union. These nations live in the memories and aspirations of their people and in the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere.

On this day commemorating Lithuanian independence, let us tell the captive peoples that we remember them and we are their brothers and sisters in the cause of freedom. They will be free again some day. ●

● **Mr. RUSSO.** Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1981, marked the 63d anniversary of the independent state of Lithuania. I am proud to join my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, when the courageous people of Lithuania gained their freedom from Soviet domination and proclaimed their right to govern themselves as they saw necessary.

Unfortunately, this event is also one of sorrow. It was in 1940 when Joseph Stalin and Soviet troops invaded and occupied the Baltic nations—and once again, the three Baltic states were under Soviet domination.

Despite constant Soviet pressures forced upon Lithuania, however, the brave country continued its fierce nationalism. Lithuania provides a constant unrest that often underscores Moscow's inability to destroy grassroots nationalism even after centuries of Russian domination in that area. Anti-Soviet incidents regularly occur in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, where national groups forcefully assert their claims to maintain their religious, linguistic and ethnic traditions.

In religion, the Lithuanian believers link their refusal to give up the Catholic faith with the survival of their culture. And the Kremlin concentrates its efforts toward weakening the growing strength of the Roman Catholic Church. Moscow worries that a link between the church and opponents of the organization could lead to a development of mass resistance to Communist rule. Yet the Lithuanian Catholic resistance to Soviet pressure is marked by the huge number of religious petitions addressed to Soviet and world leaders.

Despite strenuous efforts made by the Kremlin to force Russian language on the people, most Lithuanians, even high officials, speak Russian only in the presence of Russians.

As we in the House of Representatives commemorate the anniversary, it is imperative that we realize that the struggle of these brave people is continuing. Lithuania is now the dynamo of the Soviet light industry. Their wage levels are high above the national average. Car ownership is increasing rapidly. Lithuanians are making their mark, despite Soviet domination.

Yet, the freedom of these people continues to be restricted; they remain oppressed, and we cannot ignore their future without ignoring our past, rooted in the doctrine of freedom. The Soviet Union denies the people self-determination and they deserve worldwide condemnation; they are ruthless in their efforts to deprive the people of their sovereignty and their heritage. But the Soviets have not and cannot destroy the strong nationalistic and religious movements that continue to exist in the Baltic nations.

Let us again proclaim our support for the people of Lithuania, our support for their constant struggle for the very liberties and freedoms that we as Americans can enjoy every moment in each day of our lives. Let us join in this struggle by drawing the world's attention to it. By paying tribute to and recognizing the strength of these courageous people, we remain true to our own American moral and political ideals, and say to the world, "These people, too, must be free." ●

● **Mr. WAXMAN.** Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago as Leonid Brezhnev and Gerald Ford signed the historic Helsinki accords, the free world was filled with a new hope. The agreement stipulated that the Soviet Union would honor and respect human rights and allow freer movement of people, information and ideas between the East and the West. Yet in the wake of the Madrid Conference, whose very purpose it was to review these provisions, we must sadly recognize the accords as empty promises. Lithuania's struggle for freedom serves as testimony of the refusal of the Soviets to abide by the agreement. Ironically, today as we commemorate the 63d anniversary of "the establishment of an independent Lithuania," this small country still remains, unwillingly, an integral part of the Soviet Union, deprived of even the most basic human freedoms.

Lithuania's struggle to keep its identity as a sovereign state has been arduous indeed. Although February 16, 1918, ended 120 years of Soviet domination, this hard-won freedom was shortlived. In 1940, the country was again invaded by the Soviet Union and declared a component republic. By 1944, the ramifications of the Soviet takeover were clear; Lithuania was to be totally incorporated under the Soviet hammer and sickle—bereft of even the slightest cultural or political autonomy.

While we in the United States have refused to recognize the Soviet occupation of Lithuania, we cannot overlook the blatant abridgement of human rights. Soviet attempts to disperse the Baltic peoples led to executions and massive deportations; those remaining were forced to submit to a complete Russification of the Lithuanian culture. While the Soviet constitution ostensibly promises freedom of

speech, assembly and religion, these fundamental laws have been ignored. Intellectuals have been prevented from receiving publications from the free world and newspapers and books can only be openly published by the Communists. Families have been disbanded and family members deported. Priests have been jailed for the teaching of religion, even in church. The industrial wealth of the country has been exploited. Dissidents such as Gajuskas, Petkus, and Jaskunas have been tried and exiled to labor camps. In essence, the country has been stripped of all political and cultural independence.

On this, the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, our Nation must not only reaffirm our own commitment to the principles of self-determination, but commend a country who despite great suffering has not lost the will to fight for its freedom. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of Lithuania have only enjoyed two decades of freedom in nearly two centuries, yet despite this oppression have continued to maintain their consciousness, dignity and pride. As we pledge our continued support in the fight for human rights, we must look toward the Lithuanian people for inspiration; throughout 40 years of tyranny neither their remarkable spirit nor their undying courage has faltered. ●

● **Mr. HOLLENBECK.** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognizing February 16 as a day of pride and reflection for Lithuanians the world over. On this day in 1918, Lithuania gained its long-sought independence. Oppressed for centuries because of their vulnerable geographic location, Lithuanians have suffered invasions from the east by the Russians and from the west by the Teutonic Knights. They have demonstrated incredible spiritual and ethnic fortitude by surviving these repeated onslaughts.

Ever since this gallant Baltic nation was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union, after only 22 years of independence, Lithuanians have struggled to throw off the chains of their oppressors. Thousands of these freedom fighters have sacrificed their lives in an attempt to secure independence for their beloved country. From 1944 to 1952 alone, some 50,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters gave their lives as part of a grassroots resistance movement. However, the cessation of armed hostilities did not result in the end of the resistance to Soviet domination. Rather, it created the impetus for the introduction of passive protest.

Even today, as I speak, Lithuanians are risking their lives in outright defiance of the Communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people for their rights to self-determination as well as religious and political freedom

continues despite Soviet oppression. With this in mind we must attempt to match the courage of Lithuania by reaffirming our dedication to the principles of self-determination and human rights.

It is our duty to continue to confront the Soviets with the fact that, despite being cosigners of the Helsinki accords, they have willfully ignored many of the provisions guaranteeing basic human rights. We must continue to speak out against the infringement of human rights and not succumb to any temptation which permits us to ignore the plight of those being denied their fundamental rights. We must continue to fight vigorously for the inalienable rights of all mankind.

February 16 marks a grim reminder to all of us that there are people in the world who do not possess even the most basic of human rights. We must extend whatever support we can to the people of Lithuania and their dreams for freedom. Let us hope for the day when our Lithuanian friends can celebrate a renewed independence of modern times, rather than commemorate the anniversary of an independence since lost.

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1981, the 63d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania will be commemorated by Lithuanians around the world. It is imperative that we as a nation who cherish the principles of liberty and freedom share our concern with a people denied these very principles. It is fitting that in this situation, a manifestation of popular sovereignty, that we symbolically join with all freedom-seeking Lithuanians working for their right to reestablish their independence which was taken away at the hands of the Soviet Army.

The freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the freedom to gather freely, the freedom to petition government, the freedom to worship without harassment are basic truths incorporated in the Constitution of the United States. These principles, which are a cornerstone of our Government, are a fundamental guarantee of our liberty. These basic freedoms are often taken for granted in America and are forbidden in Soviet-dominated Lithuania.

The repression and persecution that is part of everyday life in this Baltic nation must not be forgotten by a nation that prides itself in justice. In commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day our Nation should be moved to action.

As a leader and champion of the oppressed people throughout the world, we have an obligation not only to condemn the denial of fundamental liberties to the people of Lithuania but we must effectively work to allow for self-determination in this courageous nation. By working to bring change in

Lithuania, the United States will assist in the struggle to preserve Lithuanian identities, language, and culture.

Lithuanian Independence Day is a day that gives us an opportunity to celebrate freedom and support those in quest for freedom. It must be known that the United States of America stands by all those who still seek to be free. America's role can be found in Bernard Malamud's poignant statement "The purpose of freedom is to create it for others."

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1981, the people of Lithuania will commemorate the 63d anniversary of their declaration of independence as a sovereign state. I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my fellow colleagues the significance of this very special occasion.

It has been my privilege to represent a large number of Lithuanian Americans from Syracuse, N.Y., thus I can personally identify with this proud group of citizens.

The Lithuanian people, long suffering under the weight of Soviet domination, have waged a valiant effort to secure for themselves the principle of self-determination. Like all Baltic nations, Lithuania must be allowed to choose its own destiny. No longer can the free nations of the world ignore the plight of these and all people striving to remove the stigma of Russian oppression.

I urge that you and all Members of this body join with my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, sponsor of the Congressional Commemoration of Lithuanian Independence, in observing this important anniversary.

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which we observed on February 16, reminds many of us of the oppressed victims of another nation's aggression throughout the world. We pause each year in solemn tribute to the silent and subjugated status of millions of our fellow human beings and offer hope, not despair, and faith, not resignation. We all know that words are only symbols with which we communicate our concern. However, words do not provide the Lithuanian people with the self-determination and dignity which all men deserve and seek.

The plight of the Lithuanian people reminds us of the growth and devices of totalitarian power in this century. Totalitarianism found its origins in the Hitler and Stalin era of the 1930's, became a sophisticated tool in the 1940's, and bred the tidy regimes of the 1950's, 1960's, and 1970's, which now command their own respectability and our acquiescence. Finally, the terrorist guerrilla warfare of the 1950's and 1960's completed the terrible significance of the early development of

totalitarianism in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's.

The American people cherish the free world. Most recently we have celebrated the return of 52 of our fellow Americans to the free world. The threat of Soviet intervention in Poland and the continued occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union reminds us daily of the fact that we are living in an epoch in which one evil leads inexorably to another. We cannot forget Lithuania, because to do so might allow us to fall victim to the other horrors which lie before us in this century. Therefore, I join my colleagues in the commemoration of Lithuania's Independence Day, and further condemn the Soviet Union for denying these people their right to exercise the principle of self-determination.

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join with my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 63d anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

On February 16, 1918, the flame of freedom shone brightly in the people of the sovereign state of Lithuania—established on that date as an independent republic. Unfortunately, the flame I speak of was soon to be extinguished by another example of imperialism in a long line of Soviet domination. Although the period of Lithuanian freedom was brief, the Lithuanians have never ceased to struggle to maintain and secure the rights and privileges they once knew and cherished.

For four decades the Soviets have continuously disregarded the human rights of both the United Nations Charter and the Helsinki accords. They have also blatantly ignored the stipulations of the Belgrade Conference.

Undaunted, the Lithuanians have remained resolute in their ardent resistance to the Soviet's numerous acts of political repression, religious persecution and cultural genocide. Russian attempts to obliterate the Lithuanian culture, language, and religion have been fruitless. The people of Lithuania have refused to yield or succumb, and as a result of their valiant struggle, they have preserved their unique language, which is one of the oldest living languages, as well as their culture and religious heritage.

The Soviet Union's constant denial of the Lithuanian's right to be free and sovereign is inexcusable. Since 1940, the Baltic states of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia have been occupied by the Soviets. Resultantly, these people are subjected to fierce and unrelenting Soviet repression.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the Declaration of Independence for the Lithuanians, let us reinforce our resolve to preserve and protect the

precious liberties and freedoms we enjoy, and to seek to restore those liberties and freedoms to those from whom they have been wrenched by force. Aggression against a free people cannot be condoned or tolerated, and must be challenged at every opportunity.

Today we must reaffirm our pledge to aid in restoring freedom to those who quest for its bountiful rewards. Let us join together in saluting the Lithuanians for their heroic courage in this struggle, and pledge our continual and augmented support.●

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues and the Lithuanian American community today in commemorating the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. I wish to express the hope that one day Lithuania will again be a free and autonomous nation, and that her heritage of heroism, bravery, and dedication to the cause of freedom will continue to be a source of inspiration for all the oppressed peoples of the world.

After World War I, an independent Lithuania emerged from the ruins to begin rebuilding her land, establishing her own government, and in essence, began to determine her own destiny. This progression was halted by the Stalinist Soviets who ruthlessly seized Lithuania in 1940. While under Soviet domination for the past 41 years, Lithuania has not been given the opportunity to govern itself. This has not subdued the spirit of her people, however, who have continually resisted Soviet attempts to destroy their unity and identity. An ardent desire for freedom survives in Lithuania today which is reflected in the way the people steadfastly adhere to a cultural heritage which embraces the value of liberty.

The lesson of Lithuania must be heeded by all the free peoples of the world. Lithuania reminds us of how essential and how precious freedom truly is, and what its loss can signify. Let us pray that one day soon the Lithuanian people will achieve the independence that is the natural right of all men, and that by their example, the world will realize a universal understanding of the need for all people to be allowed to exercise their inherent right of self-determination.●

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 63d anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence, February 16, 1981, I would like to pay tribute to the spirit of freedom and independence which lives on in the hearts of Lithuanians throughout the world, despite the illegal occupation of their homeland by the Soviet Union. As a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I strongly condemn the Soviet Union for its violation of principle 8 of the 1975 Helsinki Accord's Final Act, the right to self-

termination both of states and of peoples.

Principle 8 states that—

The participating States will respect the equal rights of peoples and their right to self-determination, acting at all times in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the relevant norms of international law, including those relating to territorial integrity of States.

It also reiterates the rights of all peoples "to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social, and cultural development." The Soviet Union has, for four decades, denied to the Lithuanian people their territorial, political, and cultural self-determination, in clear contravention of both the spirit and the letter of principle 8. This denial of self-determination is not only a tragedy for the Lithuanian people, but in a broader context, denial of self-determination is a threat to peace, because of the instability and insecurity it engenders.

I would like to join Representative ANNUNZIO, who has arranged for a special order on this occasion, in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day with my sympathy and support for their unyielding pursuit of self-determination and liberty.●

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague, Mr. FRANK ANNUNZIO, for reminding us of the plight of the Lithuanian people and other Baltic peoples for self-determination and freedom.

The Lithuanian struggle for self-government, denied to them since 1940, is in accord with the Final Act of Helsinki, and is still another instance demonstrating the durability of the human spirit and the quest of all peoples for liberation and fundamental human rights.●

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO), for his leadership in arranging for his special order to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

This occasion gives us the opportunity to renew our strong concerns about Soviet oppression and the denial of self-determination to the peoples of the Baltic States.

The cloud of a potential Soviet intervention in Poland, coupled with the continued brutal Soviet presence in Afghanistan, reinforces the need to remind the Soviets that we have not forgotten the millions of oppressed persons behind the Iron Curtain, nor have we wavered in our strong belief that they should be free.

It is our hope that our persistent remembrance of anniversaries such as Lithuanian Independence Day will offer reassurance to Lithuanian Americans and to those struggling to gain independence. Regardless of the length of the struggle, the fires of freedom cannot be extinguished.

A resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Club of Buffalo on February 8, 1981, describes the ongoing struggle within Lithuania to the continued Soviet violations of international law and individual rights. This resolution, I believe, expresses the rationale for our observance here today and I would therefore like to share it with my colleagues.

#### RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian-Americans of the Niagara Frontier, at a meeting held on February 8, 1981 to commemorate the reestablishment of Lithuania's independence, send our warmest greetings to the people of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, pledge our unwavering support for the restoration of Lithuania's sovereignty, and do hereby state as follows:

That February 16, 1981 marks the 63rd anniversary of the reestablishment of the independent State of Lithuania and the 730th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian Kingdom in 1251; and

That by the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, Soviet Russia officially recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily renounced forever all claims to Lithuanian soil and her people; and

That until 1940, Lithuania was a sovereign nation, a member of the League of Nations, and signatory of numerous international treaties with the Soviet Union; and

That the Soviet Union in June of 1940 invaded and occupied Lithuania, and subsequent to that invasion forcibly annexed the Lithuanian nation into the Soviet Union; and

That the Soviet Union continues to conduct a policy of colonization, forced Russification, ethnic dilution, and religious and political persecution; and

That the people of Lithuania to this day are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Soviet regime, as recently made evident by the numerous arrests of the members of the Lithuanian Helsinki Monitoring Group, signers of the August 23, 1979 petition to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and publishers of the Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania and other dissident publications; and

That the United States government maintains diplomatic relations with the government of the Free Republic of Lithuania and consistently has refused to recognize the unlawful occupation and forced incorporation of this freedom-loving country into the Soviet Union; now, therefore, be it Resolved, That we will urge President Reagan's administration to maintain and to strengthen United States' policy with regards to the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

That we urge the United States of America and other nations of the Free World to use diplomatic and other possible pressures to compel the Soviet Union to release from jails, concentration camps, and psychiatric wards, people who struggle for human rights and for liberty; and

That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the American Ambassador to the United Nations, United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from our state, the Lithuanian Minister in Washington, D.C., the Lithuanian Consul General in New York City, and to all appropriate representatives of the press.●

● **Mr. GUARINI.** Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 63d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. I am proud to join with those people of Lithuanian origin in commemorating this occasion.

While we celebrate the 63d anniversary of the independent Republic of Lithuania we must remember that the history of this proud and fiercely independent people goes back much further. The formation of the Lithuanian state took place 730 years ago. This formation became not only a geographic union but also a cultural union of people united by similar ideals.

Unlike many ethnic groups which have disappeared into history when confronted by the forces of overpowering nations, the Lithuanians were able to keep their culture and their ethnic identity. Lithuania was not only able to survive Czarist attempts at geographically dividing the land, but they also survived the Czarist attempt to eliminate the Lithuanian language and its flourishing culture.

In 1920 the independent Republic of Lithuania signed a peace treaty with the Soviet Union. This treaty guaranteed Lithuania's right as an independent and sovereign nation. At the same time the Russians renounced what they had previously claimed as their right of sovereignty over the country for all times. The signing of this treaty culminated a fight for independence that the Lithuanians had begun in the 1880's under the Russian Czar.

As we all unfortunately know, the freedom that the Lithuanians knew on February 16, 1918, was not to last. In 1940 the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania. The Lithuanian freedom fighters were unmatched in their gallantry but defeated by the overwhelming force of 300,000 troops. After World War II the Soviets refused to free the captured Baltic nation.

The types of oppression endured under the Czar resurfaced with the Soviet takeover. It is estimated that 30,000 Lithuanians lost their lives fighting the Soviets in the 10 years after the takeover. Religious freedom was denied and widespread attempts to erode the Lithuanian culture have been made.

We must recognize that freedom-loving Lithuanians are working hard to restore their rights. As Americans we can never lose sight of this struggle. As a step in the right direction we must seek enforcement of the Helsinki accords of 1975. Beyond this temporary goal we must remain open to the soundings for Lithuanian freedom. The Lithuanians deserve their freedom. I join them today in honoring their Independence Day and their continued quest for freedom.

I request that this tribute to the Lithuanians be included in Repre-

sentative ANNUNZIO's special order on Lithuanian Independence Day.●

● **Mr. ECKART.** Mr. Speaker, 63 years ago the nation of Lithuania obtained its independence. Just over 22 years later, the proud and resolute Lithuanians were overrun by the forces of the Soviet Union, and to this day the courageous people of Lithuania continue to seek renewal of their lost independence.

The anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence on February 16, coming so close as it does to the birthdays of two of our greatest Presidents, Lincoln and Washington, serves as a constant reminder to us of the struggles going on today for freedom. The effort to win the right of self-determination continues in all the captive nations, even while the people in them struggle to maintain their religion, language, and culture in the face of constant official Soviet repression.

We in this country must remember that freedom is a birthright that must not be taken for granted. Even as we battle to keep our own freedom strong, other nations, most recently Afghanistan, find themselves newly enslaved and subjugated.

The struggle of these people must not be ignored. They fight every day to emerge from the living hell of denied freedom.

On this day commemorating the shortlived freedom of Lithuania, we should renew our own commitment to assist those seeking their own birthright of freedom.●

● **Mr. FROST.** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to participate, for the second straight year, in this special order commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day. This special celebration is a way to remind us all that despite the tyranny and aggression that seems to be growing in the world today, people around the world still yearn for freedom.

This day is especially significant to me since my maternal family heritage is Lithuanian. Since my Lithuanian forebears came to this country in the 1800's, we have come to appreciate the freedom available to all in the United States. In the same way, the people still in Lithuania today, who have endured the horrors of war and the domination of a totalitarian state dedicated to eradicating all semblance of freedom, appreciate the meaning of freedom. Their courageous struggles to become unshackled from tyranny is an example to us all. I join the House of Representatives in saluting the people of Lithuania on this special day.●

● **Mr. PEYSER.** Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to commemorate the 63d anniversary of the establishment of the modern Lithuanian Republic. Today we honor the Lithuanians' constant dedication to self-determination

and human rights that led to their declaration of independence.

Lithuanian spirit for independence has prevailed throughout centuries of colonization and domination by foreign powers. In 1795, Russia annexed Lithuania, despite many rebellions by the Lithuanian people. The Russians attempted to replace the native culture and language with their own. But, the Lithuanians resisted and remained faithful to their religion, language, and customs. Finally, in 1905, the discouraged Russians abandoned their policy of russification.

Ten years later, however, the First World War burdened Lithuania with foreign occupation forces and more repression. The German Army overran Lithuania in 1915, plundering those cities and towns that the rapidly retreating Russians missed. As the war turned against Germany, the Lithuanians pressured the German Government to authorize the gathering of a congress. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared itself an independent state dedicated to democratic principles.

Early in 1919, however, after the Germans retreated, the Russian Red army seized the capital city of Vilnius and set up a Communist government. By the summer of 1920, Russia signed a peace treaty forever renouncing its domination over Lithuania.

Once truly independent, Lithuania took steps toward promoting democracy and human rights. A constitutional government and parliament were formed. The new Government instituted a land reform program to increase the percentage of landowners. In addition, the Government secured social reforms benefiting laborers and provided more educational institutions.

In 1939, however, World War II cast its shadow upon the sovereign Lithuanian State. Contrary to its earlier promise, Russia forcibly annexed Lithuania in August 1940 and so ended the freedom and independence of thousands of Lithuanians. German forces later occupied and ravaged the tiny Baltic State in their offensive against Russia. At the end of the war, the Soviet Union reclaimed Lithuania as well as its sister republics, Latvia and Estonia, and has ruled over them since.

In 1958, nearly 20 years after annexation, the Lithuanian World Congress affirmed their commitment to freedom and independence. It adopted a unanimous resolution declaring that "Lithuanians continue fiercely resisting the alien rule" of the Soviet Union and calling on free nations to "reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom."

Today, the United States continues to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign

state and not as a Soviet constituent. At this time, we pay tribute to the proud and durable people of Lithuania—a people who continue to pursue their dream of independence. They are truly an example to all free nations that treasure the inalienable rights of freedom for all individuals.●

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, freedom is a way of life here in the United States, and for that reason we often take our liberty for granted. During this month of February our thoughts are drawn once again to those crusaders for freedom that highlight the course of American history, Abraham Lincoln and George Washington. In their hearts the fire of liberty burned bright, and today, we as citizens of this great Nation have inherited that legacy.

The flame burns in the hearts of the Lithuanian people as well. Sixty-three years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania declared its independence as a sovereign and democratic nation. During this week those of Lithuanian heritage commemorate that occasion, but not with happiness. Lithuania remains a captive nation under the control of the Soviet Union, and the anniversary of its former independence serves only to foster sadness and the renewed resolve to put an end to the Soviet occupation of this peaceful Baltic nation.

In June 1940, after only 22 years of living as a self-governing and free entity, Lithuania was seized by the avaricious Soviet Union in compliance with its unholy alliance with Hitler and Nazi Germany. The neighboring lands of Latvia and Estonia were also forcibly occupied and annexed.

The patriotic people of Lithuania did not accept their fate at that time; nor do they accept it now. Despite oppressive and tyrannical persecution by the Soviet leviathan, the struggle for political and religious freedom continues, both openly and through various underground organizations. One of the major forces in the fight is the Catholic Church, which instills fervor and new hope in the oppressed population. The Kremlin has continually attempted the russification of Lithuanian culture and heritage, but the proud nation has steadfastly resisted such measures. Unfortunately, continued opposition to Soviet policy in the Eastern bloc countries has caused the already suffocating grip on Lithuania by the Soviets to tighten even further.

Soviet expansionism has always been a threat to the freedom-loving peoples of the world; Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan are our most recent and appalling reminders of that reality. During this time when we honor those individuals who defended freedom and independence on these shores, let us also pause and remember the ongoing struggle of the Lithuanian people and lend our support and

prayers to their cause, the crusade for liberty.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. As in past years, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to all Lithuanians. I admire them for their courage and I admire them for being strong and proud.

I know that several of my colleagues here in the House are fortunate, as I am, to represent Lithuanian Americans. I know that these individuals love America, but they also love their heritage. It is their fight for freedom, aided by Radio Free Europe, Radio, Liberty, and the Voice of America, that have kept alive the hope of freedom for all those in the Baltic States.

Despite brutal attempts by many nations to incorporate Lithuania, these people have held on to their identity and they have kept alive their memory of Lithuanian desire for democratic freedom. The Soviet Union has tried to destroy freedom of press, speech, and religion. Despite the deprivation of these most basic human rights, Lithuanians continue to cling to their cultural heritage.

I am proud to commemorate Lithuania's Independence Day today. I feel confident that the struggle of these people will not go unnoticed.●

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues in commemorating the 63d anniversary of the establishment of the independent Republic of Lithuania. This is an appropriate occasion to recall the tyranny to which Lithuania has been subjected by the Soviet Union and renew our commitment to opposing the Soviet Union's continued occupation of this independent nation.

The unfortunate history of the Soviet subjugation of Lithuania begins with the signing of the infamous non-aggression pact between Stalin and Adolph Hitler. Shortly thereafter, Lithuania and the other Baltic nations, Latvia and Estonia, became the first victims of the Soviet Union's imperialism and expansionism, which continues to this day. The United States has rightly never recognized as legitimate the occupation of the Baltic States. I am very pleased that the U.S. delegation to the Madrid Conference on the Helsinki accords reaffirmed this policy of nonrecognition, in keeping with our position that the illegal incorporation of these nations violates the Helsinki agreement. Although nonrecognition alone will not right the wrong done in 1940, we must not as a matter of principle ever seem to acquiesce in that wrong.

There are those who will say that our efforts today are in vain. However, we who have been actively involved in promoting the cause of basic human and political rights for people around the world know that this is not the

case. On the contrary, our vigilance serves as one of the only deterrents, however small, to more rapid Soviet expansionism. We must continue to impress upon the Soviet Union the gravity with which we view aggression and denials of human rights, as well as the fact that these factors will be central to our foreign policy. Also, the constant efforts of Lithuanian Americans and the support of concerned Members of Congress are vital in keeping alive the hopes of the oppressed people of Lithuania. We owe it to these people not to abandon our efforts.

I hope that the commitment we are expressing today will continue to be reflected in our country's foreign policy—more strongly now than ever before.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am glad and honored today in joining my distinguished colleagues and the over 1 million Lithuanian Americans in commemorating the 63d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

It is as important as ever that we show our moral support for the Lithuanians and their struggle for self-determination. As Americans, living in a country surrounded by friendly neighbors, and blessed with a government that respects the rights of its people, it is very difficult to comprehend what it would be like living in Lithuania since World War II. But imagine if you will, waking up tomorrow morning and finding out that our once friendly neighbor, through force of arms, terror, and brutality, as well as total disregard for international law, had invaded and annexed the United States. Imagine discovering that a treaty of nonaggression, signed in good faith, had been callously violated, or also being told that the invading nation had rigged an election to produce a Congress which requested the incorporation of the United States into the annexing nation. It would be a life in which little or no news of the free world would get past the borders and a world in which just as little information describing the tyranny, aggression, and blatant disregard for human rights of the occupying nation would get out. Picture a government which denies its citizens cultural, political, and religious freedoms—freedoms as a free nation it had fought so valiantly to secure.

What I have just described is a world the people of Lithuania know all too well since 1940, when the Soviet Union, in total disregard for the rights of a free nation, began its occupation of the once sovereign nation of Lithuania. It is a tribute to the brave people of Lithuania, who, though living under Soviet domination, have never lost their determination to one day live in a country where the rights and

needs of the people are held sacred. We, as the most powerful free Nation on this Earth, must never forget the plight of Lithuania. To do so would be a far more greater crime.●

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, this month commemorates the 63d anniversary of the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania and the 703d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state. As our Nation approaches its own 205th year of national independence, I believe that we should pause to reflect on the courageous people of Lithuania, who have been denied both freedom and self-determination by the Soviet Union.

Nearly 40 years ago, on June 15, 1941, the Soviet Union executed or deported over 34,000 Lithuanians. After World War II the mass deportations of Lithuanians to undisclosed points in the Soviet Union resumed and continued until 1953.

The Lithuanian people have now entered a fifth decade of Soviet occupation. Soviet occupation has resulted in the unrelenting oppression of human rights in Lithuania. The once-growing economy of this Baltic nation is now dependent upon raw materials and markets controlled by government authorities in Moscow. Sadly, the world has witnessed the standard of living in Lithuania reduced by government dictate to the level imposed throughout the Soviet Union.

Soviet annexation of Lithuania has denied its people the right to practice religious beliefs, to have their children educated in their native tongue, and to enjoy all basic rights common to free nations. The United States has never recognized the illegal Soviet annexation of Lithuania. I urge President Reagan to reaffirm U.S. commitment to a free Lithuania and to strengthen U.S. recognition and support to the diplomatic corps established by independent Lithuania.

I have written to the U.S. delegation to the Helsinki Review Conference now being held in Madrid, Spain. I urged the delegation to use the conference as an effective forum to seek improvements to the human rights policies of the Soviet Union. I request my colleagues to join with me in denouncing the human rights policies of the Soviet Union and its illegal annexation of the Baltic States. Lithuania has kept alive a spark of freedom in the very face of Soviet oppression. Our Nation must morally commit its strength to assist the Lithuanian people in this struggle.●

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, today the House formally recognizes the 730th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State and the 63d anniversary of the independent Republic of Lithuania.

I have spoken on former occasions regarding Lithuania, first praised by the Roman historian Tacitus. I have

alluded to the majesty of its forests, the wonders of its culture, and the strength of its people. We have spoken of the decades of freedom enjoyed by the Lithuanian nation until 300,000 troops of the U.S.S.R. occupied their nation in 1940, deporting its people, assassinating its leaders.

As the Soviets again cast a wanton eye West, it behooves us to reiterate the words of the deputy chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Madrid Conference, who said:

The United States does not recognize the illegal incorporation, by force of arms, of the states of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the Soviet Union. This act is clearly inconsistent with Principal VIII of the Helsinki Final Act.

On behalf of the 10,000 Lithuanian people of northwest Indiana, I join the deputy chairman in condemning the Soviet Union's denial of the exercise of the principal of self-determination for the Baltic peoples.

With the passing of another season, it is my prayer that the seed of freedom will again bloom in Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following resolution adopted by the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Ind., in the RECORD:

#### RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of Lake County, Indiana—assembled this 15th day of February, 1981 at Gary, Indiana, to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

Whereas February 16, 1981 marks the 63rd Anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State;

Whereas Lithuania was recognized as a free and independent nation by the entire free world, she was a member of the League of Nations, however, she was by force and fraud occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union disregarding the Peace Treaty of 1920 in which Moscow had guaranteed Lithuania's independence forever and disregarding the Non-Aggression Pact of 1926 with the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Soviet Union is an imperialistic, aggressive colonial empire, subjugating each year new countries; Lithuania was one of its first victims. The colonies of western countries have regained their independence, even underdeveloped nations of Africa and Asia, while Lithuania is still exposed to the most brutal Russian colonial oppression and exploitation;

Whereas the Soviet invaders, even though using tortures in jails, concentration camps, psychiatric wards are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-government and the exercise of their rights to self-determination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, we are grateful to the President of the United States who instructed the U.S. delegation to raise at the Madrid conference the right of the Baltic States for self-determination;

We are grateful to President Carter for his struggle for human rights, which should include the right of nations to live free and independent lives,

We urge the United States of America and other nations of the free world to use diplomatic and other possible pressures that the

Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, secret police apparatus, foreign administration, and release from jails, concentration camps and psychiatric wards people who struggle for human rights and for liberty;

We are grateful to President Reagan for a statement before his election that an official diplomatic non-recognition of the forced incorporation into the U.S.S.R. of the three Baltic nations will continue to be a policy also of his Administration.

That we express our most sincere gratitude to the United States Administration and the Congress for non-recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and we request them to use every opportunity in international forums and in direct negotiations with the Soviet Union to strongly support the Lithuanian aims for independence: Be it further and finally

Resolved, that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the U.S. Congressmen and Senators from our State, to Congressman Dante B. Fascell, Chairman of the Helsinki Committee in Washington and to the news media.●

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the proud and independent people of Lithuania won their national freedom. The independent State of Lithuania was reestablished. It is a special day for those of Lithuanian descent and to all who support the principles of freedom and self-determination.

Unfortunately, this era of independence and economic and political democracy was short lived. With the onslaught of World War II, Lithuania was engulfed by invading armies. Twenty-one years of freedom and honor came to an abrupt end. In 1940, the Soviet Union declared Lithuania a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. The Lithuanian people fiercely protested. The Soviet Union retaliated with brutal methods; thousands were deported to Siberia or executed.

Appropriately, the U.S. Government has never recognized the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and has continued to recognize the diplomatic corps established by an independent Lithuania. Since this policy of nonrecognition has a mitigating effect on the policies of the Soviet Union toward the Baltic States, I urge the new administration to support and strengthen the diplomatic representation of Lithuania.

I commend the recent statements by the United States at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. According to the deputy chairman of the U.S. delegation, "We know that there is little that can be done to right a wrong committed four decades ago. But let us remember also that the passage of time will not make that wrong right. Time does not make right, any more than might makes right."

The United States also took the position that principle IV of the Helsinki accords, which makes occupation or acquisition of territory in contraven-

tion of international law illegal, applies to the Soviet-occupied Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Russian domination is a part of the history of this oppressed Baltic nation. It first began in 1795 and continued until 1915. Despite this occupation, the Lithuanian people remained committed to their deep faith and to their nation. They refused to accept assimilation into the Russian system and culture.

Despite the lack of freedom and self-determination over the last 40 years, once again the pride and tradition of an independent spirit lives on. Today, I join in paying tribute to the spirit and tradition of the Lithuanian people. Along with Lithuanians throughout the world and all lovers of freedom and self-determination, I hold out eternal hope that someday Lithuania will obtain the independence they have been denied. ●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 63d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. As a member of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Baltic States and Ukraine, I feel it is important for us to condemn the Soviet Union for forcibly depriving Lithuanians of their sovereign rights and self-government.

As an independent nation, Lithuania placed great emphasis on social and economic progress for its people. A land reform program was implemented, the number of schools was increased, and labor laws were instituted. Tragically, all of this came to an end by the unprovoked invasion and occupation of the Baltic countries in June 1940.

Since that time, the Soviet system has attempted to shackle the free will of the Lithuanian people. Moscow has restricted national cultural life and religious freedom; systematic russification is official Soviet policy. Despite this Russian tyranny, the Lithuanian people have retained their insatiable desire to be free once again.

Mr. Speaker, we must vocally oppose the Soviets for blatantly disregarding the human rights of the Lithuanian people; we must bring these human rights violations to the attention of the world. Also, the United States must continue to refuse to recognize the unlawful incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. Finally, we must maintain an unwavering commitment to aid the Lithuanian people in their quest for liberty and self-determination. Perhaps, if we remain diligent in our efforts, the hopeful words of a 1959 New York Times editorial commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day will come true:

In the Baltic countries, the path to a better future is still dark, but it is not lost and will not be. The day of the overlords

will not last forever. The time will come when the three lost nations will be able to come out and join us. ●

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and honor that I rise with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian Independence.

It was 63 years ago, on February 16, 1918, that Lithuania gained independence following subjugation by Russia, and occupying German armies during World War I, for more than 120 years. Her freedom was challenged by the Soviet Union and she subsequently lost some territory. However, by her resistance, Russia was forced to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign state in 1920.

During World War II, Lithuania found herself again occupied, this time by German armies.

There was a brief time after her declaration of independence in 1918 when it appeared she would remain an independent nation. However, after 23 years, their freedom was stolen from them by the Russians again in 1941. Soon after Lithuania became part of the Soviet Union and its courageous but helpless people shipped to labor camps, the world saw that despite conditions which grew worse by the day, that there was hope alive that one day they would be free. When the war ended, they found that there was no freedom to be had. The end of the war only served to mark the continuation of their national tragedy.

We must never forget the fight waged by the Lithuanian people to reestablish their complete independence. As an American who enjoys the blessings of freedom, we must continue to strive for the same blessings for all peoples and nations.

Accordingly, I extend my warmest wishes to our Lithuanian friends here in the United States as they celebrate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence and look to the day when their friends and families in Lithuania can be free. ●

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this great Nation has always sympathized with small nations struggling to be free. Even before he wrote our Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson declared the partition of Poland to be "The infamy of the century." In 1822, this House expressed its sympathy and support for South American and Greek patriots struggling against foreign tyranny. In 1850, Secretary of State Daniel Webster told the Austrian Minister the United States desired to see Hungarian independence restored.

Our record is a noble one.

Today we share in the great tradition of American support for small nations rightfully struggling to be free. We commemorate the independence of Lithuania, proclaimed in 1918 after a century and more of suppression

within the Russian Empire. We also commemorate the 730th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state.

This is a day of both joy and sadness. Joy—because Lithuania on this day again took her place among the free nations of the world. Sadness—because that freedom was so brief.

Lithuania lies under the shadow of oppression and tyranny today. It has been annexed, against its will, by Soviet Russia. Its clergy, civil servants, teachers, army officers have been murdered. Its people have been deported, by the hundreds of thousands, to the slave labor camps of Siberia. The Roman Catholics of Lithuania are subjected to hideous persecution at this very hour. Everything possible has been done to destroy Lithuanian national life.

The very fact there still exists a Lithuanian national spirit is testament to the great courage of the Lithuanian people.

Lithuania committed no crime to merit her treatment. Rather, like the other nations of Eastern Europe, Lithuania had the misfortune to be caught between the expanding empires of Soviet Russia on the one hand, and Nazi Germany on the other.

As a result of the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact Lithuania was occupied by Soviet Russia in June 1940. Except for her occupation by Hitler in the Second World War, Lithuania has been held by Moscow ever since.

This Nation has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania or her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. Nor should we ever do so. We should insist this last vestige of the Nazi-Soviet pact be expunged, and these small nations restored to their rightful freedom.

By this special order today we reaffirm our commitment to the people of Lithuania.

By this special order we reaffirm our belief that the natural condition of all peoples is freedom.

By this special order we reaffirm our support for the idea that the rights of small nations are as important as the rights of large nations.

The Lithuania people are fit partners for a league of honor.

As we support Lithuania today, let us express our support for nations resisting tyranny throughout the globe.

The gallant Polish people lie under the serious menace of Soviet invasion. Their hopes for a future in peace and freedom could be blighted at any moment.

The Afghan people continue their heroic struggle against overwhelming odds. In the natural fortresses of their mountains they fight jets, tanks, and poison gas with primitive weapons, but with right and justice on their side.

The people of the Ukraine continue their silent struggle against tyranny. Their spirit is also unconquerable.

Throughout Eastern Europe, in Central Asia, those oppressed by Soviet tyranny know there must come a day of freedom.

All these people are our allies.

As I have stated, we do not recognize the annexation of the Baltic States. These nations still maintain diplomatic legations here. However, the money to keep up the legations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania is running low.

Since 1940, the frozen assets of the Baltic States have been used to pay for the upkeep of their diplomatic personnel. Now new sources of funds must be found.

This is a serious matter, and I trust we give some thought to it. We have a responsibility to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, to assist in maintaining their diplomatic identity.

Mr. Speaker, while we express our support for Lithuania today, let us have faith in Almighty God.

For His own purposes the Creator allows great evil to exist for a time. Then, at His own determination, that evil vanishes.

So it will be with the people of Lithuania. This great evil will pass. A free Lithuania will again exist under a free constitution. The sun of freedom will shine on a great, free nation.●

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, and I am honored to salute the Lithuanian people on this occasion. A rich cultural heritage, strong religious faith, and burning desire for freedom enabled this proud and ancient people to emerge from czarist domination in 1918 and establish a free and independent state.

Just as the Lithuanians had persevered in cherishing their heritage throughout the 19th century czarist occupation of their country, they have been heroic since 1940 in nurturing their national identity and their strong determination to be free again. The Soviet forces that overran Lithuania in 1940 and have ruled there since then have never been able to subdue the will of this brave people. This was demonstrated through long years of partisan fighting in the 1940's and early 1950's. It has been evident in demonstrations within the Soviet-managed factories, the appearance of underground newspapers and dissident journals, and the brash unwillingness of Lithuanian youth to be "Sovietized." Within the past year the restiveness of people oppressed by the Soviet system has been amply demonstrated by events in neighboring Poland.

It is both our duty and our privilege, Mr. Speaker, to do everything possible to advance the day when Lithuania and other captive nations can enjoy the blessings of liberty once again. To

that end, it is our country's policy to refuse to recognize the forcible absorption of the Baltic countries into the Soviet Union, and to continue to recognize the diplomatic representatives who represent the legitimate claims of the Baltic countries to independence and self-determination.

Very recently, Mr. Speaker, we were made keenly aware of how precious freedom is. Dozens of our own citizens returned from 14 months of captivity at the hands of self-willed political forces that do not respect principles of international law and cooperation. At the same time, we have observed the chilling reality of Soviet expansionist intentions in the brutal Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Yet, given the sordid example of Soviet tyranny over Lithuania 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 about Soviet treachery. Those lessons were learned long ago by Lithuania and other nations which fell prey to Soviet greed. 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. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the proud nation of Lithuania declared its independence 63 years ago on February 16, 1918. A goal had finally been realized by the Lithuanians after a tumultuous period of Russian domination. Unfortunately, independence came to an abrupt end when their sovereignty was violated and their freedom suppressed by the Soviet Union only 20 years later in 1938. The aggression and tyranny to which they fell victim is the direct opposite of the freedom for which the United States represents.

During the brief period of independence, Lithuania made great progress in areas of social legislation as well as an overall advancement in the standard of living. In addition, literature flourished. Lithuanians reaffirmed their pride in the national folklore with superb examples in the arts such as opera and classical music.

It is unconscionable that the Soviet Union has attempted to deny and annihilate the basic human rights of the Lithuanian people. The Lithuanians, while living in constant fear of retaliation, have refused to accept the dismantling of their national ways and traditions. Although stripped of their cultural and political freedom, their determination to shed oppression and acquire full sovereignty has not been diminished.

We continue in our steadfastness to condemn the Soviet Union for refusing to permit the basic right of national self-determination to Lithuania. It is in this spirit that we must encourage that a new glimmer of freedom will shine on this proud nation of Lithuania on her independence day.●

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my voice to those that speak today in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a good time for those of us in this free nation to remember the many states that have lost their liberty to forced russification and been denied free expression of their national character.

We remember today the Byelorussians, Kazakhs, Ukrainians, Kirghiz, Turkmens, Uzbeks, Tatars, as well as the other Baltic peoples, the Latvians and the Estonians. Along with Moldavia, and parts of Finland, Japan, and Poland, they have fallen to the Russians' seemingly insatiable hunger for the internal buffer areas that they have been carving out for hundreds of years.

It is perhaps unrealistically sanguine to hope that individual liberties, religious rights, and national independence will be returned to these peoples any day soon. But it is vital that we recall their struggles, and while doing what we can to help them, learn from their sad experiences.●

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to register my support for this occasion of House recognition of Lithuania Independence Day.

Since the 1944 military annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, the plight of this Baltic State has been a sober reminder to the world of the importance of a commitment to self-determination. This annexation was the result of an earlier Nazi German and Soviet Union Treaty wherein Stalin and Hitler agreed to divide Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, and Poland between themselves. As you know, the first three states are now incorporated into the Soviet Union.

We as a nation have never recognized this incorporation. Principle IV of the Helsinki accords makes territorial expansion illegal under international law. It is the position of the United States that this provision is applicable to the occupation of Lithuania and other Baltic States.

Lithuania has been occupied for close to 40 years. However, Mr. Speaker, self-determination is not a principle to be compromised by time. Nor is it a principle easily suppressed in the hearts of those who, like Lithuanians, yearn for it on their own soil.

I call on the entire House to reflect upon the plight of Lithuania. I ask my colleagues to join in the admiration of the perseverance of the people of Lithuania in their struggle for self-determination and simple justice.●

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday people of Lithuanian descent all over the world celebrated the 63d anniversary of the independence of the captive nation of Lithuania.

As Americans we commemorate this day by recognizing the long struggle for freedom that has been endured by

the people of Lithuania. For the past 63 years these proud and industrious people have sought national self-determination. Although this goal still eludes them, the fire of freedom which burns in the hearts of the people of Lithuania will never be extinguished.

Mr. Speaker, this fire of freedom lives in America, and it was carried here, in part, by the many Americans of Lithuanian descent. I am proud of these Lithuanian-Americans who have enriched our culture with their heritage and commitment to democratic principles.

I salute these hard-working Americans, and I pledge my continued support for human rights worldwide as America recognizes the plight of Lithuanians who continue to struggle for a free state. Let us all join in the 63d observance of Lithuanian Independence Day. ●

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in the House in this commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day on which we pause to recognize the courageous Lithuanian people and their continuing struggle for freedom.

The scars of the fight for national self-determination in Lithuania are deeply embedded in the history of this nation whose people have endured great suffering and loss. Despite the presence of a superior Soviet military force which has superimposed a political structure and repressed the free exercise of political, cultural, and religious freedoms, the Lithuanian people have been unwavering in their resistance and tenacity to be free. For generations, they have kept alive their rich and unique ethnic traditions and maintained the legacy of a commitment to independence and a free nation.

We share in the ideals and aspirations of the Lithuanian people and trust that their homeland once again will be blessed with freedom and peace. ●

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, once again I join with the Lithuanian Americans across the country, the people of Lithuania, and my colleagues in commemorating the 63d anniversary of that nation's declaration of independence. This year, Lithuania's Independence Day takes on an even greater significance when we look at the most recent actions by the Soviet Union in Poland, and its invasion of Afghanistan.

It is important to note that many other once-free nations are waging the same fight as Lithuania for basic human freedoms. Poland, Estonia, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Afghanistan have all battled and are continuing to battle the terrible oppression of Soviet domination. Indeed, many Russian

citizens are themselves struggling for the human rights they deserve.

The Lithuanian Republic, founded with such great hope in 1918, was tragically fated to enjoy only 22 years of independence. The Soviet invasion in 1940 was justified under the pretext of a friendship treaty. In July 1940, after mock elections, Russia claimed, and still claims, that Lithuania voluntarily voted and asked to be incorporated into the Soviet Union. By the end of World War II, Lithuania had lost about one-third of its population through forcible deportations, assassinations, and national genocide of its people.

Despite the Soviet repression, many Lithuanian citizens carry on a heroic struggle against their oppressors. According to Amnesty International, many Lithuanian citizens are imprisoned for the "crime" of expressing national sentiment in underground books and leaflets.

Lithuanian resistance is attested to by the large number of Lithuanians placed in Soviet concentration camps, prisons, and psychiatric hospitals for their activities on behalf of religious and national freedom. These activists are heroes such as Nijole Sadunaite, sentenced for her religious activity; Petras Paulaitis, Ph. D., whose total incarceration amounts to 35 years; Balys Gajauskas, a former freedom fighter, who had already served a 25-year prison sentence and was again, in 1978, sentenced to 15 years of prison and exile; and Viktoras Petkus, a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Accords Monitor Group, sentenced in 1978 for 15 years. Support and admiration of these brave people runs deep, not only among Lithuanian Americans, but within the American Government.

Lithuania's struggle has been long and difficult, seeming almost futile; however, the people of this country remain determined to continue their fight for justice and human rights, both of which have been nonexistent since the Soviet invasion. We must stand firm in our position of nonrecognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania; it is indeed important that we, as leader of the free world, continue to condemn such transgressions as morally, ethically, and politically wrong.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet Union's illegal annexation of Lithuania and has maintained diplomatic relations with the representatives of her last independent government to this day. Hopefully, the support and encouragement of the American people will indicate to the Lithuanian people that they are being seen and heard by a nation which remembers and cares.

Only 1 year ago the world awaited the fate of Afghanistan; unfortunately, this once-free nation has also

become a victim of Soviet expansionism. One year from today will we be awaiting the fate of yet another "once-free" nation? ●

#### PROJECT HAPPY

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

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those offices and individuals who participated in Project Happy last year. For the past 2 years, I have had the pleasure of coordinating this program among congressional offices and Catholic Charities. Over 65 offices participated by donating gifts of toys and food. Additionally, several offices generously gave money so that the charity could purchase the necessary food for families who would not normally have enjoyed an abundant holiday season.

I believe that I can speak for everyone when I say that we are left with the true feeling of the season, after watching the trucks loaded with gifts and food, lumber through the streets of Washington on their way to make someone's holidays warm and happy. It would not have been possible without the help of so many.

Below is a list of the offices that participated and a copy of the letter I received from Catholic Charities thanking us for our efforts. I would like to add my special thanks to Congressman PAUL FINDLEY and his staff for their added efforts and to the Congressional Staff Club for its generous donation again this year. These efforts, along with the many gifts, made the holiday season most enjoyable for many people who otherwise would not have been so lucky. Again, my heartfelt thanks to you all.

The following offices participated in Project Happy 1980:

#### CONGRESSMEN

Bill Alexander, Douglas Applegate, Robert Badham, Jonathan Bingham, David Bonior, Jack Brooks, James Broyhill, M. Caldwell Butler, Bill Chappell, Jr., James Cleveland, Tony Coelho, Baltasar Corrada, William Dickinson, Christopher Dodd, Charles Dougherty, Millicent Fenwick, Paul Findley, Edwin Forsythe.

Wyche Fowler, Jr., Bo Ginn, Henry Gonzalez, Lee Hamilton, John Paul Hammerschmidt, James Howard, James Jeffords, Jim Leach, Mickey Leland, Trent Lott, Mike Lowry, Ron Marlenee, Joseph McDade, Stewart McKinney, Norman Mineta, George O'Brien, Mary Rose Oaker, Charles Pashayan.

Claude Pepper, Thomas Petri, J. J. Pickle, Tom Rallsback, Peter Rodino, Dan Rostenkowski, John Rousselot, Richard Schulze, Philip R. Sharp, Tom Tauke, Bob Traxler, William Wampler, Robert Whittaker, Larry Winn, Jr., Timothy Wirth, Jim Wright, Clement Zablocki.

## SENATORS

Max Baucus, Thad Cochran, William Cohen, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, Jim Sasser, Harrison Schmitt, Richard Schweiker, Ted Stevens, John Warner, Milton Young.

## ASSOCIATED CATHOLIC CHARITIES,

ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON,  
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1981.

Representative TOM TAUKE,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TAUKE: Project Happy was again a tremendous success. This year, over 110 families were helped in their celebrations of Christmas. For many, this Holiday Season meant having a complete and satisfying meal. For others, it was watching their children open presents on Christmas morning, that may not have otherwise been there.

As you know, most of the families sponsored by Project Happy, exist on fixed limited incomes; with barely enough to meet their basic needs when the Holiday Season arrives. These families have limited resources to share with their loved ones.

The families sponsored, have individually expressed their gratitude and pleasure with the items they received. On behalf of all Project Happy families, we thank those who contributed. The response from your staff and each of your fellow workers was positive and well received.

Please extend special thanks to Laura Kane for coordinating from your office, and to the Congressional Staff Club for their generous donation.

Our very special thanks to you, Rep. Tauke, for your concept and nurturing of Project Happy.

On behalf of Associated Catholic Charities and the families sponsored by Project Happy, a warm and sincere thank-you.

Sincerely,

(Ms.) DENISE REVELS,  
Supervisor, Crisis Intervention Services.  
Rev. Msgr. JAMES F. MONTGOMERY,  
Executive Director. ●

## BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, each ethnic group in America has had its own special struggles to achieve equality in our society. But blacks, more than all others, have engaged in the longest battles and suffered the deepest wounds in their fight for justice.

It is so important, therefore, that the Congress pay tribute to this continuing struggle now, during the celebration of Black History Month.

The triumphs and tragedies of the past are well known and they are woven into the history of our Nation. One of the first Americans to give his life for freedom was a black man. Crispus Attucks died at the hands of British troops in the Boston massacre in 1770. He spilled the first blood in the cause of liberty; yet it would be 41 years before the United States legally abolished the importation of new slaves into the country, and in 1827

New York became the first State to abolish slavery.

The abolition movement was given impetus by William Lloyd Garrison's newspaper, *Liberator*, established in 1831, and when Dred Scott took his case to the Supreme Court in 1857 the issue of slavery in America's new territories became the most divisive force in our Nation. America's black men and women would have to wait until the middle of the Civil War to gain their freedom, when, in 1863 President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

Nearly a century later, equal opportunity in America was advanced when the Supreme Court ruled in *Brown* against Board of Education that separate but equal education was not good enough for America's black citizens.

The struggle did not end with that Court decision. The following year Rosa Parks went to jail for violating the Jim Crow laws in Alabama. The march on Washington in 1963 and the hundreds of other demonstrations around the country served to educate our Nation to the need for greater social justice.

Congress responded by enacting landmark civil rights legislation which I was proud to help write. The Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1968—and the Voting Rights of 1965—brought about a social revolution in our country.

The names in this struggle are legion, and the leaders were true pioneers who risked—and sometimes gave up—their lives in their noble cause. They sought to break down, through eloquence and bravery, the unjust barriers that confronted them for centuries.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to list all those courageous individuals who have given so much—from Crispus Attucks, to George Washington Carver, to Booker T. Washington, to Mary Bethune, to the martyred Martin Luther King, Jr., and Malcolm X, to A. Phillip Randolph, to Vernon Jordan and Jesse Jackson and all of today's determined leaders. Without them and their protests, their boycotts, their sit-ins and their talents for education and leadership, many of the barriers would still stand today.

While millions of Americans are joining in thousands of cities and towns across our Nation to celebrate Black History Month, I believe that my congressional district is unique in its portrayal of the special role played by Afro-Americans in our country's development.

Many of the firsts for black Americans happened in New Jersey and, in reflecting on our history, I am reminded of Dr. King's letter from a Birmingham jail in 1963. He said:

Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with America's destiny.

A look at the history of New Jersey shows explicitly that the history of America is indeed tied up with the destiny of America's black citizens.

At the beginning of the 18th century blacks were brought to Newark to work in the plantations and copper mines across the Passaic River. But by the early 1800's many of the slaves became free and started the first black-owned businesses in the Nation. The first black Sunday school in the Nation was established in Newark in 1815, and 7 years later the first formal black church was founded in our city.

Newark began a program of school integration early in the 20th century, while most of the country continued strict segregationist education policies.

In 1917, Essex County became one of the first local chapters of the National Urban League, and it has remained in the forefront of this movement ever since.

Today the cities of Newark and East Orange in my district are led by black mayors—Kenneth Gibson and Thomas Cooke. Both men are outstanding leaders who have earned national respect and admiration because of their efforts on behalf of all their constituents. The municipal councils of these two cities, the Essex County Board of Chosen Freeholders and the State assembly and senate all boast outstanding black representation from my district.

Black History Month celebrates these advancements, but it also reminds us to continue our efforts for social justice in America. It is fitting that the U.S. Postal Service this month has issued a stamp honoring Whitney M. Young, Jr., the late executive director of the National Urban League, who devoted his life to the pursuit of equal economic opportunity for black Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the events in my district this month. The Newark and East Orange City Councils have passed proclamations, signed by Mayors Gibson and Cooke, in recognition of Black History Month. Black artists, actors, musicians who have their roots in Newark and East Orange are returning this month to share their experiences and their talents with their hometown folks. The museums, the colleges, the libraries, and schools are sponsoring poetry reading sessions, plays, and movies by black writers, African music and dance festivals and lectures on black history and culture.

In fact, this Friday, February 20, at East Orange City Hall, the East Orange Library will sponsor a slide presentation celebrating the contributions of black Americans, past, present, and future; and on Sunday, February 22, the East Orange Parent-Teachers Association is hosting a special program on black history.

These programs will provide a time to reflect on the works of so many illustrious black Americans who have enriched our national character and folklife. In the arts, there are Langston Hughes, Gwendolyn Brooks, and Paul Robeson; in science and education there are George Washington Carver, Mary Bethune, and Booker T. Washington; in music there are Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington, Leontyne Price, Sarah Vaughan, and Aretha Franklin; in government there are Thurgood Marshall, Barbara Jordan, and Andrew Young; and in sports there are Jack Johnson, Jesse Owens, Jackie Robinson, and Muhammed Ali. These are just a few of the names that have contributed so much to our Nation.

I am proud of the role played by black men and women in our history as a nation and I am pleased to be a part of this celebration of Black History Month.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way to separate black history from the history of our country. The profound changes in our society wrought by blacks have been beneficial to all our citizens.

As I mentioned, the struggles are not over. All the battles have not been won. We must resist efforts to mark time or to retreat.

As Dr. King said, in every crisis there are dangers. But there are also opportunities. ●

#### LET US END THE CREDIBILITY GAP ON THE PRIME RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes. ● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I contacted the chief executive officers of the Nation's 10 largest banks in an effort to end the credibility gap over the much-heralded prime rate and to give the American public a more accurate interest rate picture.

The misleading nature of prime interest rate announcements is particularly unfair to consumers and small businessmen shopping for credit. Federal Reserve surveys indicate that at times last year lending to prime customers was actually several points below the publicly announced rate. It is possible that the more sophisticated borrowers are well aware that the prime rate is not the prime rate, but the small businessman and the consumer are none the wiser. In addition, many loan contracts are tied to the prime rate, moving up and down with the public announcements of changes by the money center banks. Other lenders often informally adjust their rates and fees to the same announcements.

In these inflationary times and in a period of crushing interest rates, I think it is highly important that bank-

ing corporations be precise, accurate, and extremely careful in conveying information to the public about their corporate policies and activities. Accordingly, I have written to the following bankers requesting more information about their actual lending practices in relation to the prime rate:

Walter B. Wriston, Chairman, Citicorp, New York City.

C. J. Medberry, Chairman, Bank of America, San Francisco.

David Rockefeller, Chairman, Chase Manhattan Bank, New York City.

William S. Beinecke, Chairman, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., New York City.

Lewis T. Preston, Chairman, Morgan Guaranty Trust, New York City.

Donald C. Platten, Chairman, Chemical Bank, New York City.

Roger E. Anderson, Chairman, Continental Illinois National Bank, Chicago, Illinois.

Alfred Brittain, III, Chairman, Bankers Trust Company, New York City.

Barry F. Sullivan, Chairman, First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago.

Carl E. Hartnack, Chairman, Security Pacific National Bank, Los Angeles.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS, Washington, D.C., February 12, 1981.

Mr. WALTER B. WRISTON,  
Chairman, Citicorp,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. WRISTON: I am concerned about the widening credibility gap between the public announcement of changes in commercial banks' prime lending rates and actual day-to-day lending practices. I believe that it is a fundamental requirement for efficiency, equity, and free competition in a market that all participants have accurate and complete information about market prices.

Federal Reserve surveys indicate that upwards of two-thirds of the business loans made by large commercial banks in New York City were, at times last year, at interest rates below the publicly announced prime rate. I am informed that in May 1980 after the prime rate hit 20 percent in April the average interest rate charged on these loans was, in fact, more than four full percentage points below that advertised as the prime rate.

As you know, the phrase "prime rate" has gained wide acceptance in our vocabulary and, in fact, Webster's Dictionary defines the phrase thusly: "An interest rate at which preferred customers can borrow from banks and which is the *lowest commercial interest rate available* at a particular time." (Emphasis added.)

The Federal Reserve survey clearly established that the prime rate, as announced by the commercial banks, is not the "lowest commercial rate available" as Mr. Webster and the American public have been led to believe.

In these inflationary times and in a period of crushing interest rates, I think it is highly important that banking corporations be precise, accurate and extremely careful in conveying information to the public about their corporate policies and activities.

It is a matter of record that news commentators and financial writers seize upon every prime rate announcement as a major indicator, often suggesting that the prime eventually affects every rate in the land from the finance company to the department store credit sales. These widely herald-

ed announcements of a prime that is not a prime can only help add to the inflationary high interest psychology of the nation, particularly when we are talking about double digit rates and then some.

The misleading nature of these prime rate announcements is highly unfair to the consumer and the small businessman. They cannot afford to assign personnel to shop for the best discount from the advertised prime rates that different banks are willing to negotiate.

What is the small store owner, seeking a loan to remodel, to think when he is told by Walter Cronkite that the very best rate to the blue ribbon, Triple A commercial borrower is a prime of 20 percent? Isn't he at a distinct disadvantage when he sits down to negotiate with his local lender? Shouldn't he have the knowledge that the prime is not 20 percent, but in reality 16 percent? Perhaps your more sophisticated borrowers are well aware that the prime rate is not the prime rate, but the small businessman and the consumer are none the wiser and most are in full belief that the commercial banking industry's prime rate announcement is the real thing.

Even more important is the fact that many loan contracts across the nation are tied to the prime rate, with the rates moving up and down with the announcements of the money center banks. What is the status of these contracts when the de facto prime rate, as established by the Federal Reserve, is some four percent less than the publicly announced prime?

In addition to these specific contractual ties to the prime rate, many lenders informally adjust their rates in line with the prime rate announcements. It is difficult to estimate the total impact that these highly visible rates have on the economy as a whole, but I am convinced that it is substantial.

In this time of deregulation, I hesitate to suggest new statutory and administrative remedies. Frankly, I would like to think the banking industry, itself, would be concerned and would make a voluntary effort to make certain that its announcements are accurate and that the public can depend on what Mr. Webster suggests is the correct definition of a prime rate.

You are a leader in your industry. I need your help in remedying the problem caused by the present use of the prime rate. Your views and suggestions would be very helpful. Also, as an important guide in clarifying the present use of the prime I am asking your bank, along with some other large banks, to answer the enclosed questions. This kind of information will go a long way in informing the American public about the nature of the prime rate.

Sincerely,

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,  
Chairman.

#### SIX QUESTIONS ON THE PRIME RATE

1. Does your bank use a bank lending rate which you call your "prime rate" or an equivalent thereof? If so, exactly how is that rate defined? Is the rate stated publicly?
2. How does your bank set that rate? What officer or group of officers has responsibility for determining the rate?
3. Does your bank give loan customers discounts from the prime rate? If so, on what basis are these discounts given? Who has authority in the bank for granting discounts from the prime? Is any class of borrowers—

with respect to size of borrowers or the type of business involved—more frequently given the discounts?

4. Please supply a statistically valid sample (using a sample of 100 or less) of all domestic commercial and industrial loans as reported under the Uniform Report of Condition provided to the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (without disclosing the identity of the borrower) made during May 1980 and January 1981. Please state the size of the loan, final maturity, and interest rates charged. Also please state what your bank's prime rate was during these two months.

5. Are your commercial and industrial loan customers informed of the range of interest rates charged different customers?

6. Does your bank have domestic commercial and industrial loans on which the interest rate floats with the prime rate, or with some other rate which is agreed upon in advance? Please describe the nature and extent of these loans as a percentage of your domestic commercial and industrial loans.

Please return your answers within four weeks.●

### PUTTING COWPS TO REST

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 commend President Reagan for his actions in joining in the movement to abolish the Council on Wage and Price Stability. A number of us in Congress have been calling for the end of COWPS for a long time. Our efforts resulted in legislation last year which would have COWPS expire on June 5, 1981, unless extended. President Reagan's actions insure that our efforts will be successful and COWPS will be put to rest.

The Council on Wage and Price Stability was established as a gimmick in 1974, just before an election, to give the administration and Members of Congress an opportunity to campaign on the basis that they were doing something about inflation. The same argument has been made every few years since then when legislation to extend the life of the Council has been considered by Congress.

The fact of the matter, however, is that there has been nothing in the Council on Wage and Price Stability except its name that has had any impact on inflation. It has not done anything about inflation. To make matters worse, its very existence created the false impression that something was being done when nothing was. The problem was that the Council on Wage and Price Stability was created as a deception of the public and has been extended year after year, based on the same deception.

The Council was given the statutory responsibility of monitoring and impacting upon all decisions in the private sector and all decisions in Government which would have an inflationary consequence—obviously an im-

possible task. Even as the number of staff and the amount of appropriations for the Council have been increased over the years, it has been impossible for this mandate to be carried out. It was never intended to. All the other functions of COWPS were already being carried out by one or more other agencies in Government better equipped to do them, such as the Labor Department, the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Justice Department.

The talented professionals at COWPS were not to blame for their problems. In fact, some good was done by them, especially in challenging some burdensome regulations and policies proposed by other agencies. But, it was the very charter and concept of COWPS that was flawed, not the people who worked there.

In 1975, I pointed out that—

The Council on Wage and Price Stability is a useless fraud on the American people. It is one more Federal agency now allowed to require information from private concerns, now able to request forms and paperwork from our already overburdened businesses. We are burying ourselves in a mound of red-tape and paperwork required by more and more Government agencies, and in the case of the Council on Wage and Price Stability, by an agency which cannot, or indeed will not, take any constructive action against the very thing it was supposed to fight, inflation.

And in 1977, I argued against the existence of this Council. At that time, I said on the floor of the House:

I suggest that the existence of this Council with its high-sounding mission of monitoring the entire economy for inflationary impact is nothing more than a sop to the public to make people think that the government is doing something, when, in fact, the council is inherently incapable of any meaningful functions. It is a cosmetic agency. It should be terminated as a useless body. It is like disguising the pain with an opiate and letting the cancer go untreated. As long as we have this merely symbolic council, we will not have to face the real and difficult task of fighting inflation since we can point to this agency as a solution. As long as we have this council, we have the skeleton on which wage and price controls could be pinned, an idea reprehensible to both labor and management.

In all fairness, the Council has never claimed to be the be-all and end-all cure to inflation. Yet, the statutory responsibilities of the Council are just that. To continue to let the public believe that the Council is capable of doing what its statutory charter provides is misleading and counterproductive.

Congressional support for the Council on Wage and Price Stability waned drastically in 1979 when the reauthorization was cut from 2 years to 1. And, although the Council was again reauthorized for another year in 1980, the House cut funding for the Council from the authorized appropriations of \$8.5 million for fiscal year 1980 to an authorized appropriation of \$6.95 million for fiscal year 1981. Yet, with the

continuing appropriations under which the Council is now operating, its budget is running around \$9 million.

President Reagan has taken the long overdue action necessary to eliminate this wasteful and unnecessary expenditure. He has recommended that when the appropriations for the Council expire on June 5, 1981, the Council be abolished. In the meantime, he has filed a rescission request with this body to cut the Council's budget, and he has eliminated 135 jobs on the Council and the useless wage-price standards and monitoring functions of the Council. The only jobs retained in the Council were those of the 35 people working on regulatory reform proposals.

I congratulate President Reagan on taking this action and hope that responsible cuts in the Federal Government, such as this move to eliminate the Council on Wage and Price Stability, will prevail in the future. The time for putting this Council to rest is long overdue.

From my own point of view, it is personally gratifying, once again, to have played a role in reducing Government by actually abolishing an agency in Government. In the case of the Civil Aeronautics Board and COWPS, I have had the opportunity of playing a major role in elimination of these agencies and I have enthusiastically supported the termination of others, such as the Renegotiation Board and the Federal Metal and Non-Metallic Mine Safety Board of Review.

When I came to Congress just over 6 years ago, I said I wanted to play a role in cutting back on Government, but I heard I was overly optimistic. It is good to see that my hopes and goals are actually being realized. Now let us look for some other Government agency candidates to put to rest.●

### NATIONAL INTENSIVE AND CRITICAL CARE WEEK

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

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to designate the week of May 24, 1981 as "National Intensive and Critical Care Week."

Unfortunately, at some time in our lifetimes, nearly all of us will need the help of experts in critical and intensive care. Our lives will depend on the abilities of doctors and nurses in this highly complex specialty.

Dr. S. G. Hershey, professor of anesthesiology at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in the Bronx, N.Y. and member of the Society of Critical Care Medicine has called to my attention the excellent work being done by the specialists in critical and intensive

care medicine. In a recent letter to me, Dr. Hershey wrote that:

This relatively formalized interdisciplinary field of medical care, education and research has rapidly achieved truly remarkable growth and recognition, worldwide, as an important component of everyday health care delivery. In the United States and "developed" countries, particularly, the various aspects of critical care practice identify the major distinguishing features of the large, best staffed and equipped tertiary care hospitals in any community. It is of interest to note that the emergence of critical care medicine within the present health care setting is due largely to the fact that its practice, teaching and research content is based on the unprecedented informational and technological advances in medicine since World War II.

By designating the week of May 24 as "National Intensive and Critical Care Week," we will not only be honoring those specialists who work so hard to save lives, but will also bring public attention to the Third World Congress on Intensive and Critical Care Medicine to be held between May 24 and May 29, 1981. The text of House Joint Resolution 177 follows:

#### H.J. RES. 177

A joint resolution designating May 24, 1981, through May 30, 1981, as "National Intensive and Critical Care Week"

Whereas critical and intensive care workers should be honored and recognized for their efforts;

Whereas the study of critical and intensive care techniques should be encouraged;

Whereas critical health situations require the most up-to-date techniques and information available from medical personnel; and

Whereas during the week of May 24, 1981, the American Society of Critical Care Medicine will be hosting the Third World Congress on Intensive and Critical Care Medicine in Washington, D.C.: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the week beginning on May 24, 1981, and ending on May 30, 1981, is designated as "National Intensive and Critical Care Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling for the observance of National Intensive and Critical Care Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

#### LOS ANGELES TIMES EDITORIAL: "HE'S TOUGH—AND SILLY"

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

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times, in a recent editorial, has captured the overwhelming reaction of Californians to Secretary Watt's decision to place previously deleted basins back into the OCS lease sale 53 process. The Secretary's decision, which flouts the integrity of the OCS process, the desires of the State and local governments, and President Reagan's explicit commitment to

listen to the needs and concerns of local governments when they are affected by Federal policy, is accurately characterized by the Los Angeles Times as "Silly."

The editorial recognizes that California has not been averse to sharing the burden of energy development. In fact, California has pioneered in offshore oil drilling, as any drive along the southern coast will make plain. What is at issue here is the indisputable fact that the estimates of oil and gas are minuscule and cannot justify the severe environmental and economic risks of oil exploration in this area. The Reagan administration with its proclaimed sensitivity to wise allocation of resources, will hopefully recognize that we must use the OCS lands in a balanced manner, as required by the OCS Lands Act amendments, the wishes of the people of this area, and the Members of the California delegation. Because this editorial raises a number of important points in a thoughtful manner, I would like to share it with my colleagues and it is reprinted below:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 17, 1981]

#### HE'S TOUGH—AND SILLY

Interior Secretary James G. Watt has knocked a chip off the shoulder of California's environmental movement by proposing to open up the north coast to offshore oil drilling.

It was a silly gesture, based on nothing that we can see except a desire to follow up on President Reagan's campaign promise to look everywhere for more domestic oil.

Now that Watt has shown how tough he is, we suggest that he forget about the north coast and find more productive ways to show that the new Administration can manage public resources better than the old.

The area that Watt proposes to include in the federal government's five-year leasing plan stretches roughly from the waters off Big Sur to the Oregon border.

The odds are that there is no oil at all, or at least not enough to make it worth producing, in the four geological basins that Watt proposes to offer for lease.

The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that there is a total of 194 million barrels in the basins—about a 10-day supply for the United States—spread in dribs and drabs under the ocean floor along a distance of some 600 miles.

The geological survey does not know that there is that much oil in the area. It measures geological basins, compares their size with basins in other parts of the world that have yielded oil, and guesses.

Oil companies already have done some exploratory drilling in the region that Watt now proposes to lease, and have found nothing.

Even if the oil industry wanted to go back and try again, however, there is not enough drilling equipment in the world pool to make that likely for years.

Exploratory rigs are already working in areas where the odds of finding oil are better than they are along the state's central and northern coast, and that is where they will stay.

The state government, the boards of supervisors in all eight counties that are in-

involved and a number of members of Congress all objected to the inclusion of the four offshore basins in the leasing plan when they were proposed during the Carter Administration.

The protest did not represent a compulsive refusal to take any risks at all with the coastal environment in the national search for energy. California pioneered in offshore oil drilling, and producing wells dot the southern horizon.

The state, after study, agreed to the inclusion of the Santa Maria basin, off the coast just north of Point Conception, in the five-year plan of the Carter Administration last year. Geologists think the Santa Maria basin may hold 700 million barrels of oil.

But the state did object to risking some of the most environmentally sensitive stretches of coastline in the country when the chances of reward were so small.

We think the objection is valid. ●

#### THE POSSIBILITY OF AN ENERGY CATASTROPHE

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a review of military and political developments in the Middle East over the last 10 years brings one to the jarring reality of the energy catastrophe, bearing on our national security, which we face. Things are definitely going downhill. The most discouraging facet of this dilemma we face is that it was avoidable. In the past decade or two, over which knowledgeable people recognized our growing problem, we could have warded off this crisis by increased development of our coal resources, increased utilization of nuclear energy, and increased domestic petroleum production.

These paths were clearly recognized and well documented but for many reasons stemming from the euphoria of complacency were not followed. With the passage of time our options have become much more limited. The same paths still are the only route to the long-time solution of our problem, but since we probably have much less time until significant interruptions to 40 percent of the free world's petroleum supplies occur we must seriously consider contingency plans for drastic and massive conversion from and restrictions in the use of critical petroleum uses.

Dr. Edward Teller, in an article in the Journal of the U.S. Army War College, entitled "Conflict in the Middle East: Time for an American Energy Contingency Plan," addresses this very problem. He summarizes developments in the Middle East which show how the energy supply situation is degrading and outlines what drastic steps we must get ready to take. Edward Teller's analysis warrants the attention of every one of us. He has applied his great mind to one of the most pervasive problems the free

world faces. His article is included below for the benefit of every one of us who must face the solution of this potential catastrophe:

**CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE EAST: TIME FOR AN AMERICAN ENERGY CONTINGENCY PLAN**  
(By Edward Teller)

For the last 10 years and more, the problem of US energy dependence and insufficiency has been a preemptive concern for those who bothered to look to the future. Despite some limited experience with rising fuel prices and long gas lines, we have as yet gained no idea of what a true energy shortage is. This knowledge may soon come to our nation in a most unhappy manner. The sad fact is that the coming crisis was largely avoidable. Had we adopted economically sound programs to encourage domestic oil production rather than penalize it, had we developed coal resources rather than simply talking about them, had we focused on a safe, clean, and inexpensive nuclear energy program rather than temporizing, we would not confront the crisis that lies ahead. Indeed, the greatest danger is no longer an energy crisis—it is the possibility of an energy catastrophe—and in seeking to place the blame for this catastrophe, we must look to ourselves, not to an Ayatollah.

What is the present situation? Soviet troops are in Afghanistan, positioned only 350 miles away from the sole maritime outlet of the Persian Gulf, the Strait of Hormuz, through which flows 40 percent of the Free World's oil. At the top of the Gulf, Iraq and Iran sit glaring at each other through the smoke and ashes of their destructive war, while the Soviets are poised opportunistically on the sideline. Southwest of the Strait, at a distance of about 650 miles, there is the aggressive, Soviet-equipped, Soviet-advised army of South Yemen. The military threat to the Strait of Hormuz posed by this hammer and pincer is thus appallingly real.

That is not the only danger. If internal instability could frustrate the attempts of the Shah of Iran to move his country into the 20th century, one can hardly say that the prospects of King Khalid on the Arabian peninsula are brighter. The recent occupation of the most holy shrine in Mecca has a less well-publicized story connected with it. King Khalid was due in Mecca the day that the shrine was taken. He might have been captured by the rebels but for the fact that he was indisposed that morning and thus, by good chance, did not make the trip.

Stability in Saudi Arabia is more apparent than real. The population base consists of 5 million tribal Bedouins. Superimposed over them is the thinnest possible crust of oil aristocrats: the royal house and the hangers-on. Social injustice in Saudi Arabia is as great perhaps as anywhere in the world. The royal house itself is deeply split. King Khalid has survived three heart attacks. No one knows what will happen when he dies. The workers in the Saudi oil fields—a million Yemenites, half a million Egyptians, a quarter of a million Palestinians—do not appear to be any less susceptible to destabilizing influence than the Iranian workers were. Imported South Korean workers are the exception, but they are kept isolated.

The fall of Saudi Arabia might well be a greater danger than blockage of the Persian Gulf, though either would cause catastrophic reverberations. These scenarios are unfortunately more than mere possibilities; they lie closer to the realm of probabilities. But in assessing the potential national responses

in the event that these awful prospects come to pass, we should not even consider major military action in the Middle East. This would be true even if the United States had not shamefully neglected its military preparedness since the Vietnam War. The geography favors the Soviets—they are a few hundred miles from the scene of the action, while we are thousands of miles away.

Recourse to war is terrible under any circumstances. But recourse to a war we are bound to lose should surely be excluded. America's threats of armed retaliation in the wake of the Soviets' invasion of Afghanistan were ill-advised. Our threats amounted to sheer bluff and bluster, incapable as we are of matching Soviet power in the area. The "dare lines" we have drawn in the Middle East are about as effectual as etching granite with a twig.

Such being the case, we must confront the question, What non-military response shall we take when the oil stops flowing? I do not know when this will happen. It may be in a month, or sooner, or later. But the odds are high that the oil will not continue to flow freely. Our government, however, has no realistic contingency plan to deal with that potential catastrophe should it become a reality. Such a plan is in the interest not only of our comfort, but of our security as well. Indeed, peace itself could well depend upon it. Without a plan to moderate the effects of the loss of petroleum imports, economic blackmail is possible. Without contingency plans, arguments will be advanced for military action.

Before approaching the details of the contingency plan itself, we must try to look at the problem whole. What would happen if the leaders in the Kremlin were to take possession of the oil spigot? Would they close it completely? Or would they dole out the oil to Western Europe and Japan on conditions reducing these nations to the political condition of Finland? Would they limit the flow of oil to the Third World, which needs it desperately? Would they thereby succeed in subjugating the developing countries? Third World nations must have oil in order to develop, but, more important, they must have oil if they want to eat. Without oil they cannot sustain the Green Revolution. The new crops produce less than the old unless there is ample irrigation (which is now machine-powered) and ample quantities of fertilizers (which require energy for their production). Without the increases of food-stuffs made possible by the Green Revolution, starvation on a massive scale seems unavoidable.

A sound contingency plan must take into account the needs of nations other than our own. Self-interest, not simply altruism, dictates that we consider the needs of our allies and other currently independent nations. To deal with the international situation, we must be prepared not only to give up our imported oil, but also to try to export energy to those nations which otherwise would be overwhelmed. Such willingness on our part would obviously entail tremendous sacrifice. We would be engaged in a desperate economic war, requiring great moral dedication.

A serious contingency plan must address the radical economic dislocations that would ensue from an energy crash. To anticipate and plan for the infinitely complex ripple-effects of a radical energy shortage will require the best efforts of our best economists. For example, the drastic contraction of steel use by the automobile industry in

the wake of an energy crunch might be neutralized by a concurrent channeling of steel into an expanded drill and pipeline industry to sustain intensified domestic petroleum search and production efforts. Reverses for the logging industry owing to reduced construction might be compensated for by increased use of wood fuels. To maintain a viable national economy in the face of major energy deprivations, the foregoing types of economic adjustments, compensations, and tradeoffs must be foreseen and provided for in a comprehensive, integrated national contingency plan.

An effective national energy policy as well as a realistic contingency plan must, of course, reflect an awareness of present and future energy patterns in the United States. It is important to realize, for example, that just to stop importing oil, we would have to reduce our oil usage by more than 40 percent. To be able to offer oil assistance to our allies and other endangered nations, however, we would have to cut our usage by more than half. An appreciation of where conservation is possible can be gained by observing our current oil use pattern. Fifteen percent of our annual oil consumption supplies residences and commercial establishments. Eleven percent goes to general industry; another 11 percent supplies the raw material of the petrochemical industry. Ten percent is used to generate electricity. Fifty-four percent is consumed for transportation.

We should immediately cut gasoline consumption massively. Unimaginable? By no means. Considering the current situation surrounding the Persian Gulf, a sound and prudent national energy policy would include conversion, wherever possible, from the automobile to bicycles, mopeds, and motorized tricycles. To encourage this change-over, traffic control measures could impose an alternating pattern of streets effectively closed to cars and thus opened without danger to smaller wheeled vehicles. We need to have busing of workers to their jobs rather than of school children to distant schools.

Under a fully operational contingency plan, worse sacrifices than these would be required. Air conditioning would have to be relinquished. One can live without air conditioning. In the winter, however, particularly in the East, North, and Midwest, one cannot live without heating. More rigorous solutions might require families to move into the same house together or perhaps to heat only one room in a house. Such contingency measures, if put into effect, would doubtless entail inconvenience, irritation, hardship, and disruption of our living patterns. Yet, the issue is survival itself, and the living patterns suggested are far less horrible than war.

Would we be able to do it? Certainly not without proper planning and preparation. Shall we be able to limit the duration of the emergency by building the power plants, including nuclear plants, in sufficient time? The Taiwanese enjoy a 63-month construction schedule for their nuclear plants. In the United States it takes more than 12 years to put a similar plant in operation because of repetitive licensing procedures. Many nations in Europe are moving with considerable speed. But the United States appears paralyzed.

The fable of a "China Syndrome" notwithstanding, experience shows that nuclear energy is safe. The long licensing process does not make it any safer. Today we have 200 nuclear generating plants throughout the Free World. They have operated on the

average for 10 years apiece. The most dramatic and damaging accident that has yet occurred was at the Three Mile Island plant in Pennsylvania. In this case, if the four operators, when the first problem occurred at 0400 hours, had called for the help of competent engineers and then gone home, and if those engineers had gotten out of bed, drunk three cups of coffee, showered, driven carefully to the plant, and spent two hours there deciding what to do next, few people today would have heard of Three Mile Island.

Even as it was, no one suffered physical harm. The amount of radiation exposure to those outside the plant was about the same as that from watching 40 hours of color television or flying in an airplane as a stewardess for a month. The worst reasonable prediction that can be made is that possibly 10 years from now there might be one additional case of cancer, and for that there is only a small probability. The only material harm was severe damage to a nuclear generator. Costs were compounded by many billions of dollars because replacement energy had to be produced from oil.

But regardless of whether we talk about nuclear energy, natural gas, solar energy, or energy from coal, additional energy sources can be developed only in small quantities during the next five years. Any effective contingency program for the interim must rest mainly on stringent conservation. Each month that we delay the development of our own resources creates more danger, lengthens the period of true deprivation should a contingency plan be needed, and weakens our economy further. Our national leaders must have the courage to impress the unpalatable realities of our energy situation upon the people.

Obviously, to talk of the oil companies as the heroes of our society is neither popular nor justified, but to introduce a form of taxation which makes it no more profitable to drill oil wells than to buy government bonds is complete folly. Similarly, the government was ill-advised to step in and prevent energy companies from ratifying realistic contracts to buy Mexican gas. With regard to coal, there is no coherent and unified national policy. The rhetoric of national leaders encourages the development and expanded use of coal; yet, environmental concerns inhibit such expansion. The tradeoffs between the advantages and disadvantages of coal vis-à-vis those of nuclear energy must be explained rationally to the American people and choices must then be made. In the seven years that have elapsed since the OPEC embargo put us dramatically on notice of our energy vulnerability, we could have put 200 nuclear plants into production. Instead we have about 70. We must have firm and enlightened leadership, at both the state and national levels, to convince the people of the threat of a massive oil shortage and galvanize the country into action.

Despite talk of detente, the cold war is likely to continue; but no matter how cold that war turns out to be, it will be incomparably better than a hot war. To lessen the probability of such a hot war, it is vital that we decrease our dependency on Middle East oil with all possible speed. As the situation now stands, we as a major power are hostage to the continued availability of Middle East oil, but we lack any guarantees for its continued availability, even if we were willing (which one would devoutly hope is not the case) to use military means, including nuclear weapons. To end our dangerous de-

pendency, the primary requirement is a national energy development program. Meanwhile, looking to the possibility that events in the Persian Gulf region might result in an involuntary cutoff of our oil supplies, we must have a comprehensive, realistic, national contingency plan ready for use. Having neglected domestic energy production for so long, we must make radical conservation the heart of such a plan. Only by taking action now—by providing secure national energy sources as rapidly as possible and by careful planning to moderate the effects of an oil cutoff—are we likely to survive as a free and independent nation. ●

### THE NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

(Mr. HILLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD the proceedings of the National Prayer Breakfast held at 8 a.m. on February 5, 1981.

The material follows:

#### THE NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Can I have your attention. I'm about to say grace. My name is Senator Harold Hughes and please from here on would you be calm and quiet. Your attention please. Would you assume an attitude of prayer wherever you are. Our dear Heavenly Father, We do thank you for this morning. Thank you for the opportunity of fellowship one with another. We thank you that we in this country can be the host for so many of our friends from over 100 countries around this world this morning when we lift up our hearts in prayer for the leadership of this nation and for the leadership of the world. We ask especially that you bless the President of the United States, the Vice President and all those in authority here and in all the nations of the world. And now we are grateful dear God for the bounty of the earth you have given us and we ask you to bless it that by its strength we can better serve you. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

(Music by Anderson College Male Chorus.)

#### CONGRESSMAN HILLIS PRESIDING

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Vice President of the United States and Mrs. Bush.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the President of the United States and Mrs. Reagan.

Ladies and Gentlemen, would you please remain standing as Barbara Williams, the Executive Director of the Congressional Black Caucus offers our opening prayer and also please for a statement of purpose by Dr. Graham.

#### BARBARA WILLIAMS

Barbara Williams: Please join hands with the person closest to you at your table and bow your heads. Father, we come to you, not as people with titles from nations and cities and states, but as your children this morning and we just thank you for being our Father. Lord, we really are grateful just for life today and we're thankful Father as we're gathered here from many nations, diverse backgrounds and cultures, that you do not see us as separate people but as one family of God. Father we just ask you to help us to see that today as we move through the day and hear your Word, Father, that we would just listen and once

we've listened, Father, that we would believe and then we would act on what we hear. So Lord, we just have a burden this morning for the separations between us that you do not see but we see. Lord, we just claim your belief in our oneness in You. We are not today gathered as haves and have-nots, Lord, we're gathered as your people. Lord remove the hostility, Father, between those of us who are affluent and those of us who are not. Help us, Father, to be free from our agendas, our schedules, our ministries, our clubs, our institutions, Father and just read and hear and believe and trust in your Word. We claim that for this morning. We claim that for this day. We claim that for just this nation and this world and, Lord, we ask a special blessing this morning for the President and Mrs. Reagan. You have put them where they are and invested in them the authority as the first family of this nation. We pray right now, no matter what our backgrounds, affiliations, republicanism, democratism, we just release ourselves from that right now and we claim them as our family and we pray Father, that you would lift them up and that we would each day pray for them. Lord, when it's all over and it's said and done each one of us will stand before you not with the score cards, the balance sheets, not with accomplishments, titles, labels, none of it. You will wonder, Lord, whether we have loved you with all of our hearts, all of our minds, all of our souls, all of our strength and you will wonder and you will ask us if we've loved every neighbor as ourself. Deliver us, Father, from the binds and all of the separations and thank you again, Lord, for the opportunity to come together, Lord, not to hear speeches, but just to hear from God. We thank you Lord for this opportunity. We praise your name and we just lift up the name of Jesus Christ today, Lord as one nation under God. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

#### DR. GRAHAM

Dr. Billy Graham: Mr. President, Mrs. Reagan, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Bush, the Lord is God, He made us. We're His people, the sheep of His pasture. Give thanks to Him and bless His name. For the Lord is always good. He is always loving and kind and His faithfulness goes on and on to each succeeding generation. During the past thirty years our nation has seen a revival of religious interest. I think part of it began probably with the election of Dwight Eisenhower. A few days before he was inaugurated as President he asked a young clergyman to come and visit him at the Commodore Hotel in New York. He walked over to the window and stood in silence looking out for a moment or two and then he said to the young clergyman that he felt that a part of the reason for his election was to help lead America in a spiritual renewal. He wanted some suggestions, especially a couple of appropriate Scripture verses. Not only did he quote Scripture in his inaugural address, but he also said a prayer of his own making.

In the meantime a small prayer group had started in the United States Senate and later in the United States House of Representatives. This had inspired Abraham Ver-eide and one or two colleagues to think and pray about the possibility of a Presidential Prayer Breakfast. One of those who was instrumental in that first Prayer Breakfast was former Senator Frank Carlson of Kansas who was supposed to be here today but he is ill. Every president since that first Prayer Breakfast in 1954 has participated in

this Prayer Breakfast. Now it has spread to many countries of the world and most of the 50 states where Governors' Prayer Breakfasts are held and to many of the major cities of the United States where Mayors' Prayer Breakfasts are held. Thousands of leaders on every continent have been confronted with the fact that God is not only interested in their individual lives but He's interested in us as nations. I believe the Prayer Breakfast movement has played a significant role in the revival of our religious interests during the past three decades. We live in a very dangerous world and I'm convinced that if we're to have peace in our time, it will come about in a spiritual dimension. Now we have a new administration with a great possibility of a new beginning that has been symbolized by the return of the hostages and the feeling of warmth and spiritual renewal that has swept America in the last few days. We are told in Scripture to pray for those in authority. This Prayer Breakfast is dedicated to praying for those in authority not only here in Washington, but throughout the world. Let us pray that God will renew our hearts and bring each of us to a deeper commitment of our lives to God and His will for us and especially do we pray on this occasion for the President and his family. Thank you.

Hillis: Thank you Dr. Graham. Now please be seated and enjoy breakfast.

Hillis: Mr. President, guests at the head table, ladies and gentlemen, I'm Congressman Bud Hillis from Indiana and it is my distinct honor and pleasure as chairman of the House Prayer Breakfast group to welcome each of you to this 29th National Prayer Breakfast. I speak for the entire House and Senate Prayer Breakfast Committee when I say we are genuinely pleased to have you with us today to share in this special fellowship that's found in the Spirit of Jesus Christ. We're especially delighted to have with us Dr. Billy Graham, who along with President Eisenhower and Senator Frank Carlson arranged the very first National Prayer Breakfast in 1953. For I'm sure as you see, as he stood here and told us in his statement of purpose that that the young clergyman visiting President Eisenhower in the hotel in New York was Dr. Graham, himself.

Dr. Graham said, Senator Carlson had also planned to be with us this morning, but due to illness he has been unable to join us and it is my understanding that he is in a hospital in Kansas and I ask and know that each of you will join in remembering him in our individual thoughts and prayers this morning. Also let me take a moment to say a word of welcome to all those people who are living and serving abroad, people in our Armed Services, on our ships at sea and all of the people all over the world who will be joining us in our fellowship through a taped rebroadcasting of this program over the Armed Forces Radio Network. Of course, to each of them we say we are sorry you cannot be with us in person but we acknowledge your presence in the Spirit and we are grateful for your participation. These rebroadcasts along with many breakfasts that are taking place all over the country in conjunction with this one have expanded the National Prayer Breakfast to a point where it now involves more people than ever before. And while this is a National Prayer Breakfast, it is heartening to note that the numbers have also continued to grow among our international guests. We have with us today representatives from over 100 nations

and we certainly are very delighted to extend a very special welcome to each of them. Your participation broadens the scope of our fellowship and greatly enriches our endeavor.

Ladies and gentlemen, we meet here this morning as in years past, to reaffirm our country's spiritual foundation. We acknowledge that the Lord has richly blessed us as a people, but we are aware also that He has said, "of those to whom much is given, much is required." We meet this morning in the recognition of this obligation, humbly seeking the wisdom and the strength necessary to fulfill it. Like so many other times when the Prayer Breakfast has met, we've come together at a time when the world faces increasingly hard choices and many difficult challenges. But we're not here to debate those problems, or even to outline them; rather we are here today because we recognize that our shared faith and our personal relationship with Christ can truly make a difference in the world. It is in this spirit that the House and Senate Prayer Breakfast groups meet each week when Congress is in session and it is with this same spirit that we welcome each of you here with us today. And if I may be permitted a personal aside, let me say as an individual member of Congress how meaningful these small informal weekly meetings really are. For me and for everyone of my colleagues who participate regularly, these breakfasts represent an opportunity for each one of us coming as we do from diverse backgrounds and different parts of the country and representing many different political viewpoints to draw spiritual strength from one another. It's a unique and rewarding experience, one which we enjoy each week and one which we gladly share with you this morning. Again, welcome and thank you very much for coming. And now I would like to introduce our head table up to the President who will be presented later in the program. Following the introduction of the head table each participant will come forward in the order of their appearance on the program. Let me ask that you hold your applause until the first lady has been presented and I'll ask each of the head table as they are introduced to stand and remain standing until that point. Starting on your right and my far left, I see that Congressman Bill Hefner is with us. I'll ask Bill to stand. He's going to lead our song. Next to him is Dr. Billy Graham. Next is the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Edward C. Meyer and Mrs. Meyer. Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President of the United States, The Honorable George Bush and Barbara Bush. Next to me the Governor of Minnesota the Honorable Albert Quie and Mrs. Quie. And now continuing to my far right may I introduce once again Barbara Williams, the Executive Director of the Congressional Black Caucus and now the Mayor of the City of New York, the Honorable Edward Koch, the Honorable Lawton Chiles, United States Senator from the State of Florida and Mrs. Chiles. To my immediate right I present my wife Carol. And, of course, we are especially honored to have with us this morning the first lady of our land, Nancy Reagan.

And now for our Old Testament reading I will call on the Mayor of New York, Edward Koch.

#### MAYOR KOCH

Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I'm very pleased to have this opportunity to be with you today. As mayor of a city with a long

tradition of cultural and religious diversity, a city where Cardinal Cook has said on so many occasions mass is said every morning in 23 different languages, a city which has been home to countless millions seeking religious freedom, I both understand and appreciate the importance of this morning's breakfast. Today I would like to read to you Psalm 8, a Psalm of David. This Psalm speaks of God's glory and the wonders of His creation. One theme in particular has special meaning for us and that is the God-given dignity of all people and our stewardship of God's wondrous creation. Psalm 8:

"O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is thy name in all the earth. Thou, whose glory above the heavens is chanted by the mouths of babes and infants, Thou hast founded a bulwark because of thy foes to still the enemy and the avenger. When I look at Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast established, what is man that thou art mindful of him and the Son of Man that thou dost care for him. Yet thou hast made him little less than God and dost crown him with glory and honor. Thou hast given him dominion over the works of thy hands. Thou has put all things under his feet. All sheep and oxen and also the beasts of the field, the birds of the air and the fish of the sea; whatever passes along the paths of the sea. Oh Lord, our Lord, how majestic is thy name in all the earth."

"Take My Hand Precious Lord" was sung by the Anderson College Male Chorus.

#### VICE PRESIDENT BUSH

The New Testament reading is from I Corinthians 13:

"If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels but have not love, I am only a resounding gong or clanging cymbal. If I have the gift of prophecy and can fathom all mysteries and all knowledge and if I have faith that can move mountains but have not love, I am nothing. If I give all I possess to the poor and surrender my body to the flames, but have not love, I gain nothing. Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy. It does not boast. It is not proud. It is not rude. It is not self-seeking and it is not easily angered. It keeps no record of wrong. Love does not delight in evil, but rejoices with the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres. Love never fails. But where there are prophecies, they will cease. Where there are tongues, they will be stilled. Where there is knowledge, it will pass away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part, but when perfection comes the imperfect disappears. When I was a child I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child and when I became a man I put childish ways behind me. Now we see but a poor reflection. Then we shall see face to face. Now I know in part, then I shall know fully even as I am fully known. And now these three remain—faith, hope and love, but the greatest of these is love."

#### SENATOR CHILES

Be careful for nothing, but in everything with prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God and the peace of God which passes all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus. Father you tell us in your Word to pray for the king and all who are in authority so that we might live a good and peaceful life. And your Psalms tell us, Father, to let the nations be glad and to sing for joy for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and

govern the nations upon the earth. Father, you are the creator of government and it's used for your purposes to fulfill your plan. So Lord we come today in thanksgiving and a joyful heart. We thank you for all of the blessings you have given to us individually and that you've given to our land and to our nation. And we hold up to you today our President, Mrs. Reagan and their family. We hold up the Vice President, all of the Members of his Cabinet and Executive Branch and Father, we just ask you to pour out a blessing upon them to give them wisdom, knowledge and judgment, joy, peace and strength. Father, we see You using them as your instruments. We know that they are creatures of your government and we just see them as being used for your purposes to work healing upon the land and to bring peace upon the world. And, Father, we now hold up a prayer for national leaders everywhere. We ask you to bring into their hearts your instrument of peace. Father we hold up officials everywhere because we know that you tell us that one of the spiritual gifts is the gift of leadership and that we who have that gift of leadership are to lead with diligence. And Father, we ask that you being the author of that spiritual gift will give that power and that diligence. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders and his name shall be called wonderful, counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting father, the prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end. Amen.

## CONGRESSMAN HEFNER

I would like you to help me. I would like to sing the first stanza of "How Great Thou Art" and then I would like for you all to join me in singing a couple of choruses and I want you to sing real good and loud. If it's not too much of a problem, I would like you to stand.

There's someone who is having a very special day tomorrow and perhaps we won't be together tomorrow as a body as we are right now, so I think it would be fine if you all would join me in singing "Happy Birthday" to the President of the United States. Would you do that?

Happy birthday was sung.

## GOVERNOR QUIE

Governor Quie: Mr. President and Mrs. Reagan, Mr. Vice President and Mrs. Bush, and all you children of God from this nation and other nations who are gathered here this morning, this National Prayer Breakfast has a special meaning to it. It occurs every time there is a new President, a new Administration, and it has special meaning this morning because we have just completed an outpouring of the American spirit at the return of the hostages. It is a time of new beginnings and new hope and we see it expressed in the newspapers as a hope for the recovery of the economy. We see it expressed as a hope for peace, the end of aggression and even the point where none would dare take our hostages again.

I would like to have your hearts and minds turn to a passage in the Book of Zechariah, the fourth chapter and the sixth verse that brings a message from the Lord. And it reads, "You shall succeed, not by military might nor by your own strength, but by my spirit." How often we forget that we are a part of God's creation. God who made all and as we heard read from Mayor Koch this morning, the God who made the heavens and earth and the seas and all that are in it and who is man, mere man, that He is

mindful of us. The essence of our being is in our spirit and so often we think of ourselves as physical beings because we can see it, intellectual beings because we can hear it, emotional beings because we can feel it and forget that before all else we are spiritual. And within each human being is a longing and a hungering until we find that union with God. The late Dr. Margaret Meade in a conversation I had one time with her expressed that additional spiritual significance in explaining one time when she and some other experts were working with a young child and that young child sitting in that little chair that babies sit in when they start sitting up, and that child couldn't even sit up straight. They did everything they could to get that child to sit up straight. Let me tell you a little bit about that child's family. It was from a broken home. It had never seen its father more than three times before in his life. That child's father came into the room. He never said a word and when that father came into the room, the child sat up straight. She said she knew there was something between that father and that child that was more than physical, intellectual and emotional. The world hungers to know each other, to be at one with each other and the greatest power that exists in this world is in the spirit. God is spirit and He expressed himself physically when He sent His son Jesus Christ to live on the earth. And the word that we'd know in that spiritual relationship between people, that's the word love. Love, one that we have a difficult time explaining ourselves because we don't use three words as the Greeks did. Eros—the relationship of a person of one sex with the other; filial, for those who are alike, kind of like each other; but agape, where we love our enemies. That is the Christ-like love and when one heard the words of the Vice president this morning in the 13th Chapter of I Corinthians and we think of the times that we are in and it starts out "if I could speak with the language of men and of angels", don't you long that all of the individuals in this room from every nation might be able to speak with the same language so that we could understand each other. But it says if we did not have love, we'd just be a big noise. Is that the reason why our talks and our treaties don't always work out, because we do not have love? Think of the problems this earth has. And it said in the second verse, "If I had all the knowledge and knew all the secrets." Does that mean we have the science and technology to be able to do all that we want to and do it without polluting and keep the ecological balance on this earth, then we would have perfection? It says if I knew all of that and didn't have love, I'd be nothing. And to those of us who may call ourselves religious, it says in the third verse, "If I gave everything that I had to the poor and even took the form of a martyr and gave my body to be burned and did not have love, it would avail me nothing." We begin to see the power of the love of God in human lives. But all that we have on this earth that we can see and talk about and feel will pass, but the spirit is eternal and the human being needs to work in the essence of their being and open their hearts and their minds to the Lord Himself. As we look to the future, we can think of times of this nature when we join together in the recognition that we are all children of God and in that spirit can we move to the future.

I'd like to tell you one thing that happened to me. I do it because if you are like me at all, it is difficult to reach out to another person and speak of spiritual matters.

We don't speak easily of spiritual matters. The American Indian could speak of the spirit easier than we can because just as Jesus Christ spoke of the spirit like the wind, we hear it, we don't know where it's coming from or where it's going, so the Indians spoke of the spirit of the wind. The Bible also spoke of the spirit as streams of living water that nourishes us. What happened to me was that once I was convinced I ought to meet with some other people in the Congress, a few to spend time in Bible study and prayer. And I thought to myself, you know if Christ did that what did He do. He looked around for the person who was the strongest Pharisee that he could find and he was a Roman citizen and a Jew as well and he picked Paul. Paul had been going around killing Christians before he picked him to be the greatest missionary there was. I looked around the Congress and there was one person I thought was the best politician I ever saw there. I thought I'd meet with him and see if I could. But I never could get myself to go up and talk with him. One day he sat down beside me in the front row of the Congress and I thought now is the time God wants me to talk to him. I turned to talk to him about we ought to get together and pray together some time and the words wouldn't come out. So I turned forward again and composed the words to myself so I could say it to him and turned again to him and the words wouldn't come out. So I turned back again in disgust with myself and said, "Oh, Lord, I'm helpless. I can't do it. You're going to have to get somebody else to do it for me." And just then, he turned to me and said, "Albert we ought to get together and pray together some time." If I had any doubts of the spirit before, they were removed at that moment. The spirit of God moves in ways that we cannot understand if we open our hearts and let it be a part of us. That is the hope for the future. I'd like to end my comments to going back to II Kings, to King Hezekiah.

They said there never was a king like him before or afterwards. King Hezekiah walked with God and as you recall in the 19th Chapter of II Kings it spoke of the King of Assyria assailing Jerusalem and threatening and insulting King Hezekiah. And King Hezekiah went to the temple and laid it all out before God. He didn't ask God to save him because they were His chosen people or because King Hezekiah was such a wonderful person or any of that. This is what King Hezekiah said when he had finished, "And now, Oh Lord, my God, I beseech you to save us that all the kingdoms of the world might know that thou, Oh Lord, art God alone."

Congressman Hillis: Ladies and gentlemen, I have the distinct honor at this time of presenting to you a man who by his presence here this morning is carrying on the tradition of this National Prayer Breakfast which was begun by Dwight D. Eisenhower 29 years ago. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming the President of the United States.

## THE PRESIDENT

President Reagan: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Hillis and all you ladies and gentlemen, Nancy and I are delighted to be here and I want to thank you for the day in my life that you recognized in starting off my celebration of my 31st anniversary of my 39th birthday. To all of you, to the many who are here from across the world, the different lands and as the chairman told us earlier, I was surprised

to learn that we are joined this morning by meetings of this kind in places that might be surprising to some, on naval vessels, on military bases, even in penal institutions all across the land, you have taken Nancy and me back to a nostalgic time because I have found myself remembering occasions like this in a hotel dining room not quite so grand or not quite so large, but the Governor's Breakfast in Sacramento. They were always enriching, spiritual experiences and I think maybe, I haven't checked with Nancy about her, but I think maybe for both of us I could say this morning we are freed from the last vestige of homesickness. I would like to tell just a little story. It was given to me by a friend on a printed card, author unknown. Now I don't know how widely this has been distributed or whether many of you are aware of it. I'm going to tell it anyway. This unknown author wrote of a dream and in the dream he was walking down the beach beside the Lord and as they walked above him in the sky was reflected each stage and experience of his life. And reaching the end of the beach and of his life he turned back and looked back down the beach and saw the two sets of footprints in the sand except that he looked again and realized that every once in a while there was only one set of footprints and each time there was only one set of footprints, it was when the experience reflected in the sky was one of despair, desolation, of great trial or grief in his life. He turned to the Lord and said, "You said that if I would walk with you, you would always be beside me and take my hand. Why did you desert me? Why are you not there in my times of greatest need?" The Lord said, "My child, I did not leave you. Where you see only one set of footprints, it was there that I carried you." Abraham Lincoln once said, "I would be the most foolish person on this footstool earth if I believed for one moment I could perform the duties assigned to me without the help of one who is wiser than all." I know that in the days to come and the years ahead there are going to be many times when there will only be one set of footprints in my life. If I did not believe that I could not face the days ahead.

Mr. Hillis: Would you please remain standing for our final prayer.

#### GENERAL MEYER

In June of 1783 George Washington while he was still Commander in Chief of our Continental Army composed a prayer which he sent to the 13 governors of the then fledgling nations. With the words of our newest president still ringing in our hearts, it seems appropriate that we close this National Prayer Breakfast with the words of our first President in Washington's prayer for the nation. Let us pray:

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that thou wilt keep the United States in Thy Holy protection, that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large and finally, that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and specific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the divine author of our blessed religion and without a humble imitation of example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplications, we beseech thee through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Mr. Hillis: Would you join me in singing the chorus "Alleluiah" and the second time we will sing "I will praise Him" and the third time we will sing alleluiah again.

#### FREE ENTERPRISE POSTAGE STAMP ACT

(Mr. GOLDWATER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service had a \$306 million deficit last fiscal year. This deficit will probably increase after Postal Union contracts, which expire July 20, are renegotiated. The unions are suggesting Congress simply increase the Postal Service's annual subsidy to meet their escalating wage demands; in other words, more taxes. Such an increase would have to be quite substantial, because the Office of Management and the Budget recently proposed a \$632 million reduction in Postal Service subsidies.

To further aggravate the Postal Service's deficit problems, the Postal Service has requested a 5-cent boost in first-class postage rates, but the Postal Rate Commission will probably approve only a 3-cent rate increase. This means higher rates for other classes of mail. Still, these increases will not come close to offsetting the \$1.2 billion another 2-cent first-class postage increase would produce. Because of such nagging problems, the Postal Service is already talking about another rate increase—to 22 cents.

There just does not seem to be an end to these ever-escalating rate increases, Mr. Speaker. It seems incredible that the American taxpayer has already been subjected to a 300-percent increase in the last 15 years alone. I ask my colleagues to help me in reducing the taxpayer's burden, by cosponsoring the Free Enterprise Postage Stamp Act which is a commonsensical approach toward reducing more taxes and trying to do something about rate increases.

#### LUTHERAN COUNCIL IN THE U.S.A. PUBLIC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

(Mr. ERDAHL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to share the following statement with public policy recommendations on church-State issues adopted by the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.:

##### A. INTRODUCTION

An increasingly complex society has produced growing interdependence and interaction among groups, persons, and resources in the governmental, economic, and voluntary sectors. The government's responsibilities to maintain equity and order have led

both the churches and the state into greater contact and, at times, into tension. As governmental bodies seek to perform their roles and the churches seek to fulfill their missions, each needs to be aware of the other's purposes, principles, and methods. In their endeavors, both the churches and the government have the task of formulating and clarifying position statements and guidelines for implementation and application when appropriate.

The Lutheran Council in the USA, a cooperative agency of The American Lutheran Church, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, Lutheran Church in America, and Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, is aware of rising concern within its participating bodies over governmental activity in matters affecting the churches and their ministries. There are instances in which laws, rulings, and regulatory procedures on the part of government appear to infringe upon the churches and their agencies and institutions. Governmental efforts to define the nature, mission, ministries, and structure of religious organizations are likely to continue. These developments have raised questions within the Lutheran churches about the right and competence of government to define the nature, mission, ministries, and structure of religious bodies.

The Lutheran Council recognizes that an ongoing process of communication within the Lutheran family of churches and with other religious bodies and organizations in the voluntary sector is proper and timely as response is given to the government. Government officials need to be informed about the positions and perspectives of the Lutheran churches.

On these grounds the Lutheran Council convened a consultation on church-state issues which resulted in the following statement and recommendations. The report of the consultation was adopted by the council's 1979 annual meeting on May 16 in Minneapolis.

##### B. STATEMENT OF AFFIRMATION

###### 1. Church and Government in God's world

God's omnipotent activity in creation is dynamic; that is, it is living, active, and powerful in all human affairs. The structure and policies of civil and Christian communities are determined and arranged by tradition, circumstances, and needs.

Lutherans acknowledge the twofold reign of God, under which Christians live simultaneously. God is ruler of both the world and the church. The church is primarily the agency of the Gospel in the new age of Christ, while the state is primarily the agency of the Law in the old age of Adam.

Given the balance of interests and differing responsibilities of the churches and the government in God's world, the Lutheran churches advocate a relationship between the churches and the government which may be expressed as "institutional separation and functional interaction."

Both the churches and the government are to delineate and describe the proper and responsible extent of their functional interaction in the context of God's rule and the institutional separation of church and state.

###### 2. Institutional separation

In affirming the principle of separation of church and state, Lutherans in the United States respectfully acknowledge and support the tradition that the churches and the government are to be separate in structure. As the U.S. constitution provides, government neither establishes nor favors any reli-

gion. It also safeguards the rights of all persons and groups in society to the free exercise of their religious beliefs, worship, practices, and organizational arrangements within the laws of morality, human rights, and property. The government is to make no decisions regarding the validity or orthodoxy of any doctrine, recognizing that it is the province of religious groups to state their doctrines, determine their policies, train their leaders, conduct worship, and carry on their mission and ministries without undue interference from or entanglement with government.

#### a. The Church's Mission

(1) The central mission of the church is the proclamation of the Gospel; that is, "the good news" or promise of God that all persons are forgiven by and reconciled with God and one another by grace through faith in Jesus Christ.

(2) The church is the fellowship of such forgiven and reconciled persons united in Jesus Christ and guided by the Holy Spirit to be sons and daughters of the Father. In and through that fellowship Christians express their love for, confidence in, and reliance upon God through worship, education, social action, and service.

(3) The church is also the people of God called and sent to minister under his authority in his world. God also calls the church to be a creative critic of the social order, an advocate for the needy and distressed, a pioneer in developing and improving services through which care is offered and human dignity is enhanced, and a supportive voice for the establishment and maintenance of good order, justice, and concord. Another mark of the presence of the church in the world is in its ministries involving activities, agencies, and institutions through which the church and society seek to fulfill their goals in mutual respect and cooperation.

(4) Lutherans hold that their churches have the responsibility to describe and clarify to their members and to society the mission of the Lutheran churches and to determine, establish, maintain, and alter the various forms through which that mission is expressed and structured.

(5) The distinctive mission of the churches includes the proclamation of God's Word in worship, in public preaching, in teaching, in administration of the sacraments, in evangelism, in educational ministries, in social service ministries, and in being advocates of justice for participants in the social order.

(6) On the basis of their commitment to him who is both Lord of the church and Lord of the World, Lutheran churches establish, support, operate, and hold accountable their congregations, agencies, institutions, schools, organizations and other appropriate bodies.

(7) While church bodies have differing policies, it is fitting to describe them, including their duly constituted agencies, according to their ecclesiastically recognized functions and activities.

(8) Lutheran churches have the authority, prerogative, and responsibility to determine and designate persons to be professional church workers, both clergy and lay; to establish criteria for entrance into and continuance in the functions carried on by professional church workers; to create educational institutions for training professional church workers; and to provide for the spiritual, professional, and material support of such persons. Such support extends throughout the preparation for, activity in,

and retirement from service in the several ministries of the churches.

(9) Lutheran churches have the authority and prerogative to enter into relationships, associations, and organizations with one another; with overseas Lutheran churches and bodies; with other Christian fellowships or other religious groups on regional, national, and international levels; and with voluntary or governmental agencies which the Lutheran churches and other groups deem helpful and fitting to their respective purposes.

#### b. The Government's Role

(1) According to Lutheran theology, the civil government's distinctive calling by God is to maintain peace, to establish justice, to protect and advance human rights, and to promote the general welfare of all persons.

(2) As one of God's agents, government has the authority and power in the secular dimensions of life to ensure that individuals and groups, including religious communities and their agencies, adhere to the civil law. The churches and their agencies in the United States are often subject to the same legislative, judicial, and administrative provisions which affect other groups in society. When necessary to assure free exercise of religion, however, Lutheran churches claim treatment or consideration by government different from that granted to voluntary, benevolent, eleemosynary, and educational nonprofit organizations in society.

(3) Government enters into relationships, associations, and organizational arrangements with nongovernmental groups, including churches, according to the nation's laws and traditions, in order to fulfill its God-given calling and without compromising or inhibiting the integrity of either the groups or the government.

(4) Government exceeds its authority when it defines, determines or otherwise influences the churches' decisions concerning their nature, mission, and ministries, doctrines, worship and other responses to God, except when such decisions by the churches would violate the laws of morality and property or infringe on human rights.

#### 3. Functional interaction

Lutherans in the United States affirm the principle of functional interaction between the government and religious bodies in areas of mutual endeavor, so that such interaction assists in the maintenance of good order, the protection and extension of civil rights, the establishment of social justice and equality of opportunity, the promotion of the general welfare, and the advancement of the dignity of all persons. This principle underscores the Lutheran view that God rules both the civil and spiritual dimensions of life, making it appropriate for the government and the churches to relate creatively and responsibly to each other.

In this functional interaction, the government may conclude that efforts and programs of the churches provide services of broad social benefit. In such instances and within the limits of the law, the government may offer and the churches may accept various forms of assistance to furnish the services. Functional interaction also includes the role of the churches in informing persons about advocating for, and speaking publicly on issues and proposals related to social justice and human rights. From the Lutheran perspective, the church has the task of addressing God's Word to its own activities and to government. The U.S. Constitution guarantees the right of the churches to communicate concerns to the public and to the government.

#### a. The Church's Responsible Cooperation with the Government

(1) The church relates to the interests of the state by offering intercessory prayers on its behalf. Christians are called to offer supplications and thanksgiving for all persons, especially "for kings and all who are in high positions" (1 Timothy 2:1).

(2) The church relates to the interests of the state by encouraging responsible citizenship and government service. The church has always admonished its members to be "subject to the governing authorities" (Romans 13:1) out of respect for the civil power ordained by God.

(3) The church relates to the interests of the state by holding it accountable to the sovereign law of God, in order to provide judgment and guidance for those leaders responsible under God for the peace, justice, and freedom of the world.

(4) The church relates to the interests of the state by contributing to the civil consensus which supports it. Especially under the U.S. system which provides for wide participation, the church has the responsibility to help create a moral base and legal climate in which just solutions to vexing political problems can take place.

(5) The church relates to the interests of the state by championing the human and civil rights of all its citizens. Christians believe that under God the state exists for people, not people for the state. In addition, the church may volunteer its resources as a channel for meeting the needs of society through cooperation with government.

#### b. The Government's Responsible Cooperation with the Church

(1) The state relates to the interests of the church by ensuring religious liberty for all.

(2) The state relates to the interests of the church by acknowledging that human rights are not the creation of the state.

(3) The state relates to the interests of the church by maintaining an attitude of "wholesome neutrality" toward church bodies in the context of the religious pluralism of our culture.

(4) The state relates to the interests of the church by providing incidental benefits on a nonpreferential basis in recognition of the church's civil services which are also of secular benefit to the community.

(5) The state relates to the interests of the church by providing funding on a nonpreferential basis to church agencies engaged in the performance of educational or social services which are also of secular benefit to the community.

#### C. PUBLIC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The foregoing "Statement of Affirmation," prepared by the Lutheran Council's Consultation on the Nature of the Church and Its Relationship with Government, speaks in broad terms about a Lutheran understanding of the appropriate relationship between church and government, under God, which has been described in terms of "institutional separation and functional interaction."

The consultation applied this understanding to a number of concrete issues presently confronting Lutheran churches, their agencies and institutions in their relationship with government. The following recommendations, which deal with current issues, illustrate ways our churches can address future issues and should be understood as relating to the "Statement of Affirmation."

### 1. Religious liberty

We affirm in principle the civil right of the free exercise of religion by a wide variety of groups in our pluralistic culture. We acknowledge that the constitutional guarantees protecting religious beliefs are absolute. However, we recognize that those guarantees governing religious practices are not absolute. The violation of human rights and the breaking of just laws in the name of religion are deplored by our churches.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council encourage the participating churches to oppose any attempt by government to curb religious liberty through criminal and/or administrative measures focused at groups, except in cases posing a grave and immediate threat to the public's health, safety, or welfare.

### 2. Regulatory processes

Lutheran churches, together with other churches and voluntary organizations, perceive a trend toward greater governmental intervention and regulation leading to erosion of civil and religious liberties.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council urge Congress to review the regulatory processes, to ensure that they afford adequate notice and opportunity to the public to study and respond to proposed regulations and rulings.

### 3. Integrated auxiliaries

Prior to 1969 most religious organizations, including churches and their related agencies, were exempted from filing informational returns with the Internal Revenue Service. The Tax Reform Act of 1969, however, stipulated that all organizations exempt from taxation under Section 501(a) of the Tax Code would henceforth have to file an annual informational Form 990 return—except churches, their "integrated auxiliaries," conventions and associations of churches, the exclusively religious activities of any religious order, and exempt organizations with gross receipts under \$5,000 annually. The law involves the reporting of information; no payment of taxes is involved.

The problem for the IRS since 1969 has been to define "integrated auxiliaries," since that term had no legal meaning and no common definition among religious groups. In February 1976 the IRS issued proposed regulations which had the net effect of providing for all churches a single and extremely narrow definition of religious mission. Protests by a number of religious organizations led to some modifications in the "final" regulations issued in January 1977, but the regulations continue to be restrictive. Explicitly excluded from the definition of "integrated auxiliaries" are church-related hospitals, orphanages, homes for the elderly, colleges, universities, and elementary schools, although elementary and secondary schools are exempt from filing.

The heart of the issue is that the regulation relative to "integrated auxiliaries" seeks to impose on the churches a definition of "religious" and "church" which the churches cannot accept theologically, one which constitutes an unwarranted intrusion by the government into the affairs of the churches. The narrow definition introduces confusion within the churches and their agencies and institutions. Questions are raised in the agencies and their constituencies about whether these ministries are considered to be part of the churches' mission. It also leads the government to attempt other intrusions into the activities of the churches and church-related agencies and institutions, e.g., the Department of Labor's

stance in the unemployment insurance tax issue (see section 5, below).

Our churches would probably not object to the disclosure of most of the information required by Form 990 by those agencies and institutions of the church whose ministries appear to have counterparts in the public sphere, if such requirement of disclosure were not predicated upon a denial that those ministries are an integral part of the churches' mission. But the churches object on principle to having any of their ministries, including their agencies and institutions, be treated as "not religious." These agencies and institutions perform ministries which are essential to the churches' mission and must not be put in a different category from the strictly sacerdotal functions of the churches.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council encourage the participating churches to seek statutory change which will recognize the religious character of the churches' ministries through their agencies and institutions;

That the Lutheran Council encourage the participating churches to urge selected agencies and institutions to initiate a court test of the present IRS definition of "integrated auxiliaries." The intention of such action would be (a) to assure the churches' agencies and institutions that the church bodies continue to consider them an integral part of their mission; (b) to assist Congress in achieving a better understanding of this issue; and (c) to achieve a court ruling restoring the recognition of the integrity of the churches' ministry through their agencies and institutions.

### 4. IRS and private school desegregation

A religious organization, as other organizations otherwise entitled to a tax-exempt status, cannot claim the exempt status and at the same time operate contrary to established public policy on racial nondiscrimination. Withholding or withdrawing of the tax exemption by government must be based on an organization's racially discriminatory policy or practice determined on facts within a framework of due process. Presumptions on general circumstances or external conditions are inadequate for this purpose.

On August 22, 1978, the Internal Revenue Service issued a "Proposed Revenue Procedure on Private Tax-Exempt Schools." The proposal set forth guidelines which would be used by the IRS to determine whether such schools are operated on a racially discriminatory basis and whether they are entitled to tax exemption under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. On December 5, 1978, the IRS held hearings on the proposed revenue procedure. At that time, Lutheran church bodies presented testimony opposing the proposed procedure. On February 9, 1979, the IRS revised its original proposal. The revised revenue procedure is a reasonable procedure for dealing with racial discrimination by private schools. It may have been unnecessary, but it is not objectionable.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council urge the participating churches to support the withholding or withdrawing of the tax-exempt status of organizations which, in fact, have a policy or practice of racial discrimination.

### 5. Unemployment insurance tax

To understand the current issues involving the churches' exemption from unemployment insurance coverage, the following points must be remembered:

First, the statutory exemption from coverage under the unemployment insurance law is based on structure, i.e., "church," "convention or association of churches" and "organization operated primarily for religious purposes." The Department of Labor is trying to qualify this by reading into it a functional test, narrowly tied to worship.

Second, elimination of the exemption would seem to have only a negligible impact on free exercise of religion. The direct effect would be paying a tax. There would be an indirect effect of possibly paying a higher tax (depending on experience rating) based upon discharging employees for what the organization might regard to be misconduct on religious grounds but which the government would decide was not such misconduct.

Both religion clauses of the First Amendment are violated when the government establishes an exemption based on structure and then applies it on the basis of the government's perception of whether an activity is or is not religious or sufficiently religious.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council, while not necessarily opposing legislation which would eliminate the churches' exemption from unemployment insurance coverage, encourage the participating churches to oppose efforts by regulatory agencies of government to include the churches in unemployment insurance programs by definitions that appear to be contradictory to existing legislation.

### 6. Public funding and regulation of church-related education and social services

Education and social services are the tasks of society as a whole. These are public services. When churches contribute to the fulfillment of these public services, they may accept a measure of public support and a concomitant degree of monitoring by government on behalf of the public. That is, government may provide assistance on a nonpreferential basis in recognition of the public services and benefits provided by church-related educational institutions and by social service agencies and institutions of the churches. In relation to these public services, government regulation of church-related institutions and agencies is not per se objectionable.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council urge the participating churches to object when governmental regulation of church-related educational institutions and social service agencies or institutions violates due process, exceeds statutory authority or infringes on First Amendment guarantees;

That the Lutheran Council encourage the participating churches to join, when possible, with other members of the voluntary sector in objecting to unreasonable regulations. Only when there is a bona fide constitutional question at stake should the Free Exercise Clause be invoked as the basis for objection to regulation;

That in order to maximize the access of citizens in our pluralistic society to education and social services from agencies and institutions of their choice the Lutheran Council encourage the further exploration and assessment of all constitutional means of government support for a variety of social and educational services at all levels, whether public, private, or church-related.

### 7. Specialized ministries of clergy

Church and government are presently interacting in two sets of circumstances involving the specialized ministries of the churches' clergy. One has to do with specialization in pastoral counseling and the other

with chaplaincies in specialized settings. Both of these ministries are more often conducted apart from and on behalf of congregations than through specific local congregations.

The point of intersection between church and state with respect to specialization in pastoral counseling is where governmental units seek to license or otherwise regulate such ministries. The normal counseling dimension in the work of parish pastors is not a part of the issue.

The points of interaction between church and state with respect to chaplaincies in specialized settings have to do with the right of churches to have adequate access in order to serve persons in such settings, the right of individuals in those settings to have access to the ministries of the churches, and the best way to combine these two rights of access.

Attention is drawn to the statement defining pastoral counseling and suggesting standards for certification and accountability approved by the Lutheran Council's Division of Theological Studies and Department of Specialized Pastoral Care and Clinical Education and by the council itself. Additionally, two studies are currently underway in the DTS in consultation with the DSPCCE: one on state licensure of pastoral counselors and the second on institutional chaplaincies.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council encourage the participating churches to establish standards of approval and accountability for professional pastoral counselors and urge the states to recognize the status of such pastoral counselors;

That the Lutheran Council urge the participating churches to maintain their right of access to restricted environments (e.g., prisons, hospitals, and the military) in order to serve people in those environments, assert the right of people in such environments to access to the ministry of the church, and assert that these two rights of access are best served when qualified persons are integrated into the total function of that environment.

#### 8. Regulation of lobbying activity

Advocacy on behalf of justice is an integral part of our churches' mission. The "substantiality" test as applied to lobbying activity requires that "no substantial part" of the income or activities of any tax-exempt organization may be directed toward "carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation" (Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code). Such a test unfairly penalizes, through the threat of loss of tax exemption, those churches which regard public advocacy as part of their mission. Moreover, the effect of this test is to give preferred status, in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, to those churches which do not participate actively in the debate on public policy.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council urge the participating churches to resist in principle the "substantiality test" as applied to lobbying activity by the churches.

Regulation of lobbying activity may jeopardize the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and freedom to petition the government for redress of grievances which, in turn, is contrary to the interest of open government and the public's right to be informed on issues. It is the responsibility of those who sponsor legislation that may seriously jeopardize those rights guaranteed under the First Amendment to certify that

there is a compelling need for government intervention and regulation.

Lobby disclosure legislation which has been proposed extends its scope beyond those organizations engaged in major and continuing lobbying activity. It would, in fact, lay heavy burdens upon small, non-profit organizations and thus limit many of the services they render in search of peace, justice, and human rights.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council publicize the arguments it has set forth as testimony on March 14, 1979, before the House Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, stating opposition in principle to many of the components of far-reaching lobby disclosure legislation.

Lobby disclosure legislation which includes provisions requiring the reporting of grass-roots lobbying and the disclosure of the names of contributors will substantially restrict the free exercise of religion. Such legislation may well result in intimidation of the churches in carrying out their mission because of the massive record keeping that it would require. Disclosure of names poses a potential threat to those who might be inclined to address specific issues through contributions to the churches. Such legislation could also lead to excessive entanglement of government in the work of the churches.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council urge the participating churches to oppose any lobby disclosure legislation which would substantially restrict the free exercise of religion.

The method for enforcing any lobby disclosure requirements is an important issue. Criminal sanctions are inappropriate in that they lead to intimidation of those who would be inclined to address government and thus will have a chilling effect on free speech and the right to petition the government.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council recommend that the participating churches continue to oppose criminal sanctions within the context of any present or future lobby disclosure legislation.

#### 9. Fund-raising disclosure

Lutherans support in principle the concept of fund-raising disclosure. The members of this consultation gladly endorse voluntary reporting of financial operations by church-related and other charitable organizations and encourage the maintenance of an informed giving public. However, in saying this, we are not endorsing every legislative or administrative effort that may be proposed to implement disclosure.

While aware of legitimate interest in curbing past abuses, we oppose federal legislation and regulation which would encompass the entire charitable community in an effort to reach and expose the activities of a very small number of fraudulent operators who solicit money from the general public.

There is no compelling need for legislation requiring charitable solicitation disclosure, given existing laws. Broad and inclusive legislation in this area would likely lead to an expansion of bureaucracy and could create serious constitutional difficulties.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council urge the participating churches to oppose any legislation relating to fund-raising disclosure which leads to an unwarranted expansion of government bureaucracy without a justifying and compelling need, an unwarranted and excessive entanglement by government in the affairs of the church, or an unconstitutional involvement by the

government in defining the church, its mission, ministry, or membership.

#### 10. Tax exemptions and deductions

Religious organizations receive a number of tax exemptions and deductions under state and federal law. However, not every benefit of exemptions and deductions presently enjoyed is indispensable to the free exercise of religion. Lutherans in the USA must never be willing to subordinate their right to such free exercise of religion in exchange for, or as a condition of, the continuation of all benefits of exemptions and deductions currently in effect.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council lend its support to coordinated efforts to ensure the continuance of all proper tax exemptions and deductions for all organizations in the voluntary sector, including religious organizations, as long as acceptance of these exemptions and deductions does not jeopardize constitutionally protected religious rights and freedoms;

That the Lutheran Council urge repudiation of the concept that exemptions and deductions for organizations in the voluntary sector are tax expenditures.

#### 11. Enhancing the importance of charitable contributions

Studies have shown that changes in tax forms to simplify filing have had an adverse effect upon charitable giving. To reverse this trend, legislation has been introduced to make the charitable deduction available to all taxpayers, whether they elect the standard deduction or itemize their deductions.

Allowing a separate charitable deduction for all taxpayers whether or not they itemize their other deductions would (a) represent an important incentive to personal giving to voluntary human services, (b) recognize the unique nature of the charitable deduction in contrast with other currently itemized deductions, (c) democratize the charitable deduction's base by extending its use to most middle- and low-middle income taxpayers, (d) reverse the current trend toward decreased use of this deduction, and (e) avoid the regulatory and related governmental requirements associated with direct forms of federal assistance.

Under another proposal such a charitable deduction for all taxpayers would be allowed only if the charitable contributions exceed a certain amount or percentage of income (the "floor"). Establishing a "floor" would negate the positive effects of a proposal which permits all taxpayers to deduct gifts to charity on their individual income tax returns.

Recommended: That the Lutheran Council continue to support legislation that would allow all taxpayers to take a deduction for their charitable gifts, whether or not they itemize their other deductions;

That the Lutheran Council inform its participating church bodies and the Congress of the justification and need for such a deduction;

That the Lutheran Council continue to oppose any new limitations, such as a "floor," on the use of the charitable deduction.

#### D. IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSULTATION GOALS

For implementation of the goals of the consultation on church-state issues, the following actions were taken by the annual meeting of the Lutheran Council in May 1979:

Adopted the above report of the consultation as a policy statement for the guidance of the work of the council;

Authorized the general secretary of the Lutheran Council to have the report and the recommendations as adopted printed and distributed to the church bodies participating in the consultation;

Authorized the general secretary of the Lutheran Council or his representative to present testimony thereon before committees of the Congress, legislative bodies, and agencies of government as opportunity arises, the precise testimony in each instance being subject to approval by the presidents of the participating church bodies or their appointees;

Requested the presidents of the four participating church bodies to nominate persons for election by the council to constitute a continuing consultative committee of seven, responsible for studying church-state issues, this committee to meet at least twice a year with the staff of the council's Office for Governmental Affairs;

Authorized the appointment by the general secretary of the Lutheran Council, in consultation with the executive director of the Office for Governmental Affairs, of a committee of legal consultants, including lawyers drawn from the four participating church bodies, to meet on a call of the general secretary for deliberation of legal aspects of church-state issues;

Authorized the Office for Governmental Affairs in cooperation with the Division of Theological Studies and the Division of Mission and Ministry to hold a follow-up consultation with representatives of other church bodies and others interested in matters considered by the consultation;

Referred the report and recommendations of the consultation as adopted by the council to the participating bodies for their endorsement in substance.

#### 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. PARRIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TAUKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEISS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVITAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 60 minutes, on February 24, 1981.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HILLIS, 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 \$1,560.

Mr. ERDAHL, 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 \$1,800.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PARRIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. BEARD in two instances.

Mr. ERDAHL.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. MARLENEE.

Mr. DANNEMEYER.

Mr. VANDER JAGT in two instances.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. RITTER.

Mr. DORNAN of California in three instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. DREIER.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. RUDD.

Mr. LEBOUTILLIER.

Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. GOLDWATER.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. KRAMER.

Mrs. HECKLER.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.

Mr. STANGELAND.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEISS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mrs. BOUQUARD.

Mr. MAVROULES in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. STARK.

Ms. FERRARO.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. AU COIN.

Mr. FARY.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI in five instances.

Mr. BRODHEAD.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. McDONALD.

Mr. WEISS in 10 instances.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. NOWAK.

Mr. BEDELL.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. GEJDESEN in two instances.

Mr. FITHIAN.

Mr. BARNES.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. ANDERSON in three instances.

Mr. LEVITAS.

Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. HARKIN.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. GORE.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 18, 1981, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1553. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 1981, the House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.

#### JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 69 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. James T. Molloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY); the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER); the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. FERRARO); the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL); the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT); the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP); and the gentleman from California (Mr. CLAUSEN).

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of the Senate, pursuant to the order previously entered into, the Chair appoints the following Senators on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND); the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER); the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS); the Senator from California (Mr. HAYAKAWA); the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD); the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON); the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER); and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

**THE SPEAKER.** Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

#### A PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 97-21)

**THE PRESIDENT.** Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished Members of Congress, honored guests, and fellow citizens. Only a month ago, I was your guest in this historic building and I pledged to you my cooperation in doing what is right for this Nation that we all love so much.

I am here tonight to reaffirm that pledge and to ask that we share in restoring the promise that is offered to every citizen by this, the last, best hope of man on earth.

All of us are aware of the punishing inflation which has, for the first time in 60 years, held to double digit figures

for 2 years in a row. Interest rates have reached absurd levels of more than 20 percent and over 15 percent for those who would borrow to buy a home. All across this land one can see newly built homes standing vacant, unsold because of mortgage interest rates.

Almost 8 million Americans are out of work. These are people who want to be productive. But as the months go by, despair dominates their lives. The threats of layoffs and unemployment hang over other millions, and all who work are frustrated by their inability to keep up with inflation.

One worker in a Midwest city put it to me this way: He said, "I'm bringing home more dollars than I thought I ever believed I could possibly earn, but I seem to be getting worse off." And he is. Not only have hourly earnings of the American worker, after adjusting for inflation, declined 5 percent over the past 5 years, but in these 5 years, Federal personal taxes for the average family have increased 67 percent.

We can no longer procrastinate and hope that things will get better. They will not. Unless we act forcefully, and now, the economy will get worse.

Can we who man the ship of state deny it is somewhat out of control? Our national debt is approaching \$1 trillion. A few weeks ago I called such a figure—a trillion dollars—incomprehensible. I've been trying ever since to think of a way to illustrate how big a trillion is. The best I could come up with is that if you had a stack of \$1,000 bills in your hand only four inches high you would be a millionaire. A trillion dollars would be a stack of \$1,000 bills 67 miles high.

The interest on the public debt this year we know will be over \$90 billion. And unless we change the proposed spending for the fiscal year beginning October 1, we'll add another almost \$80 billion to the debt.

Adding to our troubles is a mass of regulations imposed on the shopkeeper, the farmer, the craftsman, professionals and major industry that is estimated to add \$100 billion to the price of the things we buy and it reduces our ability to produce. The rate of increase in American productivity, once one of the highest in the world, is among the lowest of all major industrial nations. Indeed, it has actually declined in the last 3 years.

I have painted a pretty grim picture but I think that I have painted it accurately. It is within our power to change this picture and we can act with hope. There is nothing wrong with our internal strengths. There has been no breakdown in the human, technological, and natural resources upon which the economy is built.

Based on this confidence in a system which has never failed us—but which we have failed through a lack of confi-

dence, and sometimes through a belief that we could fine tune the economy and get a tune to our liking—I am proposing a comprehensive four-point program. Let me outline in detail some of the principal parts of this program. You will each be provided with a completely detailed copy of the entire program.

This plan is aimed at reducing the growth in Government spending and taxing, reforming and eliminating regulations which are unnecessary and unproductive or counterproductive, and encouraging a consistent monetary policy aimed at maintaining the value of the currency.

If enacted in full, this program can help America create 13 million new jobs, nearly 3 million more than we would have without these measures. It will also help us to gain control of inflation.

It is important to note that we are only reducing the rate of increase in taxing and spending. We are not attempting to cut either spending or taxing levels below that which we presently have. This plan will get our economy moving again, increase productivity growth, and thus create the jobs that our people must have.

I am asking that you join me in reducing direct Federal spending by \$41.4 billion in fiscal year 1982, along with another \$7.7 billion user fees and off-budget savings for a total of \$49.1 billion.

[Applause.]

This will still allow an increase of \$40.8 billion over 1981 spending.

I know that exaggerated and inaccurate stories about these cuts have disturbed many people, particularly those dependent on grant and benefit programs for their basic needs. Some of you have heard from constituents, I know, afraid that social security checks, for example, were going to be taken away from them. I regret the fear that these unfounded stories have caused and I welcome this opportunity to set things straight.

We will continue to fulfill the obligations that spring from our national conscience. Those who through no fault of their own must depend on the rest of us, the poverty stricken, the disabled, the elderly, all those with true need, can rest assured that the social safety net of programs they depend on are exempt from any cuts.

The full retirement benefits of the more than 31 million social security recipients will be continued along with an annual cost of living increase. Medicare will not be cut, nor will supplemental income for the blind, the aged, and the disabled, and funding will continue for veterans' pensions.

School breakfasts and lunches for the children of low income families will continue, as will nutrition and other special services for the aging.

There will be no cut in Project Head Start or summer youth jobs.

All in all, nearly \$216 billion worth of programs providing help for tens of millions of Americans—will be fully funded. But government will not continue to subsidize individuals or particular business interests where real need cannot be demonstrated.

[Applause.]

And while we will reduce some subsidies to regional and local governments, we will at the same time convert a number of categorical grant programs into block grants to reduce wasteful administrative overhead and to give local governments and States more flexibility and control. We call for an end to duplication in Federal programs and reform of those which are not cost effective.

Already, some have protested that there must be no reduction in aid to schools. Let me point out that Federal aid to education amounts to only 8 percent of the total educational funding. For this eight percent the Federal Government has insisted on a tremendously disproportionate share of control over our schools. Whatever reductions we've proposed in that eight percent will amount to very little in the total cost of education. They will, however, restore more authority to States and local school districts.

[Applause.]

Historically the American people have supported by voluntary contributions more artistic and cultural activities than all the other countries in the world put together. I wholeheartedly support this approach and believe that Americans will continue their generosity. Therefore, I am proposing a savings of \$85 million in the Federal subsidies now going to the arts and humanities.

There are a number of subsidies to business and industry that I believe are unnecessary. Not because the activities being subsidized aren't of value but because the marketplace contains incentives enough to warrant continuing these activities without a government subsidy. One such subsidy is the Department of Energy's synthetic fuels program. We will continue support of research leading to development of new technologies and more independence from foreign oil, but we can save at least \$3.2 billion by leaving to private industry the building of plants to make liquid or gas fuels from coal.

We are asking that another major industry, business subsidy I should say, the Export-Import Bank loan authority, be reduced by one-third in 1982. We are doing this because the primary beneficiaries of taxpayer funds in this case are the exporting companies themselves—most of them profitable corporations.

This brings me to a number of other lending programs in which Govern-

ment makes low-interest loans. Some of them at an interest rate as low as 2 percent. What has not been very well understood is that the Treasury Department has no money of its own to lend. It has to go into the private capital market and borrow the money. So in this time of excessive interest rates the government finds itself borrowing at an interest rate several times as high as the interest it gets back from those it lends the money to. This difference, of course, is paid by your constituents, the taxpayers. They get hit again if they try to borrow because Government borrowing contributes to raising all interest rates.

By terminating the Economic Development Administration we can save hundreds of millions of dollars in 1982 and billions more over the next few years. There is a lack of consistent and convincing evidence that EDA and its Regional Commissions have been effective in creating new jobs. They have been effective in creating an array of planners, grantmen and professional middlemen. We believe we can do better just by the expansion of the economy and the job creation which will come from our economic program.

[Applause.]

The Food Stamp program will be restored to its original purpose, to assist those without resources to purchase sufficient nutritional food. We will, however, save \$1.8 billion in fiscal year 1982 by removing from eligibility those who are not in real need or who are abusing the program.

[Applause.]

Even with this reduction, the program will be budgeted for more than \$10 billion.

We will tighten welfare and give more attention to outside sources of income when determining the amount of welfare an individual is allowed. This plus strong and effective work requirements will save \$520 million in the next year.

I stated a moment ago our intention to keep the school breakfast and lunch programs for those in true need. But by cutting back on meals for children of families who can afford to pay, the savings will be \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1982.

Let me just touch on a few other areas which are typical of the kinds of reductions we have included in this economic package. The Trade Adjustment Assistance program provides benefits for workers who are unemployed when foreign imports reduce the market for various American products causing shutdown of plants and layoff of workers. The purpose is to help these workers find jobs in growing sectors of our economy. There is nothing wrong with that. But because these benefits are paid out on top of normal unemployment benefits, we wind up paying greater benefits to

those who lose their jobs because of foreign competition than we do to their friends and neighbors who are laid off due to domestic competition. Anyone must agree that this is unfair. Putting these two programs on the same footing will save \$1.15 billion in just 1 year.

Earlier I made mention of changing categorical grants to States and local governments into block grants. We know, of course, that the categorical grant programs burden local and State governments with a mass of Federal regulations and Federal paperwork.

Ineffective targeting, wasteful administrative overhead—all can be eliminated by shifting the resources and decision-making authority to local and State government. This will also consolidate programs which are scattered throughout the Federal bureaucracy, bringing government closer to the people and saving \$23.9 billion over the next 5 years.

Our program for economic renewal deals with a number of programs which at present are not cost-effective. An example is Medicaid. Right now Washington provides the States with unlimited matching payments for their expenditures. At the same time we here in Washington pretty much dictate how the States are going to manage those programs. We want to put a cap on how much the Federal Government will contribute but at the same time allow the States much more flexibility in managing and structuring the programs. I know from our experience in California that such flexibility could have led to far more cost-effective reforms. This will bring a savings of \$1 billion next year.

The space program has been and is important to America and we plan to continue it. We believe, however, that a reordering of priorities to focus on the most important and cost-effective NASA programs can result in a savings of a quarter of a billion dollars.

Coming down from space to the mailbox—the Postal Service has been consistently unable to live within its operating budget. It is still dependent on large Federal subsidies. We propose reducing those subsidies by \$632 million in 1982 to press the Postal Service into becoming more effective. In subsequent years, the savings will continue to add up.

The Economic Regulatory Administration in the Department of Energy has programs to force companies to convert to specific fuels. It has the authority to administer a gas rationing plan, and prior to decontrol it ran the oil price control program. With these and other regulations gone we can save several hundreds of millions of dollars over the next few years.

I'm sure there is one department you've been waiting for me to mention, the Department of Defense. It is

the only department in our entire program that will actually be increased over the present budgeted figure.

[Applause.]

But even here there was no exemption. The Department of Defense came up with a number of cuts which reduced the budget increase needed to restore our military balance. These measures will save \$2.9 billion in 1982 outlays and by 1986 a total of \$28.2 billion will have been saved. Perhaps I should say will have been made available for the necessary things that we must do. The aim will be to provide the most effective defense for the lowest possible cost.

I believe that my duty as President requires that I recommend increases in defense spending over the coming years.

[Applause.]

I know that you are aware but I think it bears saying again that since 1970, the Soviet Union has invested \$300 billion more in its military forces than we have. As a result of its massive military buildup, the Soviets have made a significant numerical advantage in strategic nuclear delivery systems, tactical aircraft, submarines, artillery and antiaircraft defense. To allow this imbalance to continue is a threat to our national security.

Notwithstanding our economic straits, making the financial changes beginning now is far less costly than waiting and having to attempt a crash program several years from now.

We remain committed to the goal of arms limitation through negotiation. I hope we can persuade our adversaries to come to realistic balanced and verifiable agreements.

[Applause.]

But, as we negotiate, our security must be fully protected by a balanced and realistic defense program.

Let me say a word here about the general problem of waste and fraud in the Federal Government. One government estimate indicated that fraud alone may account for anywhere from 1 to 10 percent—as much as \$25 billion—of Federal expenditures for social programs. If the tax dollars that are wasted or mismanaged are added to this fraud total, the staggering dimensions of this problem begin to emerge.

The Office of Management and Budget is now putting together an interagency task force to attack waste and fraud. We are also planning to appoint as Inspectors General highly trained professionals who will spare no effort to do this job.

No administration can promise to immediately stop a trend that has grown in recent years as quickly as Government expenditures themselves. But let me say this: waste and fraud in the Federal budget is exactly what I have called it before—an unrelenting national scandal—a scandal we are

bound and determined to do something about.

[Applause.]

Marching in lockstep with the whole program of reductions in spending is the equally important program of reduced tax rates. Both are essential if we are to have economic recovery. It's time to create new jobs. To build and rebuild industry, and to give the American people room to do what they do best. And that can only be done with a tax program which provides incentive to increase productivity for both workers and industry.

Our proposal is for a 10-percent across-the-board cut every year for three years in the tax rates for all individual income taxpayers, making a total cut in tax rates of 30 percent. This 3-year reduction will also apply to the tax on unearned income, leading toward an eventual elimination of the present differential between the tax on earned and unearned income.

I would have hoped that we could be retroactive with this, but as it stands the effective starting date for these 10-percent personal income tax rate reductions will be called for as of July 1st of this year.

Again, let me remind you that while this 30 percent reduction will leave the taxpayers with \$500 billion more in their pockets over the next five years, it's actually only a reduction in the tax increase already built into the system.

Unlike some past "tax reforms," this is not merely a shift of wealth between different sets of taxpayers. This proposal for an equal reduction in everyone's tax rates will expand our national prosperity, enlarge national incomes, and increase opportunities for all Americans.

Some will argue, I know, that reducing tax rates now will be inflationary. A solid body of economic experts does not agree. And tax cuts adopted over the past three-fourths of a century indicate these economic experts are right. They will not be inflationary. I have had advice that in 1985 our real production of goods and services will grow by 20 percent and will be \$300 billion higher than it is today. The average worker's wage will rise (in real purchasing power) 8 percent, and this is in after-tax dollars and this, of course, is predicated on a complete program of tax cuts and spending reductions being implemented.

The other part of the tax package is aimed directly at providing business and industry with the capital needed to modernize and engage in more research and development. This will involve an increase in depreciation allowances, and this part of our tax proposal will be retroactive to January 1st.

The present depreciation system is obsolete, needlessly complex, and is economically counterproductive. Very

simply, it bases the depreciation of plant, machinery, vehicles, and tools on their original cost with no recognition of how inflation has increased their replacement cost. We are proposing a much shorter writeoff time than is presently allowed: a 5-year writeoff for machinery; 3 years for vehicles and trucks; and a 10-year writeoff for plant.

In Fiscal Year 1982 under this plan business would acquire nearly \$10 billion for investment. By 1985 the figure would be nearly \$45 billion. These changes are essential to provide the new investment which is needed to create millions of new jobs between now and 1985 and to make America competitive once again in the world market.

[Applause.]

These won't be make-work jobs, they are productive jobs, jobs with a future.

I'm well aware that there are many other desirable and needed tax changes such as indexing the income tax brackets to protect taxpayers against inflation; The unjust discrimination against married couples if both are working and earning; tuition tax credits; the unfairness of the inheritance tax, especially to the family-owned farm and the family-owned business, and a number of others. But our program for economic recovery is so urgently needed to begin to bring down inflation that I am asking you to act on this plan first and with great urgency. Then I pledge I will join with you in seeking these additional tax changes at the earliest date possible.

[Applause.]

American society experienced a virtual explosion in Government regulation during the past decade. Between 1970 and 1979, expenditures for the major regulatory agencies quadrupled, the number of pages published annually in the Federal Register nearly tripled, and the number of pages in the Code of Federal Regulations increased by nearly two-thirds.

The result has been higher prices, higher unemployment, and lower productivity growth. Overregulation causes small and independent business men and women, as well as large businesses, to defer or terminate plans for expansion, and since they are responsible for most of our new jobs, those new jobs just aren't created.

We have no intention of dismantling the regulatory agencies—especially those necessary to protect environment and to ensure the public health and safety. However, we must come to grips with inefficient and burdensome regulations—eliminate those we can and reform the others.

I have asked Vice President BUSH to head a Cabinet-level Task Force on Regulatory Relief. Second, I asked each member of my Cabinet to postpone the effective dates of the hun-

dreds of new regulations which have not yet been implemented. Third, in coordination with the task force, many of the agency heads have already taken prompt action to review and rescind existing burdensome regulations. Finally, just yesterday, I signed an Executive order that for the first time provides for effective and coordinated management of the regulatory process.

Much has been accomplished, but it is only a beginning. We will eliminate those regulations that are unproductive and unnecessary by Executive order, where possible, and cooperate fully with you on those that require legislation.

The final aspect of our plan requires a national monetary policy which does not allow money growth to increase consistently faster than the growth of goods and services. In order to curb inflation, we need to slow the growth in our money supply.

We fully recognize the independence of the Federal Reserve System and will do nothing to interfere with or undermine that independence. We will consult regularly with the Federal Reserve Board on all aspects of our economic program and will vigorously pursue budget policies that will make their job easier in reducing monetary growth.

A successful program to achieve stable and moderate growth patterns in the money supply will keep both inflation and interest rates down and restore vigor to our financial institutions and markets.

This, then, is our proposal. "America's New Beginning: A Program for Economic Recovery." I don't want it to be simply the plan of my Administration—I'm here tonight to ask you to join me in making it our plan.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

Well, together we can embark on this road, not to make things easy, but to make things better.

Our social, political and cultural as well as our economic institutions can no longer absorb the repeated shocks that have been dealt them over the past decades.

Can we do the job? The answer is yes, but we must begin now.

We are in control here. There is nothing wrong with America that we can't fix. I'm sure there will be some who will raise the familiar old cry, "Don't touch my program—cut somewhere else."

I hope I've made it plain that our approach has been evenhanded; that only the programs for the truly deserving needy remain untouched.

The question is, are we simply going to go down the same path we've gone down before—carving out one special program here, another special program there. I don't think that is what the American people expect of us. More important, I don't think that is

what they want. They are ready to return to the source of our strength.

The substance and prosperity of our Nation is built by wages brought home from the factories and the mills, the farms and the shops. They are the services provided in 10,000 corners of America; the interest on the thrift of our people and the returns for their risk-taking. The production of America is the possession of those who build, serve, create and produce.

For too long now, we've removed from our people the decisions on how to dispose of what they created. We have strayed from first principles. We must alter our course.

The taxing power of government must be used to provide revenues for legitimate government purposes. It must not be used to regulate the economy or bring about social change. [Applause.] We've tried that and surely we must be able to see it doesn't work.

Spending by Government must be limited to those functions which are the proper province of Government. We can no longer afford things simply because we think of them.

Next year we can reduce the budget by \$41.4 billion, without harm to Government's legitimate purposes or to our responsibility to all who need our benevolence. This, plus the reduction in tax rates, will help bring an end to inflation.

In the health and social services area alone the plan we are proposing will substantially reduce the need for 465 pages of law, 1,400 pages of regulations, 5,000 Federal employees who presently administer 7,600 separate grants in about 25,000 separate locations. [Applause.] Over 7 million man and woman hours of work by State and local officials are required to fill out government forms.

I would direct a question to those who have indicated already an unwillingness to accept such a plan. Have they an alternative which offers a greater chance of balancing the budget, reducing and eliminating inflation, stimulating the creation of jobs, and reducing the tax burden? And if they haven't, are they suggesting we can continue on the present course without coming to a day of reckoning?

[Applause.]

If we don't do this, inflation and the growing tax burden will put an end to everything we believe in and our dreams for the future. We don't have an option of living with inflation and its attendant tragedy, millions of productive people willing and able to work but unable to find a buyer for their work in the job market.

We have an alternative, and that is the program for economic recovery.

True, it will take time for the favorable effects of our proposal to be felt. So we must begin now.

The people are watching and waiting. They don't demand miracles. They do expect us to act. Let us act together.

Thank you and good night.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 9 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the Committee of Escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order: The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Ambassadors, ministers, and chargé d'affaires of foreign governments.

#### JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the President's message and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 19, 1981, at 11 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

542. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his review of the rescissions and deferrals of budget authority contained in the message from the President dated January 15, 1981 (House Document No. 97-11), pursuant to section 1014 (b) and (c) of Public Law 93-344 (H. Doc. No. 97-22); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

543. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics), transmitting the Defense Manpower Requirements report for fiscal year 1982, pursuant to 10 U.S.C.

138(c)(3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

544. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting the base structure annex to the Defense Manpower Requirements report for fiscal year 1982, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 138(c)(3)(C); to the Committee on Armed Services.

545. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report on the impact on U.S. readiness of the Air Force's proposed sale of certain defense equipment to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-19), pursuant to section 813 of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

546. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report on the impact on U.S. readiness of the proposed sale by the Air Force of defense articles to Singapore (Transmittal No. 81-21), pursuant to section 813 of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

547. A letter from the Acting Director, ACTION Agency, transmitting proposed final regulations implementing a VISTA volunteer grievance procedure and a volunteer discrimination complaint procedure, pursuant to section 420(d) of Public Law 93-113, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

548. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report of the Director of the national cancer program for fiscal year 1980 and the annual plan for the program for fiscal years 1982-86, pursuant to section 404(a)(9) of the Public Health Services Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

549. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the annual report on Americans incarcerated abroad for calendar year 1980, pursuant to section 108 of Public Law 95-105; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

550. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, transmitting notice of the State Department's intention to consent to a request by the Government of Australia for permission to transfer certain U.S.-origin defense articles to the Government of Malaysia, pursuant to section 3(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

551. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting notice of the proposed issuance of a license for the export of certain defense equipment sold commercially to NATO AEW Program Management Organization (Transmittal MC-5-81), pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

552. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Air Force's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-19), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

553. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Air Force's intention to offer to sell certain defense articles and services to Singapore (Transmittal No. 81-21), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

554. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting

notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment to Indonesia (Transmittal No. 81-24), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

555. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on women in development, requested by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

556. A letter from the Acting Public Printer, transmitting his annual report for fiscal year 1980; to the Committee on House Administration.

557. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmitting the Council's annual report for the period covering fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 202(b) of Public Law 89-665; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

558. A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the annual audit report of the Society for calendar year 1980, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

559. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus program which proposes succeeding leases and renewed leases for 12 buildings in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

560. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the issues and challenges of the MX weapon system (MASAD-81-1, February 17, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Armed Services.

561. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the economic impacts which social and environmental regulations impose upon the construction of Federal water resources projects, and alternatives to controlling those impacts through evaluations (CED-81-36); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

562. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's appeal to the Office of Management and Budget concerning its fiscal year 1982 budget reduction, pursuant to section 307(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, and Appropriations.

563. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a determination by the Secretary of State waiving the requirement that certain foreign assistance funds for Costa Rica and Peru be withheld to cover the compensation from the Treasury paid to owners of fishing vessels seized by those countries during the period January 17, 1973, through January 14, 1980, pursuant to section 5(b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended, and Executive Order 11772; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Foreign Affairs.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolu-

tions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the requirement that States reduce the amount of unemployment compensation payable for any week by the amount of certain retirement benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AuCOIN:

H.R. 1886. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 with respect to Lake Oswego, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BEARD:

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the Veterans' Administration to furnish hospital care to certain members of the Armed Forces injured during a period of war or other armed conflict, and to establish the Federal Interagency Health Resources Committee to coordinate the sharing of medical resources between facilities of the Veterans' Administration with those of the Department of Defense; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1888. A bill to provide for forfeiture of economic gain derived by a Federal felon from sale of rights to information that takes its value from the felon's participation in the offense involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1890. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the home-bound requirement for home health services and to include additional types of services as home health services, to amend the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to clarify the purposes, goals, and administration of the Senior Companion program, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish an income tax credit for maintaining a household for dependents who are 65 years of age or older; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 1891. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984, for the administration of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COELHO:

H.R. 1892. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California shall be held at the Modesto-Ceres metropolitan area, in addition to those places currently provided by law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 1893. A bill to amend the Powerplant and Fuel Use Act of 1978 to remove certain fuel use prohibitions on existing powerplants and major fuel-burning installations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, Mr. SHANNON, and Mr. MOORE):

H.R. 1894. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the credit for expenses for household and dependent care services necessary for gainful employment, to make such

credit refundable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORRADA:

H.R. 1895. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow judicial review of decisions made by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. SWIFT):

H.R. 1896. A bill to prohibit certain oil tankers from entering Puget Sound, Wash.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 1897. A bill to establish a program to develop, maintain, and monitor marine artificial reefs in waters of U.S. jurisdiction; to the Committee on Merchant Marine Fisheries.

H.R. 1898. A bill to designate the building known as the Quincy Post Office in Quincy, Mass., as the "James A. Burke Post Office"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1899. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 regarding the location and relocation of public buildings in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1900. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the \$2,000 credit for the purchase of a new principal residence will not be recaptured where the taxpayer replaces it with another principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

H.R. 1901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the deduction for contributions to individual retirement savings even though the taxpayer is an active participant in a pension plan and to increase the maximum deduction allowed for such contributions, and to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide, with the instructions for completing individual income tax returns, a simple-language explanation of the requirements and benefits of such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the requirement that States reduce the amount of unemployment compensation payable for any week by the amount of certain retirement benefits and to prohibit any reduction in unemployment compensation because of the receipt of social security or railroad retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDGAR (by request):

H.R. 1903. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to terminate the authority for the pursuit of flight training programs by veterans and for the pursuit of correspondence training by veterans, spouses, and surviving spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ERLNBORN (for himself, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HARTNETT, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 1904. A bill to establish a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 1905. A bill to establish a national adoption information exchange system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1906. A bill to provide a penalty for the robbery or attempted robbery of any controlled substance from any pharmacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$2,500 the amount of interest which may be excluded from gross income, and to make such exclusion permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 1908. A bill to amend the Presidential Science and Technology Advisory Organization Act of 1976 to provide additional information to the Congress for the purpose of providing a basis for implementing multiyear research and development authorization; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mrs. BOUQUARD, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 1909. A bill to accelerate and provide direction to the Department of Energy's research, development, and technology demonstration program for the disposal of high level radioactive wastes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

H.R. 1910. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on tartaric acid and certain tartaric chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.:

H.R. 1911. A bill to abolish the Legal Services Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANCE:

H.R. 1912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$2,000 for an individual and \$4,000 for a joint return the amount of dividends and interest which may be excluded from gross income, and to make such exclusion permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARKIN:

H.R. 1913. 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. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. MARRIOTT, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 1914. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, pertaining to the use of citizens band radios by operators of certain buses; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H.R. 1915. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the exclusion from the gross estate of a decedent of a portion of the value of certain interests in a farm or ranch or trade or business if the spouse or children of the decedent materially participate in such farm or ranch or trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa:

H.R. 1916. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act with respect to certain reserve requirements; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL of New York:

H.R. 1917. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize appropriations for the purposes of such act of fiscal years 1982 through 1988; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr.

ALBOSTA, Mr. APFLEGATE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERTTEL, Mr. EVANS of Indiana, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1918. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a service pension of up to \$150 per month for veterans of World War I and for certain surviving spouses and dependent children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 1919. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make discrimination against handicapped individuals an unlawful employment practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NOWAK (by request):

H.R. 1920. A bill to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to provide for more effective regulation of motor carriers of passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 1921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals a refundable tax credit for a portion of the rent which they pay on their principal residences and which is attributable to real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 1922. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the establishment of a prisoners of war advisory committee and provide certain services and benefits to former prisoners of war and to authorize the awarding of the Purple Heart to certain former prisoners of war; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 1923. A bill to authorize certain appropriations to the Office of Personnel Management, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Special Counsel of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and the Federal Labor Relations Authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 1924. A bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation the earned income of certain individuals working outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 1925. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 for purposes of providing that certain educational loans, grants, scholarships, fellowships, and veterans' educational benefits received by recipients of aid to families with dependent children shall not be included in determining household income for purposes of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1926. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide that State domestic relations or community property laws are not preempted by the act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1927. A bill to provide that the 1972 revision in the social security benefit computation formula for men shall fully apply with respect to individuals who retired in or before 1972 as well as with respect to individuals retiring after that year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to permit assignments or alienations of rights under pension plans pursuant to court orders for alimony or child support, and to permit the division of pension benefits under State community property law or common law; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.R. 1929. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to establish a nine-digit ZIP Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WON PAT:

H.R. 1930. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make alien crewmen, serving onboard a fishing vessel having its home port or operating base in the United States, nonimmigrant while they are temporarily in Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, or American Samoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 1931. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on doxorubicin hydrochloride until the close of June 30, 1984; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLANCHARD:

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a refundable income tax credit for the purchase of a new principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the Walsh-Healey and the Contract Work Hours Standards Act to permit certain employees to work a 10-hour day in the case of a 4-day workweek, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 1934. A bill to permit the congressional page school to hold a graduation ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in June 1981; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOFFETT, and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 1935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate certain tax expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 1936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow taxpayers to value any excess inventory of books and other published material at its net realizable value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. SAWYER):

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the patent law to restore the term of the patent grant for the period of time that nonpatent regulatory requirements prevent the marketing of a patented product; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVITAS (for himself, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ATKINSON, and Mr. ALBOSTA):

H.R. 1938. A bill to establish public buildings policies for the Federal Government, to establish the Public Buildings Service in the General Services Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 177. Joint Resolution designating May 24, 1981, through May 30, 1981, as "National Intensive and Critical Care Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to designate certain Federal holidays to their original date of observance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and that the U.S. Embassy in Israel should be relocated to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

H. Res. 74. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 75. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 76. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOGGS:

H.R. 1939. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Socorro Carrillo Gibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EARLY:

H.R. 1940. A bill for the relief of Barnett Hellman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1941. A bill for the relief of Claire Hontz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 1942. A bill for the relief of Nancy Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 1943. A bill for the relief of Capt. Julian G. Carr, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWERY of California:

H.R. 1944. A bill for the relief of Benjamin B. Doeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1945. A bill for the relief of Eliazar Sandoval-Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H.R. 1946. A bill to reinstate and validate U.S. oil and gas leases numbered OCS-P-0218 and OCS-P-0226; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 1947. A bill for the relief of Seth Kofi Ahiekpor; 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. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. ATKINSON, and Mr. MITCHELL of New York.

H.R. 44: Mr. LOEFFLER.

H.R. 46: Mr. LOEFFLER.

H.R. 247: Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. HILER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 253: Mr. MCCLORY.

H.R. 266: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FARY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.R. 334: Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

H.R. 469: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 473: Mr. GINN.

H.R. 478: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 556: Mr. ZEPERETTI, Mrs. FENWICK, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 750: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 837: Mr. RAILSBACK.

H.R. 911: Mr. ROSE, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, and Mr. GOLDWATER.

H.R. 967: Mr. MCCLORY.

H.R. 1000: Mr. HANCE.

H.R. 1005: Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 1035: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1100: Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 1206: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OTTINGER, and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 1207: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OTTINGER, and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 1270: Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 1271: Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. SIMON, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ERTTEL.

H.R. 1362: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. HEFTTEL, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1400: Mr. STUMP, Mr. EMERY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 1429: Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. YATES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DWYER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ALBOSTA, and Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 1464: Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HANCE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. LUNDINE.

H.R. 1490: Mr. PRICE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ROE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1531: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. WINN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1532: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1642: Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. BEDELL, Mr.

DAVIS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. CHAPPELL.

H.R. 1700: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NEAL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1711: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. UDALL, Mr. GINN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. OTTINGER.

H.R. 1765: Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 1818: Mr. RODINO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. STOKES.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. BARNARD, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. ROTH.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WINN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. GRADISON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. FARY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HANCE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. HEFTTEL, Mr. YATES, Mr. SHAW, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LUKE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MOTT, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. HILER, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. PRICE, Mr. BEARD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LEATH of Texas.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LENT, and Mr. LEBOUTILLIER.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. STRATTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. BEARD, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BONKER, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. FROST, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GUYER, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. SYNAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HINSON, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FISH, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H. Res. 13: Mr. ANTHONY, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. DWYER, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. GUARINI.

H. Res. 30: Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. STOKES.

H. Res. 38: Mr. FRANK, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. SKEEN.

H. Res. 55: Mr. COELHO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 65: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

24. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Gloversville Common Council, N.Y., relative to condemning recommendations by the Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

25. Also, petition of Thomas P. Gannon, Folsom, Pa., and others, relative to prayer in public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.