

SENATE—Wednesday, February 18, 1981

(Legislative day of Monday, February 16, 1981)

The Senate met at 8:20 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, LL.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom, through whom, to whom are all things, we beseech Thee on behalf of our Nation and its leadership at this significant hour in national affairs.

We pray for the President of the United States as he addresses the Congress and the people. Give to him special wisdom, special strength, special clarity, as he communicates his message so crucial domestically and internationally.

We pray for the Members of Congress that they may hear with objectivity and respond with integrity as they understand their individual and collective responsibility.

We pray for the people that they will hear the President's message uncluttered by selfish interests and parochial concerns.

Grant to all of us a deep desire for the best for our country and the world. Let this be an evening marked by the highest and finest in loyal, dedicated citizenship.

We ask this in the name of Him who is the Lord of history. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate be approved to date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 8:30 p.m., in which Senators may speak for not more than 1 minute each.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC MESSAGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 31

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying document:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is with pleasure that I take the opportunity this evening to make my first major address to the Congress. The address briefly describes the comprehensive package that I am proposing in order to achieve a full and vigorous recovery for our economy. The key elements of that package are four in number:

- A budget reform plan to cut the rate of growth in Federal spending;
- A series of proposals to reduce personal income tax rates by 10 percent a year over three years and to create jobs by accelerating depreciation for business investment in plant and equipment;
- A far-reaching program of regulatory relief;
- And, in cooperation with the Federal Reserve Board, a new commitment to a monetary policy that will restore a stable currency and healthy financial markets.

Taken together, I believe these proposals will put the Nation on a fundamentally different course—a course leading to less inflation, more growth, and a brighter future for all of our citizens.

To aid the Congress in acting promptly on these proposals, I am today forwarding the attached documents which describe the program in greater detail than I can in my address to you. Specifically, you will find the following documents in this package:

- (1) An economic report—issued as a White House paper—that outlines all four of the elements in my program and sets forth the background to those elements.
- (2) A lengthy report on my initial budget cut proposals that has been prepared by the Office of Management and Budget. It should be noted that this report will be followed by a complete budget submission to the Congress, addressing fiscal years 1981 and 1982. That report will be sent to you on March 10.
- (3) A report on my proposals for tax reduction issued by the Department of the Treasury.

It is my hope that this combination of transmittals will allow the Congress to proceed in accordance with timetables established in the Congressional Budget Act and will permit rapid consideration of this entire program.

My Cabinet and other members of my Administration have worked intensively and cooperatively with me in developing this program for economic recovery. All of us are now eager to work with the Congress as partners in an undertaking that is vital to the future of the Nation.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 18, 1981.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GARN, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 75. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. CHAFEE):

S. 493. A bill to permit Charles E. Day, Sr., and Mary Day, husband and wife, to file an action against the United States in the U.S. District Court for the District of Rhode Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 447

At the request of Mr. RANDOLPH, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 447, a bill to redesignate the days on which Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, and Columbus Day are celebrated to make each such day a legal public holiday.

SENATE RESOLUTION 75—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GARN, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 75

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized from March 1, 1981, through February 28, 1982, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the

contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$1,583,411, of which amount (1) not to exceed \$1,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed \$1,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of such Act).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1982.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public, the scheduling of public hearings before the Com-

mittee on Energy and Natural Resources on President Reagan's proposed economic package and budget for fiscal years 1981 and 1982.

The hearing on the Department of Energy's budget is scheduled for Monday, February 23 at 2 p.m. in room 1202 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Testimony will be received from the Secretary of Energy.

The hearing on the Department of the Interior's budget and the Department of Agriculture's budget is scheduled for Tuesday, February 24 at 2 p.m. in room 3110 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Testimony will be received from the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

For further information regarding these hearings, you may wish to contact Mr. Richard Grundy at 224-2564.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICKLES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 97-21)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 8:35 p.m. having arrived, the Senators will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session; and upon the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate will stand in recess until 11 a.m., Thursday, February 19, 1981.

Thereupon, at 8:35 p.m., the Senators, preceded by the Sergeant at Arms, Howard Liebengood; the Secretary of the Senate, William F. Hildenbrand; and the President pro tempore (STROM THURMOND), proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan.

(The address delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered into, at 9:45 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, February 19, at 11 a.m.

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 workweek; 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 workweek; 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 Dikzas, 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 terroristic 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 foodstuffs 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 changeover, 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, grantsmen 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. ERLBORN (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. ZEGERETTI, 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.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OIL LEASE REINSTATEMENT
SUPPORTED BY NATIONAL
ENERGY POLICY

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a private bill today which will reinstate two offshore oil and gas leases in the Santa Barbara Channel, Calif. This bill is identical to legislation which I sponsored in the 96th Congress and which was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives. That bill, H.R. 5769, was also considered and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. However, procedural delay and lateness of the session prevented the full Senate from considering the legislation.

Many of my colleagues have expressed their interest in cosponsoring this measure, but because it is a private bill, cosponsors are not permitted. I would, however, like to acknowledge and thank the Members who have expressed their support for the bill. Those Members are: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. MARRIOTT.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already mentioned, this bill is identical to the measure which passed the House last year. It was the subject of a thorough and extensive review by both the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 96th Congress. In order to provide my colleagues with the factual background which necessitates enactment of this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the House committee report on H.R. 5769 (H. Rept. No. 96-1260, Aug. 27, 1980) be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

This bill reinstates two OCS leases in the Santa Barbara Channel, Calif., for which the leaseholders—a group of independent oil and gas companies—paid \$74 million. As a condition of this reinstatement, the bill requires that the companies file an exploration plan with the Secretary of the Interior within 45 days of its enactment. It also requires that the lessees comply with all pertinent environmental require-

ments of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978. Finally, the bill provides for the payment of back rentals for the period during which the leases were not in force and for a unique profit-sharing arrangement between the leaseholders and the Federal Government.

The Interior Committee stated in its report that our "national energy policy dictates" that we reinstate these two leases and permit the Pauley Group to resume its operation. I urge the committee to follow its directive and report this bill as soon as possible so that the Pauley Group can get on with the business of oil and gas exploration.

EXCERPT FROM HOUSE REPORT NO. 96-1260, "REINSTATING AND VALIDATING U.S. OIL AND GAS LEASES NUMBERED OCS-P-0218 AND OCS-P-0226," COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS (AUGUST 27, 1980)

BACKGROUND

The Pauley Group was created in 1967 as a joint venture by 11 independent oil companies to bid on OCS tracts in the Santa Barbara Channel. The Pauley Group was composed of Pauley Petroleum Company, as operator; Mesa Petroleum Company; Husky Oil Company; Colorado Oil and Gas Corporation; McCullough Oil Corporation; J. M. Huber Corporation; Midwest Oil Corporation; Kewanee Oil Corporation; Ashland Oil & Refining, Inc.; MacDonald Oil Corporation; and Forest Oil Corporation.

On March 1, 1968, in exchange for a \$73.8 million cash bonus payment and an annual rental of \$34,560, the Pauley Group was granted an exclusive right to explore for oil and gas on two tracts in the Santa Barbara Channel for a primary term of five years and "... as long thereafter as oil and gas may be produced in paying quantities. . . ." The member companies of the Pauley Group and the United States executed lease number OCS-P-0218 for Tract 375 and lease number OCS-P-0226 for Tract 384.

The Pauley Group began immediate exploration and drilled eight exploratory wells between March, 1968, and January, 1969, at a cost of \$4 million. In late January, 1969, when the Group was preparing to drill a ninth well, a blowout occurred several miles north of the Pauley Group tracts on a tract operated by the Union Oil Company. In response to the massive oil spill, the Secretary of the Interior suspended all drilling operations in the Channel on February 7, 1969. Ten days later, on February 17, 1969, the Secretary of the Interior altered the traditional standard of negligence for oil spills to one of strict liability applicable to all those who were operating in the Channel. This new standard of strict liability made each participant operating on the OCS jointly and severally liable not only for all clean-up costs of an oil spill, but also liable for any and all damage whatsoever to a third party, regardless of fault.

Concurrent with the issuance of this new standard of liability and the suspension of drilling operations, the private liability in-

surance market for offshore oil operations collapsed. As a result, the Pauley Group lost its liability insurance for offshore oil spills and was financially unable to obtain coverage from other sources. Without insurance, the independents risked financial disaster by resuming drilling operations and, thus, were effectively barred from operating in the Channel. In contrast, once the drilling ban was lifted, the major oil companies were able to resume their drilling activities because they could self-insure their operations. This step was unavailable to the independents because they lacked sufficient financial resources.

Thus, in April, 1969, the Pauley Group was confronted with a dilemma. On the one hand, the Pauley Group, forced to sit idle because the Interior Department's final decision on whether to resume drilling in the Channel was unknown and, in any case, because it was faced with the government's strict liability regulation, could elect to do nothing and wait. In waiting, however, the Pauley Group, with large amounts of their exploration budgets tied up and enormous interest payments due, risked their total investment and their financial stability. On the other hand, the Pauley Group could attempt to protect its substantial investment by seeking judicial relief for breach of contract. The risk of financial disaster was great and, on April 9, 1969, suit was filed in the United States Court of Claims.

The Pauley Group filed a petition for damages against the United States Government alleging that the United States had violated its contract with the Group by suspending drilling operations and imposing strict liability. Counts included breach of contract, frustration and mutual mistake; a fourth count of partial breach was alleged at a later time. Because damages were sought, the action was filed in the United States Court of Claims.

The Pauley Group was not the only Channel leaseholder to challenge the government's action in court. Other legal actions were filed by, among others, Union Oil Company and Gulf Oil Corporation, against the United States in California Federal District Court. These actions challenged the lawfulness of suspension orders of the Secretary of the Interior and sought injunctive relief, rather than monetary damages, against the Secretary's suspensions order, and an extension of the lease terms.

The case dragged on for ten years before the court dismissed the petition on January 24, 1979. Although the court did not award damages to the Group, it did indicate the possibility of another remedy:

"Perhaps the legislative or executive branches could, as a matter of grace or policy, extend their lease-terms to permit them to drill further (if they still wish to) in the effort to discover oil in commercial quantities, but of course we cannot take that step. *Pauley Petroleum, Inc., v. United States*, 591 F.2d 1308, 1328 (Ct. Cl. 1979)."●

RETIREMENT OF ROBERT L. DANIELS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 28 at its annual dinner-dance, the Barstow Area Chamber of Commerce will honor Robert L. Daniels on the occasion of his retirement as chamber executive. I have known and worked directly with Bob during his 7½ years in this post and want to take this opportunity to join his other friends in wishing him well. I am delighted that he plans to open his own business in the area so that neither his expertise nor his knowledge will be lost to us.

Bob came to Barstow after a successful career in the Marine Corps. He has played a vital role in many activities affecting the community as a whole. Over the past 2 years, I have had occasion to take the floor to discuss several different activities affecting the community. Some of my colleagues may remember this as the city where the Army is activating a new, sophisticated national training center designed to enhance our military capabilities. Others may recall it is also the site of a 10 megawatt solar generating plant—a facility which will come online before the end of this year and which will produce that amount of energy without the use of one drop of oil. Still others may remember it as the community which raised more than \$105,000 in less than 48 hours to assist one of its citizens in paying for possible heart surgery. Bob played a vital role in all these projects.

Moreover, he had made significant long-range contributions to the operations of the chamber itself. While those contributions are too numerous to list, I would like to cite just a few. He was instrumental in forming the Barstow Area Industrial Development Commission. He established ongoing communication procedures between the chamber and elected representatives, including the annual Sacramento legislative trip. He established an annual Christmas decoration program within the community. He began an aggressive and well-organized plan to establish a separate identity for the city of Barstow and to publicize that identity on a nationwide basis. He began a local radio program designed to keep the citizens advised of activities and proposals which would directly impact on them.

All in all, Bob Daniels brought to the city of Barstow the kind of leadership which was vitally needed during a period when the population of the city was rapidly expanding. I am certain that I speak for all of his friends in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Barstow in wishing him well in his new endeavor.●

THE ARMENIAN PEOPLE IN LEBANON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of tenacity among the Armenian people who are scattered throughout the world. They steadfastly preserve their religious and cultural heritage. A good example of this being the example set by Armenian theologians in Antelias, Lebanon. Despite the internal disputes in Lebanon, the complications created by the PLO and by the Syrian occupation army, the Armenian church is clearly able to survive. I recently received a copy of the Christmas message, issued by Bishop Karekin II, of the See in Antelias, which I share with my colleagues since it dramatizes the determination of the Armenians to retain their identity and their nationalistic spirit.

One year passed since the last time I wrote to you on this blessed occasion. It was not an easy year for our Spiritual Center, the Catholicosate of Cilicia in Antelias, and the people of our Diocese of Lebanon. It was not an easy year also for the people of our three Dioceses of Iran. But thanks be to God for all the blessings that He bestowed upon us. We learned much from conditions of hardship, times of tribulation, situations of insecurity and uncertainty. We learned that God never abandoned us. He continued to be with us because He is called "Emanuel".

Most of our time we spent here, in Antelias. Two brief journeys in February and August took us to Strasbourg and Geneva for the Executive and Central Committee meetings of the World Council of Churches. One pastoral visit to the Western Prelacy of our Armenian Church of America made us spend one month (November) with our own Armenian people in California. These visits gave us a most beneficial opportunity of seeing how God was with us through the ecumenical fellowship and the attachment of our Armenian people to their Church and to the Catholicosate of Cilicia. We were deeply gratified and greatly enriched by the reflection of God's love and care through the brotherhood of so many friends and the dedication of so many members of our church.

Here, in our headquarters of Antelias, in this Spiritual Home and National Center, we tried to work mainly in the area of Christian Education through the Theological Seminary, the Sunday Schools, publications and various other special programs aimed at the spiritual, cultural and national edification and conscientiousness of the people, particularly the young generation. In one word, we tried, through our humble and modest means and capacities, and together with our people, to respond to God's being with us by drawing closer to Him and to our Armenian Christian heritage.

1980 concludes the fiftieth year of the reestablishment of the centuries-old Catho-

February 18, 1981

licosate of Cilicia here in Antelias, Lebanon. Sixty years ago, in 1920, after the deadly blow of the massacres perpetrated by the Turks during the First World War, the See of Cilicia was forced to move out of Sis, the capital of the ancient Kingdom of Cilicia, where it had uninterruptedly served its people for about five centuries. As the people of Cilicia in great majority came to settle in Syria and Lebanon, the Catholicos of the time, Sahak II Khabayan followed his flock. After ten years of peregrination in various cities and towns of Syria and Lebanon, in 1930, Catholicos Sahak finally and with the unanimous wish and determination of the people in the Diaspora, came to reestablish the Catholicosate in Antelias. In this suburb of the city of Beirut an Armenian orphanage had been established by the American Near East Relief. The orphanage was converted into a center for Church administration and service.

In the same year the Seminary was opened on the same location. In fact, the decision for the reestablishment of the See of Cilicia was greatly motivated by the idea of preparing a new generation of ecclesiastical and lay leadership for the Diaspora where the people were scattered after the massacres and were left with no adequate and sufficient leadership to face the new challenges and the emerging demands of the new situation. Thus, the seminary became the very heart of the Catholicosate.

Since 1930, for fifty years, the Seminary has tried its utmost to meet the growing demands of the Church. Four years ago, due to the expansion of the city of Beirut, Antelias became almost fully integrated in the city of Beirut with all its conditions of a crowded life. The Seminary was transferred to Bikfaya, ten miles up in the mountain, in the summer residence of the Catholicosate, which provides better conditions for spiritual life and intellectual concentrated work.

The 50th anniversary is an occasion to render thanks to God, because we were blessed by His being with us for the last fifty years. It is also an invitation to us to become more faithful to Him by devoting our efforts to the promotion of the training of the servants of God. How to grapple with the complex situation of our Diaspora life without men well equipped for the service to God and His people? How can we preserve and enrich our Armenian Christian identity and mission without such people who are well versed in the Holy Scriptures, Theology, Armenian literary and cultural heritage?

The Seminary is here to continue to help the formation of such men who, after the cleansing of their own hearts and minds, can stand up with Isaiah and say: "Here am I! Send me" (Ch. 6:8).

The 50th anniversary will be duly marked during the year of 1981 in Antelias and in all our dioceses. Various programs are in preparation. I ask you all, friends and members of our church, to keep the Catholicosate and the Seminary present in your prayers and thoughts.

Let us not forget that God's being with us becomes a happy experience only when we try to be with Him.

Let us live all our life in 1981 and in the years to come with the full and responsible consciousness of this imperative of our being with Him.

Prayerfully,

KAREKIN II,
Catholicos Coadjutor.●

HUMAN RIGHTS—
DISAPPEARANCES

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, as officials of the Reagan administration continue proclaiming their intention to reverse America's foreign policy priorities—antiterrorism supplanting human rights—they would be well advised to read a report on disappearances, recently released by a working group of the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

To refresh the memory of my distinguished colleagues, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, which I chair, held a series of hearings during the 96th Congress on disappearances as a new form of human rights violation. As the result of those hearings, I sponsored and the House passed, with broad bipartisan support, House Concurrent Resolution 285:

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the disappearances of persons which is caused by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons by the government of foreign countries or by international or transnational terrorist organizations.

Last year, armed with the backing of the Congress, the U.S. delegation under the brilliant leadership of Ambassador Jerome Shestack prevailed upon the 36th session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission to appoint the working group.

That group has reported to the 37th session of the Human Rights Commission meeting now in Geneva, that over 13,000 people in 15 countries have been victims of involuntary disappearances, with more than half of these people having vanished in Argentina. Furthermore, their report indicates that cases examined usually "involved persons who have been arrested, detained or abducted by personnel" associated with government agencies.

The U.N. report names as the worst violators, Governments of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, the Philippines, South Africa, Uruguay, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Peru.

The supreme irony is that out of the 15 nations named, 9 are countries with very repressive governments that could be the beneficiaries of the Reagan administration's reversal of policy.

It will be interesting to see how this administration's antiterrorism emphasis as opposed to a human rights emphasis is applied to these governments. For, according to the U.N. report, they are clearly guilty of terrorism against their own citizenry.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PENSION EQUITY FOR WOMEN

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing two bills today to address inequities in Federal law regarding the pension rights of women. One bill would undo the damage to divorced and separated women caused by the Supreme Court's 1979 decision in the case of *Hisquierdo* against *Hisquierdo*, where the Court ruled that a divorced wife has no ownership interest in her former husband's pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974. The second bill provides that pension plans governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) must obey court orders dividing the pension benefits in a community property settlement, or attaching the pension for alimony or child support.

My interest in this area of law was sparked by a letter I received in 1978 from a constituent whose husband had left her and their two children and taken early retirement from his job. Because ERISA section 206(d)(1) (26 U.S.C. 401(a)(13) and 29 U.S.C. 1056(d)(1)) provides that "benefits provided under the plan may not be assigned or alienated," and because ERISA preempts State law, the husband's pension plan has ignored a State court order attaching his pension for the support of his homemaker wife and their two children. My constituent has had to turn to welfare for subsistence.

In the Supreme Court case, *Jess Hisquierdo* sued his wife, Angela, for divorce in 1975, after 14 years of marriage during which she was a homemaker and he a worker for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway. The California Supreme Court, reversing a lower court, ruled unanimously in 1977 that Mrs. *Hisquierdo* was entitled as a matter of ownership under California's community property laws to half the pension benefits attributable to his labor during their marriage. On January 22, 1979, in a 7 to 2 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the California Supreme Court, holding that section 14 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 preempts California's community property laws. Section 14 (45 U.S.C. 231m) protects railroad retirement benefits from legal process "[n]otwithstanding any other law . . . of any State."

My research into this question has convinced me that Congress did not intend this result from ERISA, the Railroad Retirement Act, or from any other Federal law, and I think we have a responsibility to speak unequivocally on this point. A strong case can be made that Congress should recognize

that marriage is an economic partnership by establishing joint worker-spouse ownership of Federal pensions. At the very least, we should not frustrate the laws of those eight States which have established such a community property interest.

The 95th Congress passed legislation to permit the attachment of civil service pensions under the terms of any court order or court-approved property settlement agreement incident to divorce proceedings, and the 96th Congress extended similar treatment for Foreign Service pensions. The bills I am introducing would apply these principles to private pensions covered by ERISA and to railroad retirement pensions, and legislation is being introduced in this Congress by other Members to apply these principles to military pensions. These bills are not only fair and just for the parties involved, they are fiscally prudent because they provide a source of support for those who might otherwise have none and have to turn to public assistance. I am hopeful that they will receive prompt attention in this Congress.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (relating to exemption from legal process) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Sec. 14. Notwithstanding" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sec. 14 (a). Notwithstanding";

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Sec. 14 (b) Nothing in this Act is intended to prohibit the characterization or treatment under State law of the annuity or supplemental annuity provided by this Act as community property for all purposes, or as property subject to equitable distribution for the purpose of divorce, dissolution of marriage, annulment, or legal separation."

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (13) of section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to requirements for qualification of pension plans, etc.) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(13) A trust" and inserting in lieu thereof "(13)(A) A trust";

(2) by striking out "This paragraph" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "This subparagraph"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any assignment or alienation of benefits

payable to any participant or beneficiary who is receiving benefits under the plan if—

"(i) such assignment or alienation is pursuant to either a decree of divorce or separate maintenance, or an order of a court which requires an individual to contribute to the support of his children, or both; and

"(ii) such decree or order does not affect the date, timing, form, duration or amount of any benefit payments under the plan."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 206 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any assignment or alienation of benefits payable to any participant or beneficiary who is receiving benefits under the plan if—

"(A) such assignment or alienation is pursuant to either a decree of divorce or separate maintenance, or an order of a court which requires an individual to contribute to the support of his children, or both; and

"(B) such decree or order does not affect the date, timing, form, duration or amount of any benefit payments under the plan."

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter, amend, modify, invalidate, impair or supersede the operation of any State law governing the acquisition, division, or distribution of property defined by State laws as community property or as property belonging to a marriage."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act. ●

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE FOR LECH WALESA

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a subject which not only gives me great personal pleasure, but is also a subject of great pride in my district.

Mr. Speaker, Lech Walesa, the courageous leader of the Polish free trade union known as Solidarity, has recently been nominated for the 1981 Nobel Peace Prize. I would like to take this occasion to state here on the floor of the House that I can think of no more appropriate recipient for this prestigious award than Mr. Walesa. He has set an example for all persons, regardless of nationality or the political system their nation follows, as one who cherishes freedom and the dignity of working men and women.

Lech Walesa has arrived at his present position of international prominence not as a man seeking personal power, or even a formal office in his country's government. He has come to our attention because of spectacular events in Poland, for which he has been the prime catalyst, have galvanized the imagination and respect of peoples throughout the world.

It is not my intention here today to speak to the merits or shortcomings of the Communist system under which Mr. Walesa's Poland finds itself oper-

ating—that is a subject for another time and another day. In leading his people, Lech Walesa has remained a calm and steady figure in the face of the overwhelming threat of a Soviet invasion of his beloved Poland. And, Mr. Speaker, as we all know from the sad and tragic history of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, such threats are far from idle exercise. Mr. Walesa has balanced these concerns with the very real needs of working people in Poland. He has resisted provocative counsel to push immediately to a confrontation even as at the same time he has resisted the easy path of retreat and surrender.

Mr. Speaker, I said that we in New Jersey's 14th Congressional District have great pride in Lech Walesa's achievements. That is for two reasons. Stanislaw Walesa, father of this now world renowned labor leader, lives and works in our district and is employed at the Henderson Lumber Mills in Jersey City. Like so many before him, the senior Mr. Walesa came to our shores in search of freedom and the land of opportunity. And, as you know, New Jersey's 14th Congressional District lies in the very shadow of the Statue of Liberty, long a symbol to generations of immigrants seeking a new life in America and leaving behind the oppression and totalitarian governments of their native lands. The people of our district, tens and thousands of them, feel a special bond with the Walesas, father and son.

We all fervently pray that awarding the Nobel Peace Prize to Lech Walesa will be the crowning event in a peaceful and successful achievement of his worthy goals. Perhaps such international recognition will give pause for reflection to those who would crush freedom in Poland through force of arms.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, in speaking out before the House today, to, in some small way, add my own voice, representing the people of Hudson County and New Jersey's 14th Congressional District, in supporting the nomination of Lech Walesa for the 1981 Nobel Peace Prize. ●

STILL GOING AFTER THE CIA

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an article by Mr. Rowland Evans and Mr. Robert Novak entitled "Still Going After the CIA." I would urge my colleagues to read this most interesting article.

The article follows:

STILL GOING AFTER THE CIA

Trying to repeal the 1980 election and preserve Jimmy Carter's human rights policies,

liberal Democratic congressmen are plotting to keep control of the House Foreign Affairs African subcommittee and retain as a symbol of the past a staffer named Steven R. Weissman.

Weissman's 1978 attack on CIA undercover work in Zaire was reprinted in the book "Dirty Work 2, the CIA in Africa." It was published in 1979 with an introduction by Philip Agee, the renegade ex-CIA official now living in exile in West Germany to avoid U.S. investigators.

Weissman was hired two years ago by Rep. Stephen J. Solarz of New York, who is about to step down as chairman of the African subcommittee. Solarz then did not know Weissman had contributed to "Dirty Work 2," described in an introduction by Agee as an attempt "to expose and analyze clandestine operations" by the CIA in Africa. Weissman told us he himself was unaware that "Dirty Work 2" would include an introduction by Agee and an appendix listing the names of 385 undercover CIA operatives in Africa.

Solarz is giving up his African affairs chairmanship for what he thinks will be the more lively Asian affairs panel. The power play of liberals versus moderates in the committee's Democratic ranks revolves around Solarz's push for Rep. Howard Wolpe of Michigan, a liberal scholar on African affairs who is backed by the Congressional Black Caucus. Wolpe has given Solarz assurances that if he gets the chairmanship, he will retain the subcommittee's present staff—including Steven Weissman.

Wolpe's opponent in the caucus of committee Democrats, set for tomorrow, is moderate Rep. Dan Mica of Florida, who has seniority to become chairman but is regarded as dangerously unsafe on the human rights issue by the liberals. Supporting Solarz and Wolpe is the committee's longtime liberal powerhouse, Rep. Jonathan Bingham of New York, backed by many junior members (including five freshmen, two of them black and all of them liberals).

"These people are terrified," a committee staffer told us. "They think [President] Reagan and [Secretary of State Alexander] Haig are out of touch with reality, and they are trying to build a barricade around the African subcommittee to keep it safe for human rights."

In fact, it is Solarz, Bingham and Wolpe who seem "out of touch with reality." Their insistence on keeping Weissman as the Africa subcommittee's No. 2 staffer shows a quixotic attempt to repeal the election and restore politics of the 1960s and 1970s. The role of Weissman, so distrusted by the government of Zaire that he is regarded as an enemy by that U.S. ally, shines as a beau ideal of the post-Vietnam mood. But that time has passed.

How far it has passed was demonstrated last summer when Weissman appeared at a CIA briefing for Solarz in the congressman's office. Hours after the briefing, Adm. Stansfield Turner, director of the CIA, telephoned Solarz and admonished that the presence of Weissman had tended to tighten the tongues of the CIA briefers.

Solarz then learned for the first time from Turner that Weissman's treatise, titled "The CIA and U.S. Policy in Zaire and Angola," had been reprinted in "Dirty Work." Asking an explanation from his staffer, Solarz was told Weissman did not know that Agee and other anti-CIA extremists also would appear between the covers. Solarz transmitted that explanation to Turner and the matter was dropped, with

Weissman retaining his CIA security clearances.

But Weissman's activities on behalf of the African subcommittee, which the panel's liberals are battling to continue, do not stop with "Dirty Work." In informal remarks to the African Studies Association in Philadelphia last Oct. 16, Weissman used his subcommittee position to attack Zaire in a way surpassing the latitude taken by members of Congress themselves.

"Zaire is a basket case," Weissman told his largely black audience. "It is falling apart. . . . A concentrated lobbying effort is what is needed in Washington to change policy." Weissman, who has no notes, told us he never said that. But an eyewitness, who took careful notes, attests to the accuracy of the quote.

Those and other Weissman comments look to the government of Zaire suspiciously like an attempt by a U.S. government official to destabilize their country. In fact, the prospect of change in U.S. policy toward Zaire desired by Weissman is zero under Reagan and Haig; any change will go the other way—firming up U.S. support for the Mobutu regime, corrupt or not, with less minute attention to human rights. Backroom infighting over Solarz's successor reached a frenzied peak over the weekend with Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill himself helping Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Clement Zablocki assert the rule of orderly succession, supporting Mica over Wolpe. That is one way to operate.

The other is to read the Nov. 4 election returns to the Democratic caucus. If the African affairs subcommittee truly desires to exercise influence, it must understand that the heady years of the anti-CIA cult and human rights as the shining emblem of American policy are gone. ●

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S BUDGET CUTS

HON. DAVE DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, the voters of this Nation made it clear that they expected a new direction from their elected officials. They demanded that fiscal responsibility once again be restored to the operations of the Federal Government. Perched on the brink of economic disaster, the people of the United States gave a new generation of leaders a mandate to make decisive, yet commonsense, decisions to bring the mammoth Federal bureaucracy under control.

Tonight President Reagan unveils to the Nation an important first step in achieving this goal. Each specific budget cut represents a carefully considered, yet very difficult, decision in which the needs of particular groups were weighed against the overwhelming necessity to restore sanity to the Federal budget process.

While I may not agree with each particular reduction in Federal outlays, I believe it absolutely essential that we stand behind the President in

what he is trying to accomplish. Only through putting aside our individual interests can we hope to achieve the national goal of a strong, stable, and prosperous America.

I applaud the President for embarking on a course that in the past few have had the courage to follow. ●

DECONTROL, AT LAST

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels, of which I am a member, began a hearing on President Reagan's decision of January 28, 1981, to speed up the process of oil price and allocation decontrol. I support the President's decision and outlined my reasons at the hearing this morning.

A number of sources could be used to support oil decontrol. One could turn to the drilling statistics showing a 5.6-percent increase in new oil and gas wells in 1979, the first year of partial decontrol, and 15.4 percent in 1980, the second year. In addition, one could point to the gasoline consumption decline of approximately 7 to 8 percent last year as further proof that oil decontrol works.

Former Energy Secretary Charles Duncan, testifying before our Oversight Subcommittee, stated on June 30, 1980, that drilling activity was up 33 percent during the first 6 months of 1980 over the same period in 1979 before decontrol.

On the important subject of the impact of decontrol on price, one could cite the now famous Lundberg Letter which reported on January 30, 1981, that the decontrol decision will only speed up the price increases that would have occurred without the President's actions under the Executive order.

Perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, one could and should point to the Washington Post's lead editorial of January 29, 1981, entitled "Decontrol, at Last". The Post editorial is the most persuasive and succinct defense of oil decontrol that I have read since the President's decision. It contains a lucid analysis of the failure of the Government price and allocation system for crude oil. I cannot help but note that the same principles which apply to oil decontrol also apply to the regulation of natural gas under the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978. I would hope that the Post and others would apply these principles to natural gas and support efforts to deregulate natural gas in the same fashion that we have now decontrolled domestic crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert the Post editorial at this point in the RECORD and respectfully commend it to my colleagues for their review.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 29, 1981]

DECONTROL, AT LAST

President Reagan was absolutely right to decontrol oil and gasoline prices, quickly and without qualification. It is an essential step toward a rational energy policy. You can dismiss all of those tendentious claims about the added cost to the consumer. The added cost to the consumer will probably be in the range of zero. More than five-sixths of the country's crude oil supply is decontrolled. Home heating oil was decontrolled five years ago. As for gasoline, competition is holding actual retail prices well below the legal ceilings. For the country as a whole, these controls have brought nothing but harm, and the end of them will bring nothing but benefit.

The controls were wrong in theory when President Nixon imposed them in 1971. They were demonstrably wrong, as much costly experience already showed, when Congress insisted on perpetuating them in 1975. President Carter wisely began the process of decontrol last spring. The schedule was a gradual one running into next fall, when the law will expire altogether. Mr. Reagan has now sped up that final process by eight months.

Why were controls wrong? Because they disguised the dangerously high cost of oil to the American economy. The control system required refiners with cheap, price-controlled domestic oil to subsidize other refiners' imports. That held the price to American consumers far below the cost of the imports. Americans used a lot and kept the flow of imported oil high. That seriously damaged the country's balance of payments and eroded the value of the American dollar.

The high level of American imports helped create the very tight market that enabled the exporting nations to double their prices in 1979. By now, the price to the American consumer is undoubtedly higher than it would have been in the absence of any price controls at all. As an attempt to protect the American economy from higher oil costs, the controls have been an unmitigated failure.

Prices have been rising, inevitably, even under the controls. They aren't going to rise any faster in the absence of controls, unless another world shortage develops. Decontrol may even slow the rise a little. The control system contained a number of hidden subsidies—including the usual fat subsidy for the independent refiners—that will now lapse, saving the public a little money.

At worst, in another international shortage and panic like the one in 1979 following the Iranian revolution, prices will indeed rise. How much? It depends on the scale of the shortage. There could be a squeeze on the supply line as early as this spring, if the war continues between Iran and Iraq. But in return for higher prices at the gasoline pump, you will get insurance against a return of the gasoline lines. Those lines were created by the price ceilings, and the cumbersome allocation rules that they required. Having been through two memorable episodes of gasoline lines, most Americans would surely prefer the next time

around to pay in money rather than time, anger and anxiety.●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL, 1981

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am elated at the release of Soviet prisoner of conscience Iosef Mendelevich after 10 years of imprisonment, and hope that this heralds, finally, a recognition by Soviet authorities that the human rights movement will not be ignored. I am convinced that had our voices not been raised these past 10 years in behalf of Mendelevich, he would still be in prison today, and I want to take this opportunity to urge all of our colleagues to recognize the importance of the vigil in the effort to assist Soviet Jews as well as other national groups within the Soviet Union to emigrate to a free country. Our friend Mike Barnes is coordinating the vigil this year, and I urge you to join in this worthwhile effort by contacting him. We owe him a debt of gratitude for his work in behalf of Soviet Jewry and particularly for his work on this year's vigil.

Col. Wulf Vilensky and his wife Sonya of Vilnius, Lithuania have not yet been successful in their attempts to join their children and grandchildren in Israel. This is the 6th year of their personal vigil, having first submitted their applications for exit visas in 1975. Colonel Vilensky is now retired, and before he applied to leave the Soviet Union he was considered a hero of the highest order as a result of valiant service during World War II. He accrued 26 medals for his bravery, including the coveted Hero of the Country Medal, and was honored on his 50th birthday by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian S.S.R. "for many years of work in the military training field, for active participation in public work." However, Colonel and Mrs. Vilensky have no family left in the Soviet Union, and when the last of their family members left the country, they too applied to emigrate to Israel. All 20 family members are now in Israel; only Colonel and Mrs. Vilensky remain in Vilnius, prevented from joining them for 6 years now.

Of their detention Colonel Vilensky does not complain. He is far from a militant or an activist. He sees their desire to emigrate in terms of family, not in terms of national loyalty. "My army rank is colonel," he writes, "but my greatest rank is grandfather." They are very lonely in Vilnius.

I will continue to petition Soviet authorities in the Vilenskys' behalf, and because there are so many like them

in the Soviet Union, prevented from being with their families or pursuing their life's goals, it is my hope that we will have the greatest possible participation in the vigil this year. Again, I want to thank Mike Barnes for his leadership in this important undertaking, and urge you to add your support to the efforts being made in behalf of Soviet Jewry.●

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that will bring equal protection in employment to the handicapped under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Under existing law, there is no generally applicable prohibition against employment discrimination on the basis of handicap. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; but it provides no protection for disabled workers.

The widespread exclusion of handicapped workers from employment exacts an enormous toll in terms of human dignity and the quality of life for countless Americans. Over 16 million people age 18 to 64 years reported some level of work disability in the 1976 census. Of this handicapped population, there were only 7.1 million persons working.

It is vital to realize that most of these people desire employment but do not work because of unjust and discriminatory hiring policies.

The handicapped face the dilemma of being discriminated against in employment opportunities because they are evaluated on the basis of false generalizations, misconceptions, and misinformation about their handicaps; not on the basis of their job skills, productivity or performance.

Qualified individuals, time and again, are denied employment because of their disability when the disability would in no way interfere with their job performance. Our handicapped deserve the opportunity to be evaluated and hired on the basis of their ability and not their handicap.

The need for this legislation is obvious. There are too many employers who still will not hire an otherwise qualified individual for the sole reason of their disability. Some employers cling to the myths related to hiring the handicapped. Fears of increased insurance rates, lower job performances and job stability, poor attendance and the required physical adjustment turn employers away from hiring the handicapped.

This unnecessary situation weighs a heavy cost on society. In 1980, it was estimated that the Federal Government spend approximately \$1 out of every \$13 in the Federal budget—\$40 billion—to support our disabled population. State, local, and private support for disabled citizens amounts to approximately an additional \$60 billion. Surely by eliminating employment discrimination of the handicapped, we can help reduce this economic burden on taxpayers.

Additionally, and more important, by enacting this legislation we can help reduce the loss in human terms that is caused by discrimination against handicapped individuals. Too many deserving people are excluded from society's mainstream; left to lose their dignity and self-worth.

The time has come to include handicapped individuals as a protected element in our population under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; protecting handicapped persons against all forms of employment discrimination under that title.

We must demonstrate our Nation's firm commitment to ending discrimination against the handicapped by enacting this legislation. I hope my colleagues will support me in my effort to give the handicapped an equal opportunity in employment.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make discrimination against handicapped individuals an unlawful employment practice

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a reference in section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 of this Act to a section or other provision is a reference to a section or other provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

SEC. 2. Section 701 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(1)(1) the term 'handicap' means the status of any individual—

"(A) who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits any of such individual's major life activities;

"(B) who has a record of such an impairment; or

"(C) who is regarded as having such an impairment.

"(2) Such term does not include the status of an individual who is an alcoholic or a drug abuser—

"(A) whose current use of alcohol or drugs prevents such individual from performing the job involved; or

"(B) whose employment, because of such current use of alcohol or drugs, would constitute a direct threat to property or safety of other individuals."

SEC. 3. (a) Sections 703(a)(1), 703(a)(2), 703(b), 703(c)(1), 703(c)(2), 703(d), and 703(e)(1), are each amended by striking out "or national origin" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

(b) The sentence beginning "Notwithstanding any" in section 703(h) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or national origin" the first place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap"; and

(2) by striking out "sex or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "sex, national origin, or handicap".

(c) Section 703(j) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or national origin" the first place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap";

(2) by inserting after "national origin" the second place it appears the following: ", or persons with any handicap,"; and

(3) by inserting after "national origin" the third place it appears the following: ", or persons with such handicap,".

(d) The center heading of section 703 is amended by striking out "OR NATIONAL ORIGIN" and inserting in lieu thereof "NATIONAL ORIGIN, OR HANDICAP".

SEC. 4. Section 704(b) is amended by striking out "or national origin" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

SEC. 5. The sentence beginning "No order of the court" in section 706(g) is amended by striking out "or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 717(a) is amended by striking out "or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

(b) Section 717(c) is amended by striking out "sex or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "sex, national origin, or handicap".

SEC. 7. The amendments made by this Act do not affect any right, remedy, obligation, or responsibility under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SEC. 8. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect at the beginning of the sixth month after the month in which this Act is enacted.●

RECONSIDERING OUR SHARE

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the upcoming session, this Congress will be called upon to find ways to responsibly eliminate excessive spending without hurting those American citizens who are truly in need.

I would like to call to the attention of this body a recent editorial presented by WOR-TV in New York, which suggested that among those ways the U.S. budget could be cut would be to reduce this country's contribution to the United Nations.

WOR's editorial director, Herbert W. Stupp, sagely notes that the U.S. Secretariat has become a bin of patronage employing about half of the 15,000 people on the U.N. payroll.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this world needs a body where the international community can meet and discuss the pressing issues which threaten our survival. But just as surely, other countries must shoulder their share of the burden as well as eliminate unnecessary personnel.

And most definitely, we cannot justify asking our own countrymen to tighten their belts while providing more than 25 percent of the U.N. budget.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Stupp's commentary to this body:

RECONSIDERING OUR SHARE

(By Herbert W. Stupp)

It's safe to say that two things the American people voted for in November, were less government, and more respect for America overseas. There is a way we can symbolically satisfy both desires. That is by taking a critical look at the U.S. contribution to the United Nations.

The U.N. has a staff of about 15,000 employees. A recent New York Times Magazine article quoted this adage: "How many people work at the secretariat?" The answer: "About half." The Secretariat has become something of a patronage system for the international community. There are more than a few high paying yet largely useless jobs. And it's common knowledge that the U.N. personnel from the Soviet bloc operate as spies.

What's especially galling is that the American taxpayer is subsidizing this activity. There are 153 member nations, yet we Americans contribute 25% of the U.N. budget.

Certainly, the U.S. should continue to support positive programs of the U.N. that work toward improving health, agriculture, and the like. And the U.N. remains a worthwhile forum during world crises. It's also important to the economy of New York City. But by withdrawing specific support for needless bureaucracy, we could make the U.N. a more effective body. A few measured, targeted cuts would give two important signals. That we mean to control our own budget and that we intend to be taken seriously by the world community.

And that's our opinion. I'm Herb Stupp.●

THE REPEAL OF FOREIGN- EARNED INCOME TAX

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to eliminate one of the most inequitable provisions of our current tax code, foreign-earned income tax. This tax, levied on Americans abroad, constitutes a major impediment to the expansion of American competitiveness in world markets, in addition to increasing opportunity costs of Americans working overseas.

At a time when American competitiveness in world markets is deteriorating, this tax further erodes the basis for any American trading advantage. The United States is the only major trading country which taxes its citizens outside its borders. The increased cost of this tax is forcing American companies overseas to replace their American expatriate staff with foreign nationals. This shift in hiring practices has resulted in endless adversities for the United States, not the least of

which is an 8-percent unemployment rate, which I need not remind my colleagues is primarily attributable to the influx of foreign imports in the American marketplace.

This onerous taxing of Americans abroad is directly undermining efforts to enhance American trade policy. With a deficit balance of payments for 8 of the last 10 years, it is evident that the United States urgently needs to reevaluate current trade policy. Such a policy should be focused on advancing the American trade advantage overseas. Yet how can our competitiveness be improved when we continue to penalize the very citizens who are actively advocating American know-how in other countries. These citizens, who are already paying an opportunity cost in terms of relocation, should be relieved of this financial hardship.

The negative impact of this tax on U.S. workers, on overall tax receipts, and on domestic unemployment is not worth the projected increase in revenue to be collected from the personal income taxes of these Americans overseas.

Mr. Speaker, in short my bill would exclude all foreign-earned income of Americans working overseas, if they have resided in a foreign country for 11 out of 12 consecutive months. By enacting this vitally needed legislation, Congress would be taking a positive step toward restoring American economic prestige both at home and abroad.●

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1981

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to help our Nation deal with the growing problem of nuclear wastes. As you well know, this subject received a great deal of attention during the 96th Congress, and legislation to establish a comprehensive high-level nuclear waste program was reported in both Houses of Congress. However, due to unfortunate time constraints, we were unable to schedule floor consideration on this act's predecessor or to convene a conference on other nuclear waste legislation. With the beginning of the 97th Congress, I am confident that we can now move forward with a meaningful nuclear waste technology demonstration legislation and take the other necessary steps to make nuclear energy a viable option.

The issue of safe permanent disposal of nuclear wastes is of considerable importance to the Nation, and is a prob-

lem which had already been neglected for too long a period of time. Our Nation must demonstrate that technological solutions to this problem exist now or we may have to face the prospect of closing nuclear plants in the near future. We have already been forced to limit construction of new nuclear plants in some areas of the country due to the public's perception that a technological solution does not exist.

My legislation, the Nuclear Waste Management Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1981, will help us gain the experience and information necessary to obtain public confidence in our Nation's ability to safely dispose of high-level nuclear wastes.

This legislation directs the Secretary of Energy to design, construct, and operate two technology demonstration facilities for research and development purposes. Nuclear wastes owned or acquired by the Federal Government and primarily resulting from unlicensed activities shall be utilized in these activities. The first of these facilities is required to be in operation by the end of fiscal year 1987; the second is required by the end of fiscal year 1988. These facilities are required to be located at sites identified in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Under this bill, the Secretary is also required to design, construct, and operate technology demonstration facilities to solidify nuclear wastes for eventual emplacement in the demonstration repositories. These solidification facilities shall utilize any suitable technique, including but not limited to vitrification, that will provide a waste form that is resistant to the release of radionuclides.

This bill also recognizes that the States must play a significant role in the formulation of any effective nuclear waste disposal program. My legislation formally recognizes the role of the States, and gives them a meaningful opportunity to influence any actions taken by the Secretary under this bill. It specifically requires the Secretary of Energy to consult and coordinate with the appropriate officials from any State in which a potential nuclear waste technology demonstration facility may be located regarding the Department's planning and construction of that facility. Thus, under this legislation, we protect the rights of the States involved in providing for the construction and operation of a nuclear waste technology demonstration facility, while at the same time acting in our Nation's best interests.

I believe that it should be a national goal to insure that a nuclear waste demonstration is begun now and that it be in operation within the time frame established in this bill. We need action rather than studies. We have seen a seemingly endless series of stud-

ies, reviews, and evaluations of nuclear waste disposal within the last several years, each ending with several laudable recommendations or goals that somehow get sidetracked before they are achieved. What we need instead is to establish a research, development, and demonstration program that will get this job done, and to my mind that includes construction and operation of a demonstration repository in a timely manner.

I find it ironic that despite its rhetoric on this subject, the Department of Energy has continued to slip the deadline for the construction of any nuclear waste facilities. We cannot afford to accept this leisurely type of approach.

We in the Congress must recognize that the principal national issue of concern with nuclear energy is waste disposal. I believe that this legislation provides the tools to allow us to adequately address this concern. For this reason, I urge that my colleagues support the bill and that it receive prompt consideration.●

MENDELEVICH IS FREE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, Iosef Mendelevich, one of the three remaining defendants in the 1971 Leningrad trials, was finally allowed to leave the Soviet Union this morning for Israel. It is exactly 10 years since the infamous trials wrongly convicted Mendelevich and his codefendants for attempted hijacking of a Soviet airliner. His original 12-year prison sentence was extended 3 years because of his desire to observe strict religious practices during his incarceration.

The release of Iosef Mendelevich, together with a recent increase in the number of exit visas issued to Jews could be a tremendously hopeful sign for all those concerned with human rights in the Soviet Union. Although current emigration figures are nowhere near the 1979 levels when emigration reached nearly 51,000 for the year, the upward swing cannot go unnoticed. I believe we must encourage the Soviet Union to continue the trend of the last 2 weeks by allowing even more Jews to leave, and by granting permission to the other prisoners of conscience to leave for the West.

At a time when East-West relations are poor, the Soviet Union is in a position to improve current tensions by improving its emigration record. In so doing, a new climate of conciliation could be created to improve East-West relations on a host of important issues.

I hope the Soviet Union will see fit to release the two others held in the

Leningrad hijacking case, Yuri Fyodorov and Aleksei Murzhenko, as well as the other prisoners of conscience soon. Today, we can all be relieved that Iosef Mendelevich is free.●

FREEDOM FOR JAN BARTA

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the recent incarceration of Father Jan Barta in Czechoslovakia. The details surrounding Father Barta's arrest have been detailed in an article appearing in the January 7, 1981, edition of *Jednota*. *Jednota* is the official organ of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada.

As a nation committed to freedom from oppression, I feel we must continue to put pressure on the Communist regimes for their wanton acts of repression against their own citizens. As Members of Congress, we must continue to be sensitive to the oppression that occurs beyond our shores. The Communist nations must come to realize that incarcerating religious believers, simply because their views differ from those of the government, will be met with condemnation from free peoples everywhere.

The Slovak nation has a rich and highly cultured history. Its strong spiritual beliefs together with its inexorable sense of nationalism are feelings that will never be overcome by the shroud of totalitarianism. What makes Father Barta's arrest even more heinous is the fact that Father Barta has already suffered two heart attacks and his health is described as sickly. In addition, Father Barta was sentenced to prison in 1952, during the Government's all-out drive to eradicate religion from Czechoslovakia, and was not released until 1966. One wonders about the morality of a government whose repression includes the sick and the elderly.

The incarceration of Father Barta is not only a callous act against human rights, but also a grave act against all Slovaks. We must insist on the spirit of the Helsinki accords which provide basic human rights—rights that are guaranteed by that agreement signed by the Czechoslovak Government. I am proud to represent a district overflowing with ethnic pride. Today I join with them in asking the Government of Czechoslovakia to right its wrongs against Father Jan Barta and restore the rights entitled to him as a human being. I further join with all Americans in asking that we continue to hold the torch of religious freedom aloft to serve as a beacon to those who are repressed and to let them know

that we in America will continue the struggle for such human rights.

Enclosed, for the benefit of my colleagues, is a copy of the Jednota article describing the plight of Father Barta.

[From Jednota, Jan. 7, 1981]

RELIGIOUS ORDERS MOST SEVERELY RESTRICTED—HUMAN RIGHTS GROUP PROTESTS PRIEST'S ARREST IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(By Jerry Filteau)

ROME (NC).—A human rights group from Slovakia, Bohemia and Moravia has sharply protested the recent arrest in their country, Czecho-Slovakia, of a Franciscan Catholic priest.

The protest, given to NC News by reliable sources in Rome Dec. 23, said that Father Jan Barta, 59, was arrested in Liberec Nov. 18 by secret police agents.

He was charged with interfering with the state's control over the church.

The protest said that the secret police simultaneously searched three houses inhabited by Franciscans in Liberec Nov. 18, including the one where Father Barta lived, and confiscated about 70 objects. The objects were described as consisting mainly of religious writings, such as liturgical and theological books, Polish Catholic journals and writings on the Franciscan order.

Author of the protest was the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Persecuted of the Czecho-Slovak League for Human Rights, a group described as closely connected with Czecho-Slovakia's dissident "Charter 77" human rights movement.

"Father Barta's arrest is an open violation of the most basic human rights, as well as an arbitrary interference in the area of the Franciscan order's structure and life," the rights group communique said.

"With Father Barta's arrest," it said, the Czecho-Slovak secret police "clearly want to cut off the religious and pastoral activity of a priest who wanted to do nothing but exercise the ministry to which he had consecrated his whole life."

The Franciscan priest was described as a sickly man who has suffered two heart attacks and was on disability pension as the result of a serious accident.

In 1952 he was sentenced to 20 years in prison on charges of treason. He was one of more than 3,000 priests in the country imprisoned in the early 1950's in an all-out government effort to erase religion from Czecho-Slovakia.

In 1966, as some church-state tensions were easing, he was released from prison.

Shortly after the "Prague Spring" of 1968, when many religious restrictions were dropped or eased, a new series of government measures restored many of the pre-1968 conditions.

Religious orders are among the most severely restricted. They cannot accept novices and their members cannot live a community life. Nuns are barred from their traditional teaching and social service apostolates.

A Franciscan source in Rome said the order has no accurate figures on its members in Czecho-Slovakia because of the limitations on the order there and lack of communications.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AMENDMENTS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would correct an injustice in the computation of social security benefits for men who retired or reached the age of 62 prior to the 1972 Social Security Amendments.

To describe the bill, it is necessary to relate the development of the early retirement provision. In 1954, the Congress enacted a provision which extended to women only the option of retiring at age 62. To provide women who retired early eligibility to receive benefits to which they might not otherwise be entitled unless they retired at age 65, the early retirement provision modified the way in which social security looked at the earnings record, thus optimizing a woman's chance to receive social security benefits at age 62. In 1972, the same early retirement provision was extended to men. However, between 1954 and 1972, male retirees could not avail themselves of the early retirement provision. The result: There are thousands of male retirees who are receiving lower social security benefits than those provided under the early retirement formula, or who would have been eligible to receive benefits had they chosen to retire at age 62 under the early retirement provision, but were not eligible when they did retire at age 65.

My bill makes retroactive the 1972 amendments, thus providing lump sum back payments in benefits to those men who retired or attained the age of 62 before the 1972 amendments. In addition, it would adjust the benefit level for those men who retired early, thus increasing their monthly social security benefits. Finally, it would bring on the rolls those men who would have been eligible to receive social security benefits had they been able to use the early retirement provisions.

I have introduced this legislation in the past two Congresses, but no action was taken, largely to the complexity of the issue. I hope that the Social Security Subcommittee will consider this proposal this year, when it seeks to correct injustices in the social security system.●

FAMILY BUSINESS, RANCH AND FARM PROTECTION ACT

HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill designed to

help foster the preservation of family-owned farms, ranches, and businesses. In spite of numerous studies and reports which demonstrate that small businesses generate the bulk of employment and innovation in our economy, our present tax laws act to discourage the passing of small, family-owned and operated businesses from one generation to the next. The disincentives presented by present tax laws are compounded by the cruel inflation rate of recent years which has overstated the value of such small family-owned businesses, thus often resulting in heirs being forced to sell off these properties in order to pay inheritance taxes. If we are serious about generating new employment in the private sector and about raising productivity and regenerating the innovative spirit which has made this country the technological leader in the world—and we should be serious about meeting these objectives—then we must start with the tax laws which discourage the realization of these goals.

The legislation I am introducing, entitled the Family Business, Ranch and Farm Protection Act, would amend the Federal estate tax laws to allow up to one-half the value of a family-owned farm or business, to a maximum of \$500,000 to be exempt from taxation when passed to family members who continue to operate it. The bill requires that family members continue to work in the business for a minimum of 5 years following inheritance to qualify for the exemption. The amount of tax liability is then prorated if the heirs sell the business within 10 years of inheriting. Thus, if the heir does not work in the business for at least 5 years, he must pay the estate tax on the total amount of his business which was exempted from estate taxes under this bill. If the heir sells after working in the business for 5 years, he would be required to pay one-half of the tax. Thereafter, the tax liability would be reduced each year by 10 percent of the amount for which he would have otherwise been originally liable if he sold the business without working in it for 5 years.

It is significant that the White House Conference on Small Business delegates voted as their third highest legislative priority changes in the estate tax laws to allow for preservation of family-owned business. It can truly be said that if small business is the backbone of our Nation's economy, then family-owned businesses are the core of our small business and free enterprise system. Unfortunately, the effect of existing estate tax laws and double-digit inflation and escalating property values could make family-owned businesses an endangered species, as more and more such businesses are forced to sell and become attrac-

tive candidates for acquisition by large corporations or conglomerates.

We must pay prompt recognition to the contribution which small, family-owned businesses, farms, and ranches make to overall national economy through job creation, advancing technology and innovation, and increasing productivity, and we must work to insure that that contribution is not lost through sheer inaction on our part in the Congress. Conditions have changed in recent years, mandating changes in the law, and I would hope that Members will closely review the changes which are proposed in the bill I am introducing and will join with me in pushing to effect those changes in this Congress.●

JOHN LINDSAY SPEECH ON URBAN POLICY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we struggle to achieve a rational effective urban policy for this Nation, few voices, if any, are as credible and instructive as that of John V. Lindsay, one of my constituents and former mayor of New York City. Not only is Mr. Lindsay a recognized student of urban policy but he has the unique experience of having lived in and governed the Nation's largest and most innovative urban community. I recommend to my colleagues his views as they appear in the New York Times, February 5, 1981:

SHAPING URBAN POLICY

(By John V. Lindsay)

The President's Commission for a National Agenda for the 1980's recommended in December that the struggle to revitalize our older cities be abandoned. In fact, the opposite course should be pursued. The whole country will be weakened even more if the decline of these cities continues.

There are five major urban-policy areas that require sensible, decisive action by the Reagan Administration: economic development, elimination of mandated programs, public safety, intergroup relations, and mass transit.

After having served 17 years in three areas of the public sector—the Justice Department, Congress, and City Hall—I hold a view of urban issues, shaped by experience, that is distinctly pragmatic. I'm for what works best in meeting public needs—not more government or less government, but rather better government.

First, metropolitan centers must be made attractive to investors and employers. When tax cuts and abatements are instituted to induce the creation of new jobs, as they must be, care must be exercised to prevent the providing of incentives for employers to move out of cities. For example, untariffed across-the-board tax credits for new plant construction will give manufacturers economic reason to abandon the downtown and build facilities where they are least needed. Federal policy should produce exactly the

opposite result: Employers should be encouraged to expand in those areas, urban, suburban, and rural, where employment rates have fallen below a certain level.

Second, Washington must abolish all federally mandated programs and relieve states and local governments of the fiscal burdens that are brought to their doorsteps by the migrating poor. While Mayor of New York City, I sued the Government to invalidate the entire welfare system, which imposes its costs on states and local governments and then sets discriminatory Federal reimbursement schedules for different areas of the country. Any program to deal with poverty must be national in scope, Federal in its administration, and uniform in its application. Urban areas, which have become the repositories of the poorest of the nation's poor, will never be able to deliver essential services or keep local taxes low enough to compete as long as they are oppressed by such Federal mandates as welfare and Medicaid.

Third, with crime rates at the highest level in history, is it any wonder that fear of crime has become an American preoccupation? Washington has allowed funding for law-enforcement assistance to lapse and failed to halt both the interstate traffic in handguns and the international commerce in narcotics. By licensing handguns, curbing the arms factories in South Carolina, Virginia, Florida, and Georgia that produce 70 percent of the handguns that are illegal, bringing the Government's narcotics strike force up to full complement, and rebuilding and restructuring crime-fighting funding, the Government can move effectively against crime, as it must.

Fourth, if the hallmark of a civilized society is the degree to which its citizens are safe from violence, we have indeed become a less civilized nation, and the absence of constructive local leadership often makes our streets even more dangerous. Fuses are short and people are quick to shout, even shoot, at one another. An idle generation roams the streets, estranged from the institutions and customs that used to bind communities together; they constitute small armies of hustlers that must be dealt with swiftly, but also given the chance to work and the hope of entering the mainstream. This will not be easy, but Washington can at least begin by shaping policy to bring employment back to cities. In this regard, our new leaders in Washington might read the report of the Kerner Commission on Civil Disorders (of which I was vice chairman), in which 11 Federal commissioners, Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and progressives, issued unanimous recommendations for reducing the incendiary possibilities that polarization produces.

Fifth, a decent transit system is basic to jobs—and to safety. Cities with mass-transit systems provide the best alternative to automobiles and represent a line of defense against America's inflationary dependence on the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. Lamentably, the subways and commuter rail lines in New York are a public disgrace. They are filthy, crime-ridden, and mechanically unreliable. And the buck seems to stop nowhere. Local weaknesses notwithstanding, this system cannot be restored to health without a strong Federal mass-transit policy. A wrong policy is the current one that apportions mass-transit aid on the basis of population rather than on ridership.

I am familiar with most major world cities and have participated in urban conferences in many of them. The central governments

of most of these countries assume direct responsibility for their cities' well-being. Our Federal Government must play the same role—and play it well.●

RESEARCH BILL ON NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

HON. MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. FUQUA, and I introduced the Nuclear Waste Research, Development and Technology Demonstration Act of 1981. This bill is intended to provide direction to the Department of Energy's research program for disposing of high-level radioactive wastes. It is fundamentally the same as H.R. 7418 which was introduced and reported from the Committee on Science and Technology during the 96th Congress. However, it is different in that much of the detail that is now considered unnecessary has been eliminated.

As many of you know, technical demonstration of nuclear waste disposal is a key element in freeing nuclear power from the political morass that has engulfed it for the past several years. With the technology that the vast majority of scientists agree is now available, there is no excuse for not promptly demonstrating to the people of the United States that nuclear wastes can be disposed of safely and effectively. At the same time, valuable experience and data will be gained for building, licensing, and operating commercial repositories.

The bill directs the Secretary to select two sites for small-scale research, development, and technology demonstration for nuclear waste isolation to build public confidence in the fact the technology is well in hand. A small quantity of high-level nuclear waste is to be solidified in a glasslike form and placed in containers designed to last at least as long as it takes for the wastes to decay to levels only as toxic as the uranium ore from which it came. In this way, the containers, or engineered barriers as they are technically called, will provide the primary protection for isolating the wastes. The geology deep underground will provide a further, secondary isolation. The concept behind engineered barriers is to reduce the hazard from the waste derived from spent uranium fuel rods to levels below that of the original mined uranium. The repository system composed of engineered barriers and surrounding geological protection would then provide a level of isolation greater than that provided by the original uranium ore body.

The bill provides that the first R.D. & D. facility shall be in operation by

the end of fiscal year 1987 and the second by the end of fiscal year 1988. The Secretary is further directed to consult with Federal and State officials about the Secretary's R.D. & D. plans. An important part of this bill is that it prohibits expansion of these facilities into permanent commercial high-level waste disposal repositories.

I hope that we can move quickly to revitalize and provide direction to the Nation's research efforts in the area of nuclear wastes. It will be a priority this year in the Committee on Science and Technology.●

JACK WYDLER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 of this year, the 1981 World Freedom Day Rally of the Republic of China was held in the Sun-Yat Memorial Hall in Taipei. The great gathering of people from all over the free world at that rally, was addressed by Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, the rally chairman, and by H. E. Sun Yun-Suan, Premier of the Republic of China, and by former Member of Congress, our good friend, John W. Wylder.

The occasion was the famous January 23 Day Celebration which commemorates the day of decision for thousands of Chinese from the Communist mainland who chose to go to Taiwan rather than return to the Communist State. On Taiwan, they joined a people united in the cause of freedom who are living proof of the benefits the free enterprise system can produce. The economic growth in the Republic of China stands in stark contrast to the economic decline on the mainland.

Our former colleague, Jack Wylder, was proud to participate that day as a representative of the American people and freedom loving people all over the world. I insert his speech made at the rally for the enlightenment of the Members:

SPEECH BY HON. JOHN W. WYDLER FOR 1981
WORLD FREEDOM DAY RALLY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA TAIPEI

Mr. Chairman, Officials of Republic of China, Distinguished Guests, Friends in Taiwan:

I am honored to be here as a representative of the people of the United States of America, and as one who has served in the United States Congress, to participate in the celebration of this great week of Freedom.

The idea for this week started here in free China but it has spread throughout the free World. The presence today of my colleagues from many countries around the world, of all colors, races and religions who have come here is proof that men everywhere are united to preserve their right to freedom.

I pay special tribute to the World Anti-Communist League for the important part they have played in the struggle to spread freedom to all mankind and especially to the man who has provided it with guidance and leadership, Dr. Ku Cheng-Kang.

We, in the United States are thankful for the great work and sacrifices that have been made by the people of the Republic of China in the cause of freedom.

Today, I bring you this message from the people and the Congress of the United States of America: We need your help! You, here in free China, are on the front line of the battle to preserve freedom.

If you can preserve your freedom, ours is secure as well. If you lose your freedom, ours is in danger.

We must depend on you here in the Republic of China to stand fast in our common cause. If you do that you will have our everlasting thanks.

On our part, we know you need our support and the necessary weapons for your defense.

That is the least we can do on your behalf, and the Congress has spoken out clearly that the arms will be provided to you and that any attempt by the Communist Chinese to use force against free China, including boycotts and embargoes, will be a threat to peace and of grave concern to the United States.

Let the Communists make no mistake. We mean what we say.

My country has just installed a new man as President—Ronald Reagan. He is a man who hates Communism. He is a man who fights for what he believes in and he is a man who is a friend and admirer of the Republic of China here on Taiwan.

His election and inauguration sent a clear message to the forces of Communism who control the mainland of China. The message is that free men everywhere intend from this day forward to stand together in the defense of freedom.

And as my country celebrates the release of our hostages in Iran, we understand that if the freedom of 52 people can be so important and bring us such happiness then the freedom of whole nations and peoples is of the highest importance to us and to the world.

We are reminded that as we meet here a billion of your brothers and sisters on mainland China do not live in freedom. But they, like people everywhere, would like to live in freedom and if they could choose they would live in freedom.

You here on Taiwan, the people of the Republic of China, keep the flame of freedom burning for them.

While freedom lives and flourishes here, their hope will live and some day soon they will see their dreams come true and they will live in freedom with you.

The day will come when all the Chinese people will be re-united, in freedom, bound together in the heritage of thousands of years.

That heritage, inspired in this generation by Sun Yat-Sen and Chiang Kai-shek, is to see every Chinese man and woman living in freedom.

We know that day will come.

Here, today, we all join together and pray to God that the day of freedom will come soon.

IN SUPPORT OF VIKTOR
BRAILOVSKY

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1981

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union's persecution of religious and political dissenters has been so systematic that accounts of repression there have almost lost their power to shock us in the United States.

But one recent example of this brutal policy cannot fail to outrage the sensibilities of all of us in the Congress, and across the country. The treatment of Viktor Brailovsky, a distinguished scientist who was a pioneer in the field of cybernetics, stands as a sordid monument to the Soviet Union's appalling disregard for basic human dignity.

Dr. Brailovsky's crime was being born a Jew in a nation devoted to the most virulent form of antisemitism. He compounded that crime by seeking to emigrate to Israel along with his wife Irina, also a scientist. He erred most grievously by pressing his case—asserting the rights that in every truly civilized nation are considered a birthright of all humanity—and now he has been called to pay for those crimes.

Dr. Brailovsky has sought exit visas from the Soviet Union, for his wife and himself, since 1972. In those 9 years he has become increasingly vocal in his protests against the Soviet Government, and he has been increasingly harassed and persecuted by that Government.

In 1974 he was imprisoned for 2 weeks, for trying to arrange an international session of the Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists—a group he founded to keep his fellow persecuted scientists aware of new developments in their fields, to which the Soviet Government has systematically denied them access.

In 1976 he was granted an exit visa—for himself only. He refused to leave the country without his wife, and was soon arrested again, to be held for a short time.

Last April he was arrested a third time. This time he was held as part of an investigation into the publication of "Jews in the U.S.S.R.," a cultural publication he edited along with several other prominent refuseniks. He was again released, but again his freedom was short-lived.

Last November, on the eve of the meeting of signatories of the Helsinki Final Act in Madrid, Dr. Brailovsky signed a letter—cosigned by 237 other refuseniks—demanding that Soviet President Brezhnev issue them exit visas.

Arrested 2 days later for "defaming the Soviet state," Dr. Brailovsky re-

mains in Butyrskaya Prison to this day.

Soviet law says no prisoner can be held for more than 2 months without a trial—yet Dr. Brailovsky has been in prison since November, and has seen no trial.

At this moment Dr. Brailovsky's health appears to be deteriorating, as a result of a chronic liver ailment. His wife believes he has not been receiving proper medication, yet she has not been allowed to deliver any such medicine to him in prison.

The Soviet authorities have acknowledged Dr. Brailovsky's illness: they have in fact used it as an excuse for dropping their investigation of his supposed crimes, and putting off any trial, while still holding him in jail.

Mr. Speaker, this relentless persecution of Viktor Brailovsky epitomizes the viciousness with which the Soviet authorities have pursued their goal of crushing all dissent within their borders. It is an act calculated to break the will of all who would dissent, as it seeks to destroy the life and hopes of one brave man who is their symbol.

Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot ignore Viktor Brailovsky, because it cannot ignore the ideals of freedom and dignity that he has come to symbolize. I ask that all Members in this House join me in calling on the Soviet Government to end its persecution of this man—to give him the medical care he needs, to release him from prison, and to allow him to emigrate to Israel along with his wife—and to adopt a policy of free emigrations for all its citizens, as would befit a nation that aspires to any degree of respect in the world community.

Thank you.●

THE SLATE BELT MEDICAL CENTER: COMMUNITY COOPERATION AT ITS BEST

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, I was honored to have been present as a guest at the dedication ceremonies of the new Slate Belt Medical Center in Wind Gap, Pa. The decade-long story behind the construction of this fine new health care facility proves what the residents of a community in America can accomplish when they put their minds to it. At a time of inflation and high health care costs, we can all take heart at the way the people of the Slate Belt overcame all obstacles to make this dream come true. Having first been elected to Congress in 1978, I am delighted to have been a strong supporter of these efforts since then.

The beginning of the story of the medical center started in 1970, when

Joseph Dell'Alba and several other interested Slate Belt residents started working toward the creation of a hospital in the Slate Belt. Dogged perseverance was necessary; in fact, many of the faces and names of the venture's supporters changed over the years. Through it all, a hard core of determined people continued, and new supporters were added. Finally, in 1978, the official requirements were met and permission was received to begin construction.

The medical center was to be a new concept in medical care. The building was to be of three floors, with the first floor housing a primary care center and emergency room and the upper two floors housing 120 beds for skilled-care patients and intermediate-care patients.

The cost of the project was estimated at \$3.5 million. The board of directors of the Slate Belt Medical Center went to the 35,000 residents of the Slate Belt and asked them to open up their hearts and pockets in a fundraising effort. The people of the Slate Belt responded magnificently. In a short time, they had pledged slightly over \$1 million to the building fund. The banks of the Slate Belt arranged the rest of the money in a convenient loan, and the construction of the medical center began.

Groundbreaking occurred on June 24, 1979, and actual construction began shortly thereafter. The facility was built and equipped about a year and a half later.

Today the medical center stands as a monument to the determination of the residents of the Slate Belt to carry the facility through to a successful conclusion no matter the obstacles.

The Slate Belt Medical Center vividly emphasizes that the spirit of community cooperation and togetherness in America is not a thing of the past, and that the right cause with the right leadership will receive the support of the people.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate in this summary of the history of the Slate Belt Medical Center to list the names of some of the people who were particularly supportive during the effort to build the medical center. Here are just some of the many who gave of their time, energy, and resources to aid in the struggle:

Joseph Dell'Alba, Mayor of Wind Gap.
John Turtzo, M.D., Pen Argyl.
John Turtzo, D.M.D. Pen Argyl.
Douglas Turtzo, M.D. Pen Argyl.
Peter Ghatak, M.D. Pen Argyl.
David Turtzo, D.M.D., Pen Argyl.
John Oliver, M.D. Pen Argyl.
James Tinney, Pen Argyl, President, Pen Argyl National Bank.
Roy Williams, President, First National Bank of Pen Argyl.
Ronald Cann, Merchants National Bank of Bangor.
Joseph Beers, Richmond, President of a contracting firm, General Chairman of the Fund-Raising Campaign.

Mariano C. Saveri, President, Atlantic Apparel Contractor's Association.

Jeanette Reibman, State Senator, Easton.
Philip Ruggiero, State Representative, Bangor.

Russell Kowalshyn, State Representative, Northampton.

Fred B. Rooney, former U.S. Congressman.

Richard Suck, Administrator, St. Luke's Hospital, Bethlehem.

Donald Porter, Administrator, Muhlenberg Medical Center, Bethlehem.

Donald Hamilton, Administrator, Easton Hospital, Easton.

Ernest Kline, former Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Leonard Bachman, Pennsylvania Department of Health.

Thomas Vracarich, Pennsylvania Department of Health.

W. Philip Palmer, Director, Division of Primary Care Development of the Pennsylvania Department of Health.

Richard Miller, Consultant, Medical Care Systems.

The following members of the Slate Belt Municipalities Association:

John Dally, Mayor, Pen Argyl.
Joseph Dell'Alba, Mayor, Wind Gap.
Charles Angelini, Mayor, Roseto.
Jim Abbott, Mayor, East Bangor.
Duane Miller, Mayor, Bangor.
Russell Snyder, Mayor, Portland.
Paul Wagner, Chairman, Washington Township.

Victor Melnick, Chairman, Upper Mt. Bethel Township.

Richard Grucela, Chairman, Lower Mt. Bethel Township.

William Danner, Chairman, Plainfield Township.

The following members of the board of directors of the Slate Belt Medical Center:

Joseph Dell'Alba,
Olimpio R. Pacchioli,
Harry U. Mervine,
Louis Guida,
Charles Angelini,
Alan B. McFall,
John G. Oliver, M.D.,
Joan Cope,
Helen Pysher,
Ann Zelenka,
Kenneth Ace,
Richard Grucela,
Robert R. Davis,
Garfield Williams, Jr., and
Earl Laub.●

STEVEN G. ST. JOHN WINS INDIANA "VOICE OF DEMOCRACY" CONTEST

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Steven G. St. John, while brilliantly representing the State of Indiana as well as the Second District, wrote the following piece as part of the Veterans of Foreign Wars' voice of democracy contest, a competition in which Steve placed first in his State. Steve, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred and Marjorie St. John, of Royal Center, has been very

active in Pioneer High activities, such as student council, the National Forensic League, National Honor Society, choir, band, and the French and German Clubs. The Purdue-bound senior also presided over his senior class.

The voice of democracy scholarship program began 34 years ago with the endorsement of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. In 1961-62, the Veterans of Foreign Wars assumed sole sponsorship of the program, a duty that had previously entailed the services of National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronic Industries Association, and the State Associations of Broadcasters. Since 1961-62, the scholarships have increased from a single grant of \$1,500 to the present number of five scholarships, totaling \$31,500, with the first-place winner now receiving a \$14,000 scholarship to the school of his/her choice. Steve is one of a quarter million participants, as student participation has tripled since the program's inception.

Steve, a future engineer, should be commended for his fine display of patriotism. We hope that other Indiana high school students will follow Steve's fine example of love for one's country and commitment to the outstanding ideals America represents. The Second District is proud to have Steve representing it and the State of Indiana in his quest for the national voice of democracy scholarship.

Mr. St. John's speech follows:

My commitment to my country *** When I hear these words, I think of Americans in the Armed Forces or people elected to office *** commitment *** but the word commitment goes much deeper than this. It means to me a whole attitude of service, love and devotion to my country. Such dedication must go beyond being what is commonly termed a "flag waver," to include holding steadfast for what America stands for. Benjamin Franklin once said, "We have given you a Republic, if you can only keep it that." He was saying that without the commitment of the citizen, it would be impossible for the individual states to function as a whole. I am going to keep Mr. Franklin's warning in mind as I further explore my commitment to my country.

What then, should this dedication entail? Probably the most obvious demonstration of my dedication would simply be to vote. I can make my voice heard. I can have a say concerning the functions of our governmental system. When our government was established 200 years ago, our Founding Fathers based their theories on the assumption that people would continue to be committed to their country *** that the average citizen would indeed feel responsible toward society. I believe that our electoral system works, that the vote of the average citizen does count. For me, voting is not merely a duty, rather it is a reaffirmation of the faith of the Founding Fathers in the common man.

Secondly, if I am to be a truly committed citizen, I must develop a sense of the greater good. What do I mean by the greater good?

Last year at a high school assembly, I listened to a story that seemed to demonstrate this concept. It was the story of a man *** a man whose job it was to watch over a railway bridge, rotating it when necessary to allow river traffic to pass. It wasn't unusual for the man's little boy to come with his father because he enjoyed playing by the river. One day, a day that seemed like any other, the bridge tender was anticipating the arrival of the 12:00 o'clock passenger train. As he was preparing to realign the bridge, he froze. Not 200 feet away, in plain sight, was his only child playing innocently in the massive gear mechanism. Quickly gauging the speed of the approaching train, he realizes that he hasn't time to call his son. In a split second, the man must decide between the life of his son and the lives of the passengers on the train.

The bridge tender's painful dilemma, illustrates in a dramatic way the difficult process of giving up individual freedoms for the sake of the greater good. We are loathe to relinquish these freedoms. For example, a man asked to submit to gun control becomes fearful. He feels less able to protect himself. Or another person affected by wage-price controls, to him this might mean a loss of security. But look for a moment at the benefits for society, the greater good. The man who has given up his gun has opted for a more peaceful environment. The citizen who acquiesced to wage controls in essence voted for his country's economic stability. "Liberty means responsibility," said George Bernard Shaw. He went on to add, "That is why most men dread it."

I need at this time to underscore one point. There is dread of fear in the mind of the citizen who is asked to give up personal freedoms for the sake of society. After all, the feeling of insecurity is very real. However, for the concerned citizen, the type of citizen I hope to be, this feeling of insecurity would be lessened because I would be concentrating on our nation's greater good. This concentration is a trust, a sort of faith similar to that held by our forefathers.

Benjamin Franklin said that we have been given a Republic, if we can keep it that. I intend to keep it through my belief in the common man, a man who will vote, a man who will preserve the larger vision, a man who will rotate the bridge.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE ELLA T. GRASSO

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of my good friend Ella Grasso on February 5 after a courageous battle against cancer. I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to her and offering my deepest sympathy to her family.

The loss of Governor Grasso will be felt not only by the citizens of Connecticut but by her friends and admirers around the country. For more than 30 years she served the people of Connecticut, first in the State legislature, then as secretary of state and as a member of the house of representatives, and finally as Governor. As the first woman to be elected an American

Governor in her own right, Governor Grasso was an outstanding example for other women in this country who are contemplating a career in public service.

Governor Grasso's compassion and hard work throughout her career are well known. It is indeed tragic that her public service was cut short. She will be sorely missed but not forgotten.●

CONDO MANIA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, increased attention is being paid to the public policy issues stemming from the expanding trend toward conversion of rental housing to condominium and co-op status. Condo conversion is one of the strongest forces leading to inflated housing costs, displacement, and a serious reduction in the supply of affordable housing in many communities. Peter Dreier and John Atlas, who are the authors of an article entitled "Condo Mania" which appears in the March 1981 Progressive magazine, are also leaders of an expanding tenants movement, designed to protect the rights of people who cannot afford or do not want to buy housing.

I commend this article to my colleagues as a good overview of the condo issue.

The article follows:

CONDO MANIA: ACROSS THE COUNTRY, IT'S
PAY UP OR MOVE OUT

Marie Abbott was frightened. The seventy-two-year-old Boston woman, living on a fixed income and partially paralyzed by a stroke, had just received a letter from her landlord informing her that the building in which she had spent the last thirteen years was being converted to condominiums.

"I don't know how I can move," she said. "I'm crippled on one side. I can't walk—I can't even get on a bus. My doctor told me I could have another stroke. I'd just as soon die. I hope I do soon."

In Fort Lee, New Jersey, sixty-nine-year-old Phyllis Hoffman was anxiously debating her choices. The two-bedroom apartment she shared with her sister was to become a cooperative, its \$491 rent increasing to a monthly payment of \$850. "I don't have that kind of money to invest," she said. "I moved here from New York for peace and quiet. Where are we going to go?"

The 800 tenants of the Towne Estates apartment complex in Boston were asking themselves the same question not long ago. They had received the unexpected news that their complex had been sold to American Snacks, Inc., which operates vending machines, doughnut shops, and hamburger restaurants. The new owner wanted to turn the units into condominiums and had given the tenants thirty days to buy or move. The tenants, who paid monthly rents of \$350 to \$450, would be saddled with monthly payments of \$700 to \$800 for the same units as condominiums.

A few tenants, young professionals and senior citizens alike, contacted the media and several sympathetic politicians, and "condomania" soon became a hot issue in Boston. Within a few weeks the heavy news coverage, a rally of almost 1,000 people, and pressure from tenants led the Boston City Council to pass an ordinance requiring landlords and converters to give tenants one year's notice (two years for seniors and the handicapped) before evicting for condominium conversion.

Versions of these dramas are being played out in most major cities and many suburbs across the country as the trend spreads to convert rental property to condominiums and cooperatives. The boom in condominiums (in which each unit is individually owned) and cooperatives (in which each owner buys a share in the entire complex) is so new that the U.S. Census counted them separately for the first time in 1980. But it has quickly become a major factor in the nationwide decline of rental housing available to low- and moderate-income people. In November 1979, the U.S. General Accounting Office estimated the country's vacancy rate at 4.8 per cent—the lowest on record—and added that the number of rental units lost through conversion will outstrip the number of new units being built. In most large cities, the vacancy rate is much lower.

Condominium ownership in this country first took hold in vacation areas in the early 1970s. Between 1970 and 1975, the number of condos increased fifteenfold to 1.25 million units, and by 1980, to more than 3 million. Indeed, condominium construction is the strongest sector of today's housing market, surpassing construction of both single-family homes and non-subsidized rental apartments for the first time in 1979.

But in the late 1970s the conversion phenomenon developed. According to a study released last summer by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), about 366,000 units have been converted to condominiums since 1970, with 71 per cent of the conversions taking place since 1977. Experts estimate that about 150,000 conversions took place in 1980 alone. According to HUD projections, half the population will live in condos by the end of the century if the trend of conversions and new construction continues unrestricted.

But like Marie Abbott and Phyllis Hoffman, most renters cannot afford to follow the trend. Studies estimate that one-half to three-quarters of tenants are unable to buy their converted apartments. Those who are forced out usually find inferior housing and higher prices awaiting them elsewhere in the tight rental market. And once they resettle, there is no guarantee that their new apartments will not be sold out from under them again.

Because of this, the conversion trend is meeting resistance from tenants and senior citizen groups. At first, most tenants are confused and unaware of their political and legal options. But receipt of a "buy up or move" letter—or even the anticipation of one—often prompts them to start talking to their neighbors for the first time. As a result, tenant organizations have mushroomed around the country.

Some tenant groups confront the converters directly. Tenants picketed the eighteen-story Promenade Apartments in suburban Bethesda, Maryland, for five months, frightening off potential buyers and forcing the converter to negotiate the terms of the conversion.

In most cases, however, tenants exert pressure on elected officials for protection.

Some cities, including Philadelphia, Chicago, and Washington, D.C., enacted temporary bans on all condominium conversions. Sixteen states and several dozen cities have passed various laws to protect tenants and preserve the rental housing stock. Some prohibit conversions until the vacancy rate increases to an acceptable level so tenants have somewhere to move; others require six months' notice or more before eviction, and still others require landlords to let tenants approve the conversion or to pay their moving expenses.

Some well-intentioned laws may actually backfire, however. Senior citizens claim that in a tight rental market, landlords discriminate against the elderly if they know city laws will make them harder to evict. And in some communities, developers have circumvented tough condo conversion laws by turning apartments into luxury cooperatives. In response, cities have included cooperatives in their laws.

At the Federal level, New York Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal introduced a bill to impose a three-year moratorium on condo and co-op conversion, to withhold Federal funds from communities that do not provide adequate rental housing, and to establish a Presidential commission to study the topic.

What is behind the condo phenomenon? Why would landlords want to sell their property, a source of income and power? The answer was summed up in a 1976 HUD report: "The large potential profits which can be made in a relatively short time when compared to new construction make conversion so inviting for investors."

According to *Forbes* magazine, a developer can usually turn a substantial profit in three to six months. The nation's biggest converter, American Invesco of Chicago, bought a thirty-story apartment building now called Outer Drive East Condominiums for \$10 million in 1973, spent \$250,000 on superficial remodeling, and sold the apartments for more than \$14 million—a hefty 44 per cent return on investment. It was also American Invesco that purchased the Promenade Apartments for \$50 million, made cosmetic improvements, and despite tenant picketing, put the co-ops on the market for a total of \$100 million.

The profits are so large and so immediate that banks are happy to finance conversions at 13 per cent, 14 per cent, and on up to 20 per cent interest. An official for Continental Illinois Bank, which financed most of Chicago's big conversions, says, "We love them. The turnover is quick and we're making a lot of money." Consumer groups complain that the banks' love affair with conversion ties up mortgage money that could otherwise be spent on new construction.

Behind the dollar signs are the same investment incentives found throughout the housing industry—an industry built around tax benefits for the most affluent. One such incentive is a measure actually established as a tax reform in 1976: It eliminated rapid tax depreciation for old apartment buildings which had allowed land owners to shelter large amounts of their rental income. While the measure discouraged the once common practice of buying old apartments as tax shelters, holding them for a few years, and then reselling them to another high-income investor who would do the same thing, it ultimately prompted apartment owners to leave the rental market entirely—by selling out to condo converters.

In general, the rental market has not brought apartment owners the profits it

once did. Their tenants are, for the most part, those left behind by the rush toward single-family home ownership of the 1950s and 1960s. In 1977, for example, while the median income of homeowners was \$16,000, it was only \$8,800 for renters. Landlords' operating costs have risen, but renters' incomes have not kept pace. As this gulf widens, many landlords feel they must bail out.

The first wave of condominium conversions usually takes place in the more profitable buildings in affluent neighborhoods. The recent HUD study found that most converted buildings had been generating substantial profits as apartments. It is only after this supply has been exhausted that converters go after more marginal buildings.

The effect of conversion is compounded by the failure of both the private and public sectors to build much new low- and moderate-income housing. New rental housing construction slowed to a virtual standstill in 1980, making it the worst year in two decades. The slowdown was due, in part, to the tight monetary policy established last year by President Jimmy Carter and the Federal Reserve Board, which dried up working capital needed to build new housing. But to convert existing housing to condominiums, rental income could still be used as working capital. Thus, conversion has been much safer than new construction.

Under these conditions, condo conversions offer building owners and speculators the quickest path to big profits with relatively little investment or risk. And where there are big profits, there is big business. Most conversions were initially undertaken by a mixture of small-time entrepreneurs and large local realty management firms, but now they are the work of far-flung enterprises. American Invesco alone has converted more than 15,000 units in sixty-three projects across the country. The company has bought up several large Chicago realty companies, a San Francisco firm, plus Colorado's largest commercial real estate enterprise. It has also entered the New York City market, buying a highrise on Park Avenue.

The big money draws converters into politics. American Invesco, which has lobbied heavily to stop tenant protection laws, is now under investigation by Rosenthal's Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs for possible violation of mortgage lending and campaign finance laws. According to one committee source, the firm spent \$300,000 on lobbying just to keep its records out of the investigators' hands, and another \$200,000 to defend itself in newspaper advertisements.

The profit motive is a logical explanation for the lust for condominium conversions on the part of owners, converters, and banks. But what about the condo purchasers? Why would anyone want to buy an apartment?

The real estate industry claims that the demand for condominiums is rooted in the desire for home ownership. There is some truth to the claim. Most Americans have always wanted their own houses, associating ownership with security—the freedom from eviction or arbitrary rent increases; postwar policies turned this "American dream" into a reality for many. The Federal Housing Administration established guarantees for single-family home mortgages, stimulating banks to make credit widely available. Federal highway construction projects paved the way for massive suburban development. The Federal income tax law made interest and property tax payments deductible, per-

mitting home owners to pay less than renters at the same level.

As a result, home ownership rates rose continually from 44 per cent in 1940 to 55 per cent in 1950, and ultimately to 65 per cent in 1977. Those who continued to rent were largely those who could not afford to buy—the poor, the elderly, the urban minorities.

But that picture began to change as the average cost of a single-family home rose from \$23,000 in 1970 to \$80,000 today. Former developer Jay Janis, who headed the Federal Home Loan Bank Board under Jimmy Carter, has said that only a "privileged few"—about 15 per cent—can still afford to buy a new home.

As a result, many younger renters who planned ultimately to buy a house—especially two-income professional couples—have hopped on the condominium bandwagon for fear that if they don't buy something quickly, they will never be able to make a first down payment. Rising gasoline prices and urban gentrification have also made city living more attractive. Those looking for a place of their own as a hedge against inflation, but unable to afford a single-family house, may see a condominium as the only choice. Condos selling from \$60,000 to more than \$100,000 are snapped up by panicked buyers as soon as they come on the market. Chicago realtors have called the situation "mass hysteria."

So while "demand" for condos exists, it is, at least in part, artificial. It is a creation of long-standing Federal policy favoring home ownership, landlord-tenant laws that make renters vulnerable and insecure, and extremely low vacancy rates that create panic buying. Recent Federal policy indicates a tolerance of the situation; the Government-sponsored Federal National Mortgage Association, dubbed Fannie Mae, has taken out large ads in general-circulation magazines promoting condominiums, for instance. And Moon Landrieu, HUD Secretary under Carter, called efforts to restrict condo conversions "an emotional response."

For some, condominiums seem to be the new American dream. But for many more, they have become a nightmare. Tenants faced with conversion must either move or dig deeper into their pockets simply to keep the same roof over their heads. And even those who initially believe they can afford to buy are often unaware of the long-term costs of owning a condo—especially in buildings with structural defects—and of the management problems that may attend common ownership of the external features of a building. Developers argue that conversion improves the housing stock by providing incentives for maintenance and repair, but many purchasers in fact buy little more than cosmetic improvements, such as an extra coat of paint or a new rug.

In general, condo conversions do nothing to increase the supply of housing, but simply increase the cost. More housing for those of low or moderate income is urgently needed—yet even the private housing industry admits that it cannot provide it, either for rental or ownership. It is simply not profitable enough.

Housing policy can thus go one of two ways:

The housing industry is calling for deeper and deeper subsidies—directly through Federal housing law and indirectly through the tax code—to provide an "incentive" for new construction. But with speculation driving up the cost of land and the Federal Reserve's tight money policy boosting mort-

gage interest rates, the subsidies would have to be so deep that the housing built could hardly be called "private" at all—except for the private profits it would generate.

On the other hand, the Government could recognize that the housing "crisis" is largely artificial—part of a housing system controlled by bankers, speculators, and land owners who have no incentive for cost containment. The response need not be more public housing where the Government serves as landlord, bankers and real estate interests control local housing authorities, and tenants get caught in a fiscal austerity pinch. Instead of reserving public housing for the poor and regulating the private housing interests, a more comprehensive and democratic approach must be taken.

Alternative institutions, such as non-profit and community-controlled housing cooperatives and housing development corporations, could be set up to construct new housing and rehabilitate old and abandoned buildings. "Sweat equity" and "urban home-steading" programs might be promoted for the same purpose. Mortgage money could be made available by creating state banks, investing Government and union pension funds at lower interest, and supporting the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, a new agency set up to lend money to consumer co-ops that mainstream lenders ignore. Or, to keep the price of land from skyrocketing, anti-speculation taxes and land banking (holding land off the speculative market) could be encouraged. By eliminating costly incentives and subsidies to powerful private interests, such programs would actually cost less and give residents more long-term security and financial control over their housing.

As the trend toward condominiums shows, traditional housing policy that frames the issues in terms of home ownership versus rental housing has become obsolete. It needs to be replaced with an equation that considers what people want out of the places where they live—affordability, security, and a sense of control.●

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT-VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL FACILITY SHARING ACT

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced a bill which would insure that wartime casualties, active duty military personnel, and deserving veterans receive the best health care possible.

This bill would accomplish this goal in two ways. First, the bill provides the Administrator of the VA with the authority to furnish hospital care to any member of the armed services for a service-connected disability incurred or aggravated during a period of war. These casualties will be given priority over all other persons except veterans in need of hospital care for service-connected disabilities.

Second, this bill expands the authority for sharing medical resources between hospitals and other health care facilities of the DOD and the VA. This

bill provides the legislative authority for interagency sharing of health facilities, personnel, and equipment on a facility-by-facility contractual basis. This should promote maximum use of existing medical resources in a locality, since much of the duplication or underutilization of medical resources under the present system could be eliminated. At the same time, such sharing will result in greater efficiency and savings to taxpayers.

Two recent GAO reports recommended that Congress enact legislation which would allow wartime casualties to be treated in VA facilities and would encourage interagency sharing of medical resources. I feel that this bill combines GAO's recommendations as well as insuring that our military personnel receive the best medical care available.●

DEPENDENT CARE AMENDMENTS OF 1981

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a bill today to expand the existing income tax credit for work-related dependent care expenses and to permit nonprofit organizations providing work-related dependent care readily to qualify for tax-exempt status.

I am pleased that joining with me in cosponsoring this revised bill are Representatives SHANNON and MOORE. They and I are committed to working for enactment of this legislation during the 97th Congress, and their support will make a major contribution to reaching this goal.

This bill is similar to H.R. 8109 which I introduced in September 1980, but with several very important changes. These changes have been made in response to many helpful suggestions and comments that have been made during the last few months by numerous individuals and groups with a special interest in work-related dependent care.

The need for work-related dependent care has grown steadily in the last few years even though birth rates have generally declined, largely because working mothers have become the rule in the United States rather than the exception. In March 1979, mothers in the work force included 62 percent of women whose youngest child was school aged, 52 percent of those whose youngest child was aged 3 to 5, and 41 percent of those whose youngest child was under 3 years of age.

Child care is too often wrongly categorized strictly as a "women's issue." It is a parent's issue. In 4.5 million 2-

worker families with preschoolers and almost 8 million with school age children, the fathers are increasingly sharing the responsibilities for dependent care arrangements.

Nevertheless, there are 1.3 million working mothers of preschoolers who are the sole parents in their families. The responsibilities for this group, which includes 60 percent of divorced mothers of children under age 3 and 75 percent of those with 3- to 5-year-olds, are heavy. They must have affordable child care if they are to hold jobs that prevent or reduce welfare dependency.

With so many working mothers of preschool and school age children in the work force at all income levels, it is time to reexamine policies regarding work requirements for the 3.5 million mothers receiving welfare. Two million of them have preschool children whose dependent care needs will have to be met before their mothers can take jobs that lead to economic self-sufficiency. Every year welfare benefits fail to keep pace with inflation, and more and more mothers receiving public assistance realize that unless they take jobs their children will not enjoy even basic minimum well-being. However, title XX, the social service block grant which funds most dependent care for low-income families, similarly has not kept pace with inflation. States have responded with tightened eligibility and reduced assistance in day care as well as in other services. In many areas today, families with incomes above 60 percent of median income have been excluded altogether from title XX day care. It is not uncommon for these families to then be forced sooner or later back onto welfare since the mother's minimum wage income is insufficient to pay for both living expenses and child care. Given the current fiscal restraints, there is little on the horizon to brighten this dismal picture. That is why my revised bill includes a sliding scale designed to target dependent care assistance more effectively on working parents at the low end of the economic spectrum.

I believe the tax credit is a fitting vehicle for future Federal efforts to aid dependent care. First, it is the parents who decide what kind of care to purchase rather than administrators of Government agencies. Because the credit goes directly to the taxpayer, it does not encourage the development of bureaucracies or monopolistic day care systems in States and localities that might limit parental choice or inflate the cost of services unnecessarily. Similarly, the credit does not skew the dependent care system toward any particular care alternative. It is available equally for child care in the home or out of the home, for babysitters, relatives, neighborhood group homes, summer day camps, day care centers, church-related or secular organiza-

tions. It is strictly up to the parents to explore the possibilities and make the choice.

The dependent care credit, created in 1976, is presently a nonrefundable credit of 20 percent of dependent care expenses up to a maximum credit of \$400 a year for the care of one dependent and \$800 a year for two or more dependents. The credit is currently being claimed on 3.8 million tax returns, for a total of approximately \$1 billion in fiscal 1981. This makes it the largest single element of Federal assistance to dependent care.

Despite the strengths inherent in using the credit approach, there still remain some areas where the credit could be improved. Most of the provisions of the Dependent Care Amendments of 1981 address these areas. A summary of the bill and its rationale follows:

DEPENDENT CARE AMENDMENTS OF 1981

SEC. 2—INCREASED CREDIT PERCENTAGE

The bill would replace the present 20-percent credit with a credit geared to family income. Families with adjusted gross income of \$10,000 or less would be eligible for a 50-percent credit. The credit percentage would be reduced in relation to the amount of family income above \$10,000 up to the \$40,000 income level where the credit would stabilize at 20 percent. The credit would be reduced by 1 percent for every \$1,000 of income over \$10,000. This gradual reduction would prevent any income notches from penalizing taxpayers for increasing their income.

Although better than nothing at all, the current 20-percent credit does not appear to make enough of a difference in many families' budgets to enable them to explore any alternatives to dependent care but the very cheapest, regardless of quality. Many relatively inexpensive babysitting and day care arrangements may be adequate or even ideal for meeting the needs of individual children and infants, but many are not. Yet the parents have no economic alternative but to go with what they can afford or give up their jobs.

It is my hope that by targeting this increase in the dependent care credit on families below \$40,000, this bill will enable families to have at least some degree of financial choice in selecting dependent care most appropriate to their children's or dependent's needs. I hope also that this increased ability of parents to pay for dependent care will stimulate the growing dependent care market to provide still more alternatives and services than it does today.

The following chart illustrates the credit percentage available at certain income levels:

	Percent
\$10,000 and below	50
\$15,000	45
\$20,000	40
\$25,000	35
\$30,000	30
\$35,000	25
\$40,000 and above	20

SEC. 3—REFUNDABLE CREDIT

The dependent care amendments would make the credit refundable. This means, simply, that families would be able to receive the full dependent care credit to which they might be entitled even though it exceeds their tax liability, or if they had no tax liability. This is not the case under present law. It is my hope that making the credit refundable will assist families who find themselves caught in the middle with too much income to qualify for Head Start or title XX programs, and too little to afford dependent care on the private market.

Under present law, women who are working their way off welfare are permitted to disregard all reasonable dependent care expenses in calculating how much welfare supplement they will receive in addition to their wages. Upon passage of a refundable dependent care credit, the program of aid to families with dependent children will need to be amended so that the disregard of dependent care expenses for purposes of calculating welfare benefits will reflect any dependent care tax credit to which the mother is entitled.

SEC. 4—INCREASED ALLOWABLE EXPENSES

The bill would allow the credit to be based on the first \$2,400 of dependent care expenses for one dependent, and the first \$4,800 of dependent care expenses where there are two or more qualifying dependents.

Under present law, the credit can be claimed on the first \$2,000 of annual expenses for the care of one dependent, the first \$4,000 for the care of two or more dependents. These maximum amounts were established in 1976, and despite considerable inflation since then, have not been raised.

Although only a small percentage of families using the dependent care credit claim the maximum amount allowable, many groups have argued that the credit ought to be available on an amount equal to current fees for day care centers in most cities. This figure is currently \$50 per week, although many centers do in fact charge more.

In 1979, the average dependent care credit claimed was \$206, reflecting a total family dependent care expenditure of just a little over \$1,000. This is in keeping with the tendency of many families to use informal babysitting arrangements or to arrange their work schedules so that a minimum amount of child care is necessary.

However, I am proposing to increase the maximum amount on which the credit can be calculated in recognition that for some families, group day care centers may be the most desirable, or indeed the only, option available.

SEC. 5—OUT-OF-HOME CARE

The bill permits the dependent care credit to be claimed when dependents over age 14 are cared for outside the home.

Under present law, the credit is available for either in-home or out-of-home care of dependents aged 14 and younger. However, if the dependent is an incapacitated spouse or other dependent over age 14, the credit is currently available only for in-home care.

This change is designed to respond to the growing interest in encouraging families to keep their elderly and handicapped dependents living at home rather than in institutions. In a family where both the husband and wife work or where there is only one adult capable of work, there is no one at home during the day to look after the adult dependent. In some communities, day care programs for older retarded or handicapped individuals are being organized, as are programs for elderly people. These programs meet the social needs of the older dependents, are less of a financial burden on their families than in-home care would involve hiring a person during working hours.

It is the intent of this provision to allow the credit for only nonresidential out-of-home dependent care. The bill does not include nursing homes, hospitals or other residential settings. Therefore, the bill provides that the credit would be available only where the dependent ordinarily returns to the taxpayer's household each day.

SEC. 6—COVERAGE OF PARENTS WITH LOW INCOMES

The bill would permit the credit to be claimed even when one working parent realized no or low income during the year. Under present law, the credit may not be claimed on dependent care expenses in excess of the earnings of the sole or lesser-earning parent. This prevents someone from working part-time to earn, say, \$500, in order to claim the credit on \$4,000 of nursery school costs which would have been incurred whether or not the parent worked.

Occasionally, this provision has an unintended effect. Both parents may be working at full-time jobs all year long. But if one of them ends up with a net loss or realizes very little income despite a year's strenuous effort, the dependent care credit is forfeited. People with small businesses, farms or who are self-employed are particularly vulnerable to this situation. One example brought to my attention concerned a woman who worked all year as a secretary in town, commuting from the family's farm where her hus-

band put in long hours. A combination of bad weather and low crop prices left them with virtually no income from the farm that year. They had placed their daughter in day care throughout the year so that both parents could work, and if the farm had shown some income, they would have been entitled to a dependent care credit of almost two hundred dollars. As it was, they got no credit because their dependent care expenses exceeded the income from the farm.

The bill addresses this situation by imputing for each month when an individual works in a trade or business on a substantially full-time basis earnings of not less than \$166 for one dependent and \$333 for two or more dependents. A "substantially full-time basis" is defined as at least 35 hours per week. This provision parallels the one already in existing law which imputes income to a full-time student.

SEC. 7—TAX-EXEMPT STATUS FOR DAYCARE CENTERS

The bill makes it easier for non-profit daycare centers to qualify for tax-exempt status provided they are organized to care for children of working parents and there is general public access to their services.

In a number of communities, groups are organizing before- and after-school supervision for children of working parents. Others are organizing centers linked to networks of child care homes so that the supply of affordable, non-institutional infant care can be expanded.

Both these kinds of organizations, as well as others of a more traditional nature such as summer play-schools, have had problems in qualifying for tax-exempt status under section 501(c)(3) of the tax code. Without tax-exempt status, it is difficult for these fledgling efforts to solicit the charitable contributions they often need to meet start-up and operational costs.

To qualify for tax-exempt status these innovative organizations must show they were organized and operated exclusively for educational or charitable purposes. An after-school or infant-care organization has difficulty in demonstrating its "curriculum." Children who have been in the classroom all day do not need more of the same. If an organization admits it is simply providing a safe place where the children can have a snack, do their homework, enjoy "free play" or other unstructured activities until their parents return from work, it will not qualify for tax-exempt status. If an organization caring for very young infants can convince the IRS that its curriculum consists of sensory/cognitive development, gross motor development and fine motor development instead of letting infants play with toys, crawl and learn to feed themselves, it just might qualify for tax-exempt status, as indeed an infant "school" on the

West Coast succeeded in doing. But this is far-fetched, and I do not believe organizations providing the very legitimate service of dependent care for the children or working parents should have to go through such contortions to qualify for the tax-exempt status they need to get started and often to survive financially.

My bill provides that the term "educational purposes" in the sections of the code dealing with tax exempt status will be defined as including non-residential care of individuals if substantially all of the dependent care provided by the organization is for the purpose of enabling individuals to be gainfully employed and if the services provided by the organization are available to the general public.

SEC. 8—EMPLOYER-PROVIDED SERVICES

The bill specifically allows the credit to be claimed on dependent care services provided by the taxpayer's employer if such services are deemed to be income to the employee.

A number of types of child care assistance are being provided by employers: Onsite day care centers, purchasing places for employee's children at private day care centers in the community, assisting employees in other ways to locate or pay for dependent care. Such assistance can be deducted by an employer as an ordinary and necessary business expense.

In many of these situations, the employees pay modest amounts for the day care services or pay on a sliding fee scale. At present, such employee benefits are not being taxed to the employee unless they are clearly part of the employee's overall compensation, such as when the employee receives a day care allowance in addition to the regular paycheck. However, it is possible that in the future the IRS might try to levy income tax on dependent care made available to employees. An employee with a child in the company day care center who has paid \$30 a week for an annual total of \$1,500 might find that the IRS thinks the day care was worth \$3,500 and that income tax is owed on the remaining \$2,000. I do not believe such in-kind dependent care services ought to be considered taxable income when they are generally available across the board to all employees of the company. The bill provides therefore that any such employer-provided dependent care, including imputed amounts as well as actual payments by the employee will be eligible for the dependent care credit. In most cases, this will neutralize the impact of being held liable for taxes on employer-provided dependent care services.

COST

The present law credit is estimated to cost \$1,025 million in fiscal year 1981. Because it is difficult to predict precisely what the response would be

to the increased percentages and maximums allowed under this bill, an exact estimate of its cost is not available. However, it is believed that the bill would approximately double the present credit, with most of the benefit being distributed to the middle- and low-income brackets.

Virtually all of the cost is associated with increasing the credit percentage. Refundability and increasing the credit maximum also carry some modest cost. The remaining items are believed by the Joint Committee on Taxation to be cost neutral since they would either affect relatively few individuals or would generate offsetting revenues by permitting taxpayers to make a greater work effort. ●

THE COST OF REGULATIONS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the clearest signs that the new administration is serious about cracking down on excessive Government regulation of business can be seen in the recent freeze imposed on implementing the last regulatory gasps of the Carter Presidency. If we are determined to create a positive business climate that will get our economy moving again, we have to take a hard look at the costs of the regulations we impose. We must guarantee that the benefits of these proposals significantly outweigh the costs.

Mr. Larry Israel of Santa Monica, Calif., himself a successful businessman, and a community leader, has passed along a UPI wire service story which emphasizes this point. I commend it to your attention.

BANK OFFERS TO GIVE MONEY AWAY BUT NOBODY NOTICES

MINNEAPOLIS. UPI—Bank officials doubted anyone would read the 115,000 booklets mailed to customers to comply with a government regulation, and they inserted a giveaway gimmick to prove the point.

Under government disclosure rules, the Northwestern National Bank mailed a 4,500 word booklet detailing requirements of new "Regulation E" affecting electronic money transfer services. The project cost \$69,000.

In 100 booklets, the bank inserted a sentence which said:

"Any customer who receives (in the mail) a disclosure that includes this paragraph can get \$10 simply by writing 'Regulation E' and the customer's name and address on a card and sending it along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope" to the bank.

Not one person answered.

"We'll still send \$10 to anyone who has one of the 100 booklets," a bank spokesman said, "but it seems doubtful anyone read or saved it."

Paul Eisen, a senior vice-president/marketing, said the study suggests the detailed disclosure required is both ineffective and a big waste of money.

He said the bank would have preferred notifying customers that details of the regulation were available on request. That, he said, would have cut costs substantially. ●

SPECIAL INTERESTS AND ELECTORAL REFORM

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying around Capitol Hill that Government runs on all fours with public sentiment—meaning simply that Government ought to be the mirror reflection of the Nation's common interest.

It is a nice thought. After all, that is how things are supposed to run in Washington.

But the sad fact of the matter is that it no longer rings true.

Single-issue, or special-interest groups bear a good deal of the blame for this. Their rapid growth over the latter half of the past decade has driven a wedge between elected government and the common interest elected government is supposed to serve.

The basic reason for this intrusion into public affairs has been the way we run our political campaigns today. With heavy campaign debts looming large on every candidate's horizon, big-money special interest groups have invaded the highest councils of government, pleading their own special cases.

Jimmy Carter's farewell address to the Nation, January 14, highlighted this point, warning us that, because of special interest group pressure, Government is losing sight of the national interest, which, he says, should not be defined as "the sum of all our single or special interests."

It is a warning worth heeding, especially when we consider the source, a man characterized by many pundits as the most political President of modern times. But more so, we should mark his words because a sense of common purpose may be our last salvation from a Government tugged apart by self-serving and powerful interest groups, all having an unhealthy influence on the public policy decisions affecting every American.

There are over 2,500 such groups, also known as political action committees (PAC's), making sure today that Washington knows—and acts upon—their pet concerns. And because money talks, these groups are speaking very loudly indeed.

Recently the Federal Elections Commission released a report stating that over \$75 million was contributed by PAC's to political candidates of their liking during the past election year. To compare, PAC contributions in

1974 amounted to \$12.5 million nationwide.

The result has been the fragmentation of American society and purpose, and a rudderless ship of state heading toward a ruinous end.

But there is a ray of hope, coming from suggested reforms in our electoral process. These reforms call for:

The enactment of a public financing law for congressional elections, modeled after the voluntary tax checkoff system partially used to finance Presidential campaigns.

The extension of the term of office for a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from 2 years to 4.

A limit of congressional service of 12 years, allowing for a maximum of three terms for a House Member and two for a Senator.

Finally, one 6-year term for the President of the United States.

All of these measures would lead Government back to the people and place a fatal crack in the foundation of what Common Cause's John Gardner aptly calls "the special interest state."

Mr. Speaker, let me elaborate.

Public financing of campaigns would free political candidates from the clinging need for special interest money by limiting the amount of these contributions while, at the same time, encouraging smaller financial contributions from private citizens. One such idea would limit total PAC contributions per congressional candidates to \$70,000 and cut back individual PAC contributions from a maximum of \$10,000 to \$6,000 per candidate.

This voluntary public financing system, just as importantly, would encourage more people to throw their hats into the ring and seek elective office. Such positions should not be left in the domain of the wealthy or well connected.

Extending the term of office for a House Member is nothing new, first recommended by James Madison at the 1789 Constitutional Convention. The longer term would serve to ease the pressures of raising campaign funds on those we ultimately elect to office. With House Members campaigning every other year now, fundraising is an on-going, unrelenting concern. But, above all, a 4-year term would return Congress to first principles, that is, to representing all the people with the common good in mind.

Next, keeping in mind the public's need for responsive, vigorous Government, a 12-year limit on congressional service should be imposed. Such a cap would clear the arteries of the House and Senate and allow for the free flow of bright, new faces and fresh ideas.

The last reform, with a new President settling in to his first 100 days in office, is perhaps the most important. In an increasingly complex world, buf-

feted by a number of baffling social, economic, and military problems, the most powerful elected leader in the free world should be left as unencumbered as possible in order to pursue the awesome responsibilities of office. One 6-year term would free the President from reelection considerations and interest group pressure.

Woodrow Wilson once said, "The business of government is to organize the common interest against the special interest." These reforms would allow just that. Government getting about its business.●

ELLA TAMBUSSI GRASSO

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, the American people and the people of the State of Connecticut have lost a truly outstanding public servant and an exceptional example of strength and courage.

The late Ella Grasso served in this House with distinction and the State of Connecticut's gain, when she assumed the Governorship, was certainly our loss. Her dedication and unfailing good humor were a source of strength to us all; and her unstinting devotion to public service was truly inspiring.

When it was announced that Governor Grasso would resign her position to assure the people of the State of Connecticut that their chief executive would have the constant leadership so critical to government these days, it was just another example of the outstanding sense of service which characterized this fine lady. We all suffered with her and her family as the ravages of the disease with which she was afflicted attacked her body; and we were gratified and assured as it failed to conquer her spirit. Ella Grasso's courage in the face of adversity was just another example of the truly outstanding character she leaves as an example for us all.

No finer tribute can be paid to the life of this fine woman than that of her son in his eulogy—that she was an outstanding woman, an outstanding public servant, and a truly outstanding mother to her family. Mrs. Vander Jagt and I extend to Mrs. Grasso's family our sincerest sympathy and our sentiment that the memory of her example and courage be a source of strength to them in the future.●

RABBI HECT ADDRESSES INAUGURAL CELEBRATION

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading spiritual leaders from my district, Rabbi Abraham Hect, was asked to participate in the inaugural celebrations here in Washington. Rabbi Hect, who is the president of the Rabbinical Alliance of America and the rabbi of the Shaare Zion Congregation in Brooklyn delivered a moving address based on the Biblical exhortation "and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Mr. Speaker, I insert this eloquent speech by Rabbi Hect in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPEECH OF RABBI ABRAHAM B. HECT

I feel privileged tonight to represent the Orthodox Jewish community of our great and beloved country. It is, indeed an honor to address such a distinguished and illustrious gathering, of our most dedicated and outstanding religious leaders, both clergy and laymen.

The first thought which comes to mind, as I look out upon this impressive audience of remarkable men and women, is contained in the Book of Psalms 133 "Behold how good and how pleasant it is, when brethren also dwell together". When there is a unity of purpose, which brings us all together in a common brotherhood, to celebrate the inauguration of our new president, Mr. Ronald Reagan, it is, indeed, good and pleasant to behold.

For we are gathered here tonight for a specific and unique purpose—to celebrate this inauguration—with love.

I am confident that all of us here are committed to the Biblical exhortation, Leviticus 19 "and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, I am the Lord". The most noble, fundamental feeling towards G-d and man, is love. This love is possible only, when there is a total and complete belief in and dependence on, the Supreme Being—Almighty G-d, with whom our relationship is a personal one. There is a most telling reason why this injunction is followed by the words "I am the Lord".

For, love of fellowman is expected from all of us in the name of G-d. It can be realized, when we minimize and play down the importance of our own egos. When one is self centered and egotistical, ascribing to himself superior virtues, beliefs and concepts, he cannot practice this maxim.

The broader meaning of this Biblical commandment is that we are to give to our neighbor all of our love to everything that pertains to his person, all the conditions of his life, the weal and the woe, which make up his position in the world. We are to rejoice in his good fortune, and grieve over his misfortune, as if it were our own.

We are to assist at everything that furthers his well being and happiness as if we were working for ourselves. We must also keep trouble away from him as carefully as if threatened ourselves. This is something which does lie within our possibilities, and is something which is required of us even towards somebody, whose personality may be actually antipathetic to us.

For the demand of this love is something which lies quite outside the sphere of the personality of our neighbor, and is not based on any of his qualities.

I am the Lord! is given as the motive for this demand. It is something that is expected from us towards all our fellow men: in the name of G-d, Who has given all men the mutual calling of neighbors. Everyone is to find and recognize in everybody else, the furthering of his own well being, the conditions for his own happiness in life. Nobody may look on the progress of another, as a hindrance to his own progress, or look on the downfall of another, as the means for his own rising. Nobody may rejoice in his own progress, if it is at the expense of his neighbors' failure. Man proclaims his love of G-d, through his love to G-d's creatures.

It is here in our own blessed land that the emphasis has always been on the belief in, and dependence on, G-d. We are the only nation on earth to inscribe the motto of "In G-d We Trust", on all of our currency and coins. Lest we ever forget the cause and the source of our material and financial growth and success—we are constantly reminded. This slogan assures the daily recognition of our belief in and dependence on G-d. In Him and Him alone do we place our trust and confidence.

Perhaps, that is precisely the reason why our great republic these United States of America is the strongest and most powerful in the world. Inasmuch as we acknowledge the sovereignty of G-d in all of our activities, and we accept Him as the Ruler of the Universe, it naturally follows, that our country merit His fatherly supervision and concern, for all of the citizens of these United States. His everlasting and perpetual heavenly protection, has been the source of our confidence and hopes, for the future.

Our founding fathers, were men of high and noble principles and religiously motivated. They recognized the vital importance of religion in our daily lives, and they sought to have its influence felt, in the operation of the greatest democracy on earth. They weren't afraid or ashamed to acknowledge and proclaim their belief in and total dependence on G-d. And, therefore, our country developed and grew by leaps and bounds, most assuredly, because of the blessings of that same G-d, in whom the country had proclaimed its trust.

During these past decades there seems to have been a gradual erosion of this faith, which has resulted in a breakdown of some of the most basic and fundamental beliefs practiced by our people for almost two centuries. The deterioration of the home, the prevailing attitude of permissiveness which has translated into promiscuity, homosexuality, narcotics, rape, violence and murder, atheism and loss of respect of G-d, family, government and its institutions, have all added up to a real threat to the present and future of our wonderful country.

With the incoming presidency of Ronald Reagan, there is real hope for a change back to the fundamentals and basics, which made us a great people under G-d. Our new president has sounded the alarm and has caused the masses of our decent, loyal and patriotic citizens, to rally behind him. He represents a return to sanity, decency, self respect and morality. His program spells greatness once again for our country. He will, with the help of G-d and with our co-operation, bring back domestic serenity and national self respect.

We will, under his inspired leadership, once again merit the distinction of leader-

ship in world affairs. His program for a strong America, will reestablish our undisputed position, in the world arena. We look forward to an unprecedented era, under our new president, of great prosperity, patriotism, morality and decency in government, and in society in general.

It is our fervent hope and prayer to Almighty G-d, that Ronald Reagan be blessed from Heaven with good health, long life, inspired leadership and success, in guiding our ship of State through the stormy eighties. May G-d grant our great country, bountiful prosperity, harmony and tranquility, peace in our midst and throughout the entire world. And let us all respond with a mighty Amen.

Thank you and may G-d bless you all.●

ELLA GRASSO

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the late Honorable Ella Tambussi Grasso, former Governor of Connecticut and former Member of the House of Representatives, who passed away earlier this month.

Ella and I were elected to the House in 1971 and we were both assigned to the House Education and Labor Committee. I got to know Ella very well in the 4 years we were seat mates on the committee. She earned my respect for her compassion, her warmth, her intelligence, and her competency.

That she later was elected Governor of Connecticut came as no surprise to me. And her record of success in dealing with the myriad and nettlesome problems facing the Governor of a major American State also came as no surprise to me. She was a thoroughgoing professional.

Ella's death is a loss to her family—to whom I extend my condolences and sympathies—but, also, to Connecticut, to her former colleagues here in the Congress and to all the people of the land.●

SUPERB MAIDEN SPEECH OF
AMBASSADOR MICHAEL NOVAK
AT THE 37TH SESSION OF THE
COMMISSION ON HUMAN
RIGHTS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I commend the first speech of Ambassador Michael Novak given to the 37th session of the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva.

Ambassador Novak had the unenviable duty to speak after the racist and undignified remarks of the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Under these taxing circumstances Ambassador Novak performed with the grace, dignity, intelligence, and precision which America has come to expect of its best diplomats.

I am pleased to enter the full text of Ambassador Novak's speech which was furnished by the Office of Congressional Relations at the Department of State. I thank them for their prompt transmittal of the speech to my office.

The full text of the speech follows:

MICHAEL NOVAK'S SPEECH TO THE 37TH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

First, my congratulations to our new chairman—for his election, but also for the brisk and affable competence he has already shown. May the brevity of my congratulations permit a leap of soul to soul.

This is my first term of service in this Commission. I come new to it. Many of you are distinguished veterans, have borne the heat of the day, struggling for small gains. I ask you to recall, though, what it is like for a new-comer to enter into this environment.

Let me explain what I expected. I grew up as do all children in the United States in the sure knowledge that my family had not simply been born Americans, but had chosen to become Americans—had chosen America precisely because of the sweet sway of its institutions, and the sweet taste of its liberties and rights. The attraction of the United States upon immigrants, who have streamed toward America from every region of the world, lies in its human rights. "Boat people" still come to our shores—to breathe air that is free.

When I was a child, one of my first vivid memories was implanted by the invasion of Poland in 1939. When the report came on the radio, my father told me that that day might mark the most important event of my life. Within a few weeks one army from one direction, another from the other border, overwhelmed Poland and carved it into two. Speak of occupying armies!

My earliest memories, then, are of newsreels showing endless bombings, endless columns of refugees, and, by the end, the endlessly sad faces and gaunt bodies of those liberated from the death camps; the stacks of corpses; the mass burial sites; the chimneys of cremation. Thus, I was touched recently when Pope John Paul II went as one of his first papal visits to Auschwitz. In his famous address to the United Nations in New York, the pontiff later called attention to how the declaration of human rights came about. That declaration, he said arose, above every other factor, from the millions of victims of the holocaust, the total abrogation of whose rights made the world resolve: That the whole world, not a few nations only, ought to have a bill of rights.

My fellow Representatives, I cannot forget that we sit in this room because of the unbelievable suffering of millions of persons like ourselves—older, younger, skinner, fatter, many who otherwise might have lived as long as the oldest persons in this room . . . but they were not permitted to live.

Our work here flows from their interrupted lives. The declaration of human rights is a memorial to their sacrifice. Our work is an attempt to draw some small good from so much evil.

These are the noble obligations with which I have always associated human rights. Human rights mean respect for human beings, recognition of each other's dignity. They mean cooperation, mutuality, negotiation. They mean the voice of reason.

Yet in my very first days within this commission, imagine my shock when I heard, as I did hear in this room, so much hatred, so many lies, such squalid racism, such despicable anti-semitism—all in the sacred name of human rights.

I have heard in this chamber attacks upon "Zionism" in accents of a murderous hatred not heard since the days of the Nazis. It is as though this chamber has retrogressed by forty years—as though this is, not 1981, but 1941, and not in Geneva, but along the Hitler-Stalin axis.

In 1945, as I say, there were only some fifty nations in the world and these few established the United Nations. Today there are some 160 member nations; more than one hundred new states.

Among these new nations stands tiny Israel. There is an ancient saying about Israel. The Lord God Jehovah promised Moses a "land of milk and honey." There is a wry modern joke in Israel which notes: "Unfortunately, the Lord did not promise oil." Israel is not a land rich in resources. It is a beautiful land. Yet much of it was for centuries desert land unsuited for agriculture, and nearly bereft of significant industries.

Yet, overcoming all obstacles, the Israelis have built a nation to rival any in the world in its sciences, its arts, its symphonies, its free press, its institutions of just and humane procedures. When some of my distinguished colleagues attempt to portray Israel as a land without human rights, we must ask them, compared to what? Few nations have developed institutions, or can exhibit to the public eye a record of humane practice as highly developed as those of Israel.

The United States has deep and profound respect for Israel. The United States also has admiration for the wisdom, human courage, and respect for human rights shown by many Arab nations. Our Arab brothers and sisters face many problems besides those of Israel. Fratricidal wars serve no one's true hopes. There are too many fratricidal wars. Peace and prosperity come with mutual respect. Mutual respect is the goal of further progress. It is also the indispensable means to it.

My new delegation—and new government—have learned from history to honor the high spiritual achievement of Arab culture, the brilliance, sensitivity and natural courtesy of so many of its citizens (which we have experienced even in this room). We respect its antiquity as a sophisticated and developed culture—an antiquity of which a new nation like ours can only stand in awe. We admire the personal courage and wisdom of many Arab leaders.

The people of the United States were immensely touched when three leaders of the world, one Muslim, one Christian, one Jewish—three children of Abraham—stood together in mutual respect, difficult cooperation, and painstaking negotiations. We commend Israel for giving back land seized in war. We commend Egypt for the spectacular courage and humanity it flashed before the eyes of the human race, in deeds that will endure as long as human history is written.

Our delegation is new, but the charges heaped against Israel before this commis-

sion are old. They have long since been aired, objectively examined, and discharged in the dustbin. The State of Israel is a fact. The Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty is a fact. The Camp David Accords are a fact. These are realities to which passion must accommodate itself. They are realities which ground future advances, future hopes.

The American people deeply admire a tone of reasoned discourse, the demonstration of mutual respect, a dispassionate sense of moderation and compromise—qualities which we have often observed in the exemplars of Arab culture. But I am afraid that the hatred, unreason and wildness of language manifested in this room—once they become widely known—are unlikely to be admired by the American People. They have embarrassed, and often bored, this assembly.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first speech of my delegation, let it end on a note of vision.

My delegation wishes to honor the Egyptian delegate, and through him the great and noble human being who has captured the love and esteem of millions of human beings, President Sadat. Exactly because he is an example of Arab brotherhood, he is an example of human brotherhood—exactly because he is the latter, he fulfills the highest aspirations of the former. We would wish to be as great in spirit—and in the eyes of history—as he.

My delegation wishes also to honor Israel, because few nations have achieved more in so short a national lifetime. We admire Israel profoundly, Mr. Chairman. Her destiny and ours—let the world note—are irretrievably joined. We share the same high vision of human rights on which the traditions of this commission are based. We are, none of us, without sin. Yet neither is any nation, represented in this chamber or in any other, that accuses us.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation is delighted to work with you in this assembly, depressingly ugly as its proceedings often seem. We well know that pearls come from oysters, silk from worms, butterflies from caterpillars—and great human vision from poor human clay. ●

IN HONOR OF THE RETIREMENT OF PETE MILLIGAN

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days a man I am proud to have had as a friend for nearly two decades is going to depart for the leisurely life of retirement in Florida. I am referring to C. G. "Pete" Milligan, who my colleagues from Illinois have known for many years as the assistant vice president of government relations for Illinois Bell Telephone Co. On March 1, Pete is closing out a 35-year career with the Bell System where he has held a variety of management positions.

Many of us who served in the Illinois General Assembly know Pete from our days in Springfield. Others have known him only since their days in Washington. But, in either instance, I am sure my colleagues feel as I do:

Pete Milligan always has been a man of unquestioned integrity, utmost sincerity, unflagging loyalty, and total reasonableness. He has represented his company and his industry well. Pete would be quick to point out that his golf scores belie his enthusiasm for the game or the size of the catch his enthusiasm for fishing. In turn, I would be quick to point out that his warmth, his low-key personality and his great sense of humor belie his enthusiasm for his job and his devotion to the legislative process.

Over the years, I have observed that Pete is fond of quoting Murphy's Laws. That being the case, as Pete and his charming wife, Patty, retire to Florida where Pete hopes to bring his too-long neglected golf skills to a level many desire, but few attain, I would merely remind Pete of Murphy's third law: "Everything takes longer than you think."

I know my colleagues from Illinois join me in wishing Pete and Patty Milligan a most happy and healthful retirement. ●

MILT ZIEHN

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I stand before you today to honor a truly dedicated and public-spirited resident of my district, Milt Ziehn, or Mr. Little League as he is known throughout the Greater Sacramento area.

A native of Ione, Calif., located in the adjoining district of my colleague, NORM SHUMWAY, Mr. Ziehn had his start in Little League a quarter of a century ago as the temporary secretary for one of our area leagues. At the present time he remains the district 6 administrator.

As Don Bloom, sports editor for the Sacramento Union, wrote recently, Mr. Ziehn's contributions are "unprecedented," which is why he has been honored as the first inductee into the Greater Sacramento Area Little League Hall of Fame. I am pleased to join all Sacramentans in honoring this outstanding individual. Milt Ziehn's commitment to the development of our young people is laudable and he deserves our utmost gratitude.

In addition, I respectfully submit Don Bloom's article detailing the career of Milt Ziehn to be included in the RECORD.

ZIEHN INAUGURAL HALL INDUCTEE

(By Don Bloom)

"Little League is nothing more than a free baby-sitting service."

"Little League is the greatest thing that's ever happened to kids."

"Little League is dominated by the early maturing boys who get the idea they're going to become major leaguers."

"Little League is wonderful because it is run by dedicated volunteers whose main concerns are about our youngsters' happiness."

For those of us who have spent a minimum of a decade donating time to a recreation which has far more good than bad points, the above comments are familiar. What it boils down to is you get out of Little League what you put into it. Neither the players nor the parents should overemphasize its importance, but rather just treat it as a low-key instrument to a fun time in everyone's life.

The man most versed on this subject is Milt Ziehn, Mr. Little League to those of use who've known his role in the development of thousands of youngsters. Nobody can accuse Sacramento of not having a Hall of Fame for every occasion. People who have given a large percentage of their free time have been justifiably honored. However, not until Don Northam and Ed Collins decided there should be a Greater Sacramento Area Little League Hall of Fame did the name Milt Ziehn get the recognition it deserves.

Ziehn, a softspoken native of Ione, is Little League's answer to The Man Who Came To Dinner. He never even knew it existed until February 1956, when he accepted the job as "temporary secretary" for the Grant Little League. After seeing "more than a thousand games" and handling an assortment of positions, Ziehn remains the District 6 administrator.

Ziehn's work in this field is unprecedented. That's why he will become the first person inducted into the Hall of Fame Nov. 19 at the Holiday Inn on Date Avenue near Madison. The banquet will be a fitting climax to the career of a wonderful man who's done an unbelievable job for a quarter of a century.

With the support of many friends, you've come a long way, Milt. For a man who admits, "I knew absolutely nothing about Little League," you've worn plenty of hats. Who would have thought you could fall in love with Little League and reach such a height as becoming a member of the National Board of Directors?

Looking back, Ziehn said, "When they couldn't find anybody to be president at Grant, I took that job for three years. I went to games every night. Many times I'd watch two innings at three games six days a week. I just figured it was my responsibility."

Through the decades, parents have spelled relief Z-i-e-h-n. He always was there when he was needed. "It's frustrating to see so few doing so much for so many," he said. "It remains the same today. My only disappointment is that parents and nonparents aren't lending a hand."

"Sure, there are good and poor managers. But it's difficult to get good ones for hundreds of teams. Most of them are high-class, ordinary people. Yes, I've had some experiences with screamers and I've asked a few of them to resign."

Among Ziehn's responsibilities was dealing with allowing girls to play. Times have changed since the ruling was made a few years ago. "The clamor has died down on discrimination," he said. "Not many girls are playing now and fortunately none of them have been hurt."

"One family took my league to court. The girl's parents wanted a parent or a friend to

be present during practices and games so she wouldn't be touched where she shouldn't be touched. But there was no such ruling for boys. Some managers wouldn't agree to attempt to help the girl if she were hurt because of a possible lawsuit. One unintentionally patted a girl on the seat as a gesture of encouragement and her parents got mad.

"One girl advanced to Senior Little League. When she got on base, the players ignored her. They let her steal when she wanted, never tried to force her out or make a tag on her. She finally became disgusted with it and quit."

Ziehn also has a handle on why Taiwan keeps winning the World Series in Williamsport, Pa. He said, "Taiwan has won the Little League, Senior Little League and Big League World Series more times than any country. Yes, they've been investigated. And their ages have been correct. In fact, the Taiwanese are more thorough than we are because their government runs it."

"The United States wouldn't allow more than one league in a population of 15,000 without a waiver. Taiwan was given a much higher figure because the U.S. wanted to give new countries more flexibility to make it international."

"Another thing to remember is the Taiwan kids are regimented and ours aren't. They play all year around over there. It's also interesting to note their championship teams never have been from the same league."

"What also helped them for awhile was they were allowed double-elimination tournaments. It isn't mandatory, but we can do it now, too. But I don't like it. It's too much for 12-year-olds."

Ziehn prefers not being a lonely figure in the Hall of Fame. He said, "I would like to see them induct one person from each district every year. It takes a lot of volunteer help to run the hundreds of teams involved. I don't think longevity should be 25 years, but anyone who serves for 10 years—as a board member, manager, coach, groundskeeper or a person working in the snack bar—should be considered."●

BISHOP MILTON MATHIS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Congressman MINETA and myself, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of our colleagues the appointment of my constituent, Bishop Milton Mathis, to the post of jurisdictional bishop, California Northwest, Churches of God in Christ, Inc.

Pastor Mathis has been associated with the Prayer Garden Church of God in Christ in San Jose for the last 38 years. He has been a leader in establishing the church as a focus of community help for those in need of assistance in housing, food, clothing, and counseling. He was a former member of the San Jose Human Relations Commission and he has provided needed help and services to persons incarcerated in the Santa Clara County

jail facilities. He has worked to foster a spirit of understanding between the various ethnic communities of our city.

The new bishop will assume the responsibility of chief executive and spiritual leader, representing the 160 churches from Bakersfield to Redding. It is the largest jurisdiction in the worldwide church organization.

It is people like Bishop Mathis who illustrate just what one individual with hard work can do to help his fellow men and women. We are delighted that his church has recognized what we in San Jose have long known—Milton Mathis is a remarkable man.●

A BLEAK ENERGY FUTURE

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1981, President Reagan announced the immediate elimination of virtually all price and allocation controls on crude oil, gasoline, and propane. According to the new administration, this would result in two positive accomplishments: Free enterprise increasing petroleum production and developing alternative energy sources, as well as reducing the present rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the American oil companies are going to survive splendidly. I am afraid, however, the American people are not going to fare as well, with rising gasoline costs for running our automobiles, with rising costs for heating our homes, and with rising costs for providing electricity.

The new administration must believe the American people have not sacrificed enough and can continue to dig deeper and deeper into their pockets to pay these bills. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, many of their pockets are already empty. Inflation is no longer the new kid on the block. The big problem is trying to get rid of him by reducing energy costs.

It has become increasingly difficult for Congress to explain to the American people, and particularly to my fellow New Englanders, why they are spending more and more on energy while the Federal Government seems to be doing less and less to keep energy costs within the reach of most Americans.

Granted, Mr. Speaker, no one wants big government breathing down their backs, but if there is one area that requires aggressive and meaningful government involvement—I contend it is the area of energy.

Ever since the issue of decontrolling domestic petroleum prices reared its unwelcome head on Capitol Hill, I

have been consistently opposed to its imposition on the American people. I realize what it would mean to everyone's pocketbook.

Nevertheless, when the majority of my colleagues voted in support of President Carter's move to decontrol petroleum products, my dissatisfaction was at least in part lightened by the vision of Congress enacting a strong windfall profits bill, which would recapture a substantial portion of the windfall profits American oil companies would reap at the expense of the American people, and channel this revenue toward the development of alternate energy sources. It was championed as such an effort, and the House debates on the windfall profits conference bill bear this out. This, however, is not how things turned out.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Windfall Profits Tax Act of 1980 was emasculated when the 96th Congress could only agree to apply the windfall profits tax to \$227.3 billion of the \$1 trillion excess profits the oil companies would be receiving, thanks to the decontrol proposal.

Worse yet, only 15 percent of the taxed profits would be directed toward mass transit programs and alternative fuels research.

Promises made by the proponents of decontrol were not met. Despite gradual decontrol, the American public was let down, as even steeper energy costs became unwelcome guests in every household.

Thus it was of little help bringing the American people out of their energy dilemma. In fact, Mr. Speaker, their hands were being tied behind their backs—they had no real sense of what their energy future would be like. They could only resign themselves to higher energy costs, and a higher rate of inflation.

Time has not changed the reality of continually rising energy costs. President Reagan's action, once again, Mr. Speaker, compels the American people to bite the bullet even harder.

The President's recent action could not have come at a more inopportune time for most Americans. This is particularly true for New England, which has been experiencing one of the worst and most energy-expensive winters in its history. It is no longer a matter of reducing thermostats from a comfortable 70 degrees to 65 degrees. It means reducing thermostats from 65 degrees to a bitter 60 degrees, or even less.

In the dead of winter, New England—which already has 40 percent higher residential per capita energy costs than the rest of the Nation—will be witnessing a 9-cent-per-gallon increase in heating oil and gasoline

within the next few weeks. This assured 9-cent increase, Mr. Speaker, laughs in the face of the President's earlier prediction of only a 3-cent increase for this time period.

Because of the President's action, the American oil companies will squeeze another \$775 million from New Englanders this winter. The average Massachusetts household's fuel bill is expected to increase by 33 percent—the average household now paying as much for heat, as it pays in government taxes.

And what about New England's electric bills, Mr. Speaker? Well, they are going to be increased just as dramatically. Boston Edison Co. predicts that its average customer will pay 71 percent more for electricity in 1981 than they did in 1980. On a monthly basis, the increase would push the bill for a family of four served by Edison from an average of \$36.50 last year, to \$62.50 in 1981, most of which will show up in the fuel adjustment portion of the bill. This is not small wonder, considering 79 percent of all New England's energy sources is oil, and only 13 percent of its oil is domestically produced.

What is even worse, Mr. Speaker, is that New Englanders see no end to this madness because they have cut back their power use between 10 and 11 percent from last year. As one Boston Edison official said, "These customers have basically 'bottomed out,'" with these higher prices expected to reduce overall sales of power to residential customers by only 1.5 percent this year.

For the rest of the Nation, Mr. Speaker, a hefty sum of \$11.7 billion will be squeezed out of the American consumer between now and September 30. Is this going to do anything to reduce inflation? Absolutely not. If anything, it will only serve to add fuel to inflation's already raging fires.

It is expected, Mr. Speaker, that the immediate effect of decontrol of oil prices on the rate of inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI), is likely to increase in the range of 1.1 to 1.4 percent. To illustrate this even further, the energy components of the CPI accounted for an increase of 1.8 percent in the aggregate CPI between December 1979 and December 1980. This contribution to the CPI represented nearly one-sixth of the percentage increase in the CPI since 1979.

Additional information regarding how increased energy costs have helped to aggravate inflation can be gleaned from the following tables:

TABLE 1.—CONSUMER PRICE INDEX FOR ALL ITEMS AND ENERGY COMPONENTS: DECEMBER 1979 TO DECEMBER 1980

[Index: 1967 equals 100]

Component	December 1979	December 1980	Percent change
CPI-U: All items.....	229.9	258.4	12.4
Composite energy.....	313.7	370.4	18.1
Gasoline.....	313.9	373.3	18.9
Electricity.....	224.7	262.3	16.7
Natural gas.....	332.6	381.5	14.7
Fuel oil.....	507.3	610.0	20.2

Calculated by CRS staff.

The weights of relative importance of energy components established in December 1979 are:

Type of energy expenditure	Relative weight in the CPI, in percent
Gasoline.....	5.619
Electricity.....	2.008
Natural gas.....	1.384
Fuel oil.....	1.058
Coal and other fuels.....	.148
Motor oil and coolant.....	.087
Total composite energy (rounded figure).....	10.313

It is ironic that before decontrol, Americans were only at the mercy of the OPEC pricing and production whims. Now, Mr. Speaker, with total decontrol, the American people will be subject to the results of the latest round of ping-pong pricing games between America's oil companies and OPEC. We will have replaced the Federal Government's pricing practices with the American oil companies pricing schemes.

If the future is built upon the past, then I am not optimistic about our energy future. To understand my misgivings, let's look at what decontrol has really accomplished since 1979. Better yet, let's see what the American oil companies have done for or to America.

In 1973, America was producing over 9 million barrels per day in the lower 48 States, with the domestic price of oil being \$3 a barrel. In 1980, we were producing less than 7 million barrels per day, and the price has gone up 13 times since 1973.

In 1972, the year before OPEC began to jack up oil prices, the oil industry earned about 15 percent of the total profits of American industry. But, looking at the first 6 months of 1980, oil companies earned almost 40 percent of all the profits earned by all of America's corporations. This certainly does not leave much room for the rest of America's industries to prosper.

Mr. Speaker, increased oil companies' profits and rising energy costs indicate that we are truly headed for economic disaster if America's productivity continues to be hampered.

With the administration and Congress talking about increasing production incentives in an effort to allow

manufacturing companies more profits for capital investments, it will be no small wonder when American industry will not be able to find the money to do this.

Decontrol, to these American firms, means capital starvation and a stagnating economy, as these companies, the backbone of the American economy, will have to pay more for the energy they use.

It seems awfully ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, for the administration to cite America's basic industries as needful of Government assistance through tax reform measures, but with almost the same wave of the hand, causing them to incur additional production costs, thus reducing their profit margins. Aggravating their already ailing economic situation with this latest action will be like giving them cake with one hand, and vinegar, with the other, to wash it down.

The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, itself will not escape the ravaging effects of decontrol. The Federal deficit is expected to increase by \$15 billion in 1982—owing to increased Federal costs for low-income energy assistance, unemployment compensation—750,000 workers will be affected by total decontrol—and for filling the strategic petroleum reserve.

Perhaps, though, the American people will become immune to these added costs for energy and put on a complacent smile whenever it is announced that the American oil barons are winning the battle against the foreign oil sheiks when they reduce America's dependence on foreign oil. But, Mr. Speaker, will this be welcomed news as we are merely replacing oil sheiks with oil barons?

I wish I could paint a prettier picture for the American people. Perhaps I could if these higher prices were directed toward making alternative fuels competitive. This could offer some ray of hope for American consumers if the administration had coupled decontrol with a strenuous effort to create real competition between alternative energy sources. But, the administration has not done this, nor did the previous administration.

The facts speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker. With the Reagan administration proposing to slash the solar budget for next year by more than 60 percent from the \$605 million level proposed by former President Carter; to eliminate the new solar energy and energy conservation bank that was created just last year; to cut various energy conservation programs in half from the \$931 million Mr. Carter had proposed; to substantially cut into the synfuels program; and to drop all subsidies for the production of alcohol for automobile fuel, who or what will take up the void created by the virtual cessation of any Federal encouragement

or assistance in energy-related projects except those that are—to follow the trend in the Reagan budget proposals—confined to high-risk research and development projects with a potentially large payoff, and not mere demonstration or development projects? America's oil companies? Only through self-deception could I say "Yes."

At this moment, Mr. Speaker, the oil companies control most of the other energy areas where we might expect relief from our dependence on oil. Look at coal; 40 percent of the coal reserves are owned by the oil companies. Or nuclear energy. The oil companies control most of the uranium. Geothermal, solar energy, and shale oil have not escaped, either.

The oil companies, Mr. Speaker, have a lock on the energy resources of this country. And alternative energy resources are not going to be developed on a pace and on a scale determined by an industry that recognizes that fast development of alternative energy sources will only curtail their own profits. To me, it is as simple as that. A company is not going to breed its own competition.

Though I recognize the fact that energy research and development require long-range investment of time and dollars, I would much rather prefer my energy future to be guided by the Federal Government in cooperation with private industry—a pair that would stimulate real competition within the energy industry—than the American oil companies which serve only one master, their burgeoning bank account.

In the fall of 1973, we realized what energy dependence on OPEC oil meant. A massive Project Independence was envisioned by the American people as a way to diversify America's energy mix and reduce our dependence on foreign energy sources. Today, we stand at the crossroads of our energy destiny. Mr. Speaker, I fear that the present administration is formulating a Project Dependence for the American people.

Increased energy costs and a closing off of Government support for energy programs is hastening an energy and economic dark age for America.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans begin to spend 2 weeks or more worth of salary a month to cover their energy expenditures, there will be nothing left over to invest in America.●

DR. RUTH LOVE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay

the highest tribute to a very important member of my community. On Tuesday, February 17, 1981, the Oakland Unified School District will honor Dr. Ruth Love in a special testimonial dinner. Dr. Love has been the superintendent of the Oakland public schools for the past 5 years.

It is with the deepest appreciation and gratitude that we pay tribute to Dr. Love on the eve of her departure. Dr. Love has accepted the position of superintendent of the Chicago School District and will be leaving for her new post in March.

Dr. Love has brought many things to the city of Oakland and the students she has served. Not only has the achievement of the students improved, but she has brought many innovative ideas and practices to the students of Oakland. Among these new programs is adopt-a-school, which links private industry to public education. This, as with many other programs, has been a great success.

Dr. Love came to Oakland from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, D.C., where she was the Director of the right-to-read program. In this program she was challenged with developing and instituting programs at every educational level designed to improve reading and literacy.

It is with a great deal of sadness that we bid Dr. Love farewell. We know that the students of the Chicago School District are very fortunate, as we have been fortunate in the last 5 years. I would like to join with the city of Oakland, the Oakland Unified School District, and every parent, teacher, and student in the Oakland schools in wishing Dr. Love success and good fortune in her new post.●

SUBMINIMUM WAGE PROPOSAL

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend an article to my colleagues on the proposal to create a subminimum wage. I have opposed this change in the past and I found William Greider's article in the February 15 edition of the Washington Post to be a thoughtful discussion of my views on the issue. The article follows:

THE MINIMUM WAGE LITMUS TEST (By William Greider)

The "Battered Liberal" syndrome which afflicts so many in Washington these days has produced an unattractive side-effect, a willingness among some confused liberals to trade off pieces of the great liberal pie that belong to someone else.

This is done to show the new conservative crowd in town that thinking liberals can be

hard-headed and practical, too, a token of earnestness.

For instance, The New Republic, a neo-conservative journal which styles itself as the voice of liberalism, has studied the matter of minimum wage laws and concluded earnestly that conservatives are right about them. On reflection, after 40 years of knee-jerking to the New Deal, The New Republic finds the minimum wage is a bad thing because it inhibits the creation of more jobs for poor kids, especially poor black kids whom, it is well known, The New Republic cares about deeply. This change of heart is known around Washington as "facing the New Realities."

Okay, I am in favor of thinking, even among liberals. But it's my impression that most of The New Republic crowd went to Harvard and that none of them faces the slightest possibility of actually having to work for the minimum wage, not for a little while and certainly not for the rest of their lives. The federal minimum wage is \$3.35 an hour, which, despite periodic increases, is unchanged in real terms since 1963.

The 5.6 million Americans who do work for the minimum wage are probably unaware of the New Realities; they are still mired in Old Realities. Millions of people in America work at dull, grubby, deadend jobs and they are still poor, millions of them. If you work full-time at the minimum wage these days trying to support a family of four, you earn about \$6,600 a year. This is a long way below Harvard and even \$800 below the official federal poverty line.

But if you undermine the minimum wage, you are depressing the wages of many millions more. For starters, there are another 5 million or so who work below the minimum wage, whose jobs are exempt from its coverage but whose pay levels are still influenced by it. Then there are probably 5 or 10 million more who work at jobs above the minimum wage but whose incomes are pegged to it. Sometimes, this is done explicitly in labor contracts for garment workers or retail clerks or others. More generally, the federal wage minimum is an arbitrary floor—established politically in pursuit of social equity—which affects wages way up the line from \$3.35 an hour.

This is what the old liberals of organized labor fully understand even if new liberals, young people who prefer to pursue more fashionable causes, do not.

It is why old liberals routinely go to battle stations when Republicans like Sen. Orrin Hatch or President Reagan come forward, once again, with the hoary old idea of a subminimum wage for teenagers.

A subminimum invites employers to fire older workers and hire younger ones on the cheap. If the subminimum expires for a young worker after six months, it invites the employer to fire that young worker and hire another one. Even if you are willing to overlook those problems, a subminimum will have a generally depressing effect on wages at the bottom of the American economy, diluting the impact of the federal minimum on America's secondary labor market—that scruffy sector of low-paying jobs, mostly nonunion, where competition is fierce, employee turnover is high and fringe benefits are scant.

The minimum wage, therefore, is a wonderful litmus test for contemporary ideology, a simple measure of First Principles. Does the government have any business restricting the free market in labor at the bottom of the economy in pursuit of minimal social equity? If your answer is no, then

as a matter of logical consistency you should also be opposed to labor unions, health and safety rules, and the child-labor laws, each of which does the same. And you should also think of yourself as a conservative.

Strangely enough, the minimum wage issue, popular as it is in Republican business theology, is actually an instance in which conservatives are guilty of the classic liberal fallacy—focusing on one narrow problem and ignoring the much larger consequences which the proposed solution will have. The conservative critique has been superb at identifying this weakness in liberal programs, so I await patiently to see if these points are made in *The Public Interest* or *National Review*.

The minimum wage, whether one likes it or not, is connected intimately to all of the other things which conservatives do not like about the federal government—the welfare benefits in cash and kind provided to poor people, the working variety and the other kind. It is truly mindless to pretend that Congress cannot alter one without directly affecting the other, probably in ways which nobody wants.

If conservatives will read their own literature on welfare or, better yet, go talk to some live poor people, they will see that most poor families move back and forth between work and welfare and that the breakpoint for those decisions is often the gap between a minimum-wage job and the collective benefits of welfare, food stamps, housing subsidies and so forth. This gap is already quite small and, reasonably enough, many people will choose the security of welfare over the insecurity of a low-wage job, subject to layoffs and termination, especially if the money difference isn't that much. Thus, if Republicans wish to lower the minimum wage, they are effectively making it harder to get off welfare. The conservative answer might be: Well, then, let's lower welfare too. I doubt that confused liberals will accept that remedy.

On the subject of black teenagers and jobs, liberal thinking may be too mushy with wishful thinking, but conservative thinking is flat-out illogical. President Reagan, in one breath, points to the thick want-ad pages of *The Washington Post* and wonders aloud why people can't find jobs when there are obviously so many of them begging for workers. In the next breath, he proposes this solution: Create more jobs which pay lousier wages—only \$2.50 an hour. Question: If slothful teenagers will not take any of those jobs in the want ads, why should we assume they will take worse jobs at the subminimum wage rate? Answer: We shouldn't. The problem of teenage unemployment, especially among blacks, is more complicated than that.

More to the point, the subminimum for teenagers is a bad idea whose time has passed. If the government were going to make a special exemption for young people, 16 to 19 years old, in order to encourage businesses to make more work places for this group, it should have done this 10 years ago, not in 1980. During the 1970s, the bulging youth population poured over the economy, oversupplying available spaces in the job market and in education. But now the huge baby boom is past; the youth labor pool is already shrinking and will get smaller and smaller in the next decade. If Ronald Reagan does nothing about the problem of youth unemployment, it will be ameliorated

and probably even go away in a few years. He could take the credit for doing nothing.

However, this demographic reality poses a big problem for employers like hotels and restaurants and fast-food chains who hire more of their workers at the entry-level wages of the federal minimum. Any economist knows that the shrinkage of the youth labor pool—a smaller number of new workers coming into the labor market each year—should put a powerful upward pressure on pay at that end of the economy, as businesses must bid up wages to secure enough workers. Thus, if the new administration sets about gutting the minimum wage, the effect will be to restrain that natural upward pressure in the world of lousy wages. If the folks at *The New Republic* do not grasp the implications of this, I guarantee you that the folks at McDonald's do.

Ronald Reagan has a sentimental view of America at work which is fundamentally flawed. It tugs at our nostalgia but collides with the facts. Reagan sees smokestack America, but in 1980 industrial production is no longer the dominant engine of our economy, especially the basic industries which he romanticizes in his antigovernment rhetoric. Reagan speeches evoke blue-collar workers, drawing first-class union wages, owning their own homes and bitching about taxes. He is their friend.

But the "new" worker in America isn't employed in a factory. He or she works in "services," perhaps one of those classy high-tech fields but more likely one of the low-paying, nonunionized areas about which we have been talking. An important labor leader neatly summarized this shift in employment by observing that McDonald's hamburgers now employs more workers than U.S. Steel.

The nation and its politicians will need a while to absorb the full meaning of that fact, but this much we already know: Many government policies directed at one sector of the economy may threaten, even injure, the other. Yet the president does not even acknowledge that the national economic landscape is now more complicated than it was in his Illinois boyhood (for a brilliant account of how Reagan's nostalgia collides with reality, see Emma Rothschild's important article, "Reagan and the Real Economy," in *The New York Review of Books*, Feb. 5, 1981).

Work.—The president talks a lot about the importance of work, the sweat of the brow and all that, cherished values which he thinks liberals have ignored. So far, in that regard, Reagan has urged big-city mayors to join his crusade against the minimum wage. A few days later, his chief adviser revealed that the Reagan administration will seek a major reduction in the maximum tax rate on unearned income—nonwage income like dividends from stocks and bonds. Lower wages for people working in the restaurant kitchen; lower taxes for the stockholders dining out front. If this is the new Reaganomics we have been hearing about—getting the government off the backs of the rich and the poor alike—it sounds a lot like the Republicanism of old.

But the president is certainly right about liberals and work. It's time for them to begin thinking again about how they feel about work. ●

THE MIDDLE EAST POLICY SURVEY: AN ESSENTIAL SOURCE OF INFORMATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the first anniversary of the publication of the Middle East Policy Survey, a biweekly report from Washington and the Middle East which is edited by Kenneth Wollack and Richard Straus. I find the survey to be an indispensable asset to those of us involved in the making and following of U.S. foreign policy toward the Middle East. The Middle East Policy Survey is essential because it is completely objective and because it provides information not provided by the daily press and weekly news magazines.

The credentials of Ken Wollack and Richard Straus are well known to Members of Congress. Wollack served as legislative director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee for 7 years. Straus was legislative liaison at the committee and prior to that was legislative assistant to former Representative Peter Frelinghuysen.

Because of the wide contacts of the editors here in Washington, the survey contains inside information on the administration's Mideast policymaking, as well as on congressional maneuvers relating to that policy. The survey is also very useful in pointing to emerging foreign policy trends in the new administration, not only in relation to the Middle East but in other areas as well.

I congratulate Ken Wollack and Richard Straus on the first anniversary of the Middle East Policy Survey and look forward to reading it for many years. ●

ANTINUKE STRATEGY CONFERENCE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, most Americans understand that the fundamental cause of the drastic rise in petroleum product prices they have experienced over the past 6 years is the fact that the United States lost its reserve production capacity. Due to many factors, but prime among them Federal policies, the ability of this country to simply open the tap a little wider whenever OPEC threatened an unfair price increase was lost.

When we lost that reserve production capacity, Americans did not lose

merely the ability to keep oil prices down, we also lost our energy independence, and became increasingly dependent on foreign countries for our energy needs.

There is little need for me to remind any Member of this House of the dangers to which energy dependency has exposed this country which include possibilities of severe economic damage through ever higher oil prices, possibilities of political blackmail by oil producing countries, and the increased international tensions we must face in the Persian Gulf.

Obviously the best way out of this predicament is for the United States to again achieve energy independence. This is not to say that we should not buy any petroleum abroad, but it is to say that we should keep this to a rational minimum. To do this we need to develop additional production capabilities in this country and to develop additional sources of energy.

A tremendous amount of oil is burned in this country to generate electrical energy. There is no logical reason why this fuel should not be replaced by nuclear fuel. But an organized lobby exists to prevent this from happening. The antinuclear lobby has a hidden agenda. It hopes to weaken the United States in order to aid various Third World revolutionary groups which are backed by the Soviet Union.

Recently this antinuclear lobby held its strategy conference for 1981. The Western Goals Foundation, a nonprofit tax exempt educational foundation formed "to rebuild and strengthen the political, economic, and social structure of the United States and Western civilization so as to make any merger with totalitarians impossible," has produced a report on that antinuclear conference which I believe will be of great interest to my colleagues.

The report follows:

ANTINUKE STRATEGY CONFERENCE

Some 350 activists from disarmament, Marxist, antinuclear, revolutionary and environmental organizations attended the fourth national conference of the Mobilization for Survival (MFS) held in Rockwell Hall at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, January 30 to February 1, 1981.

With the hyperbolic rhetoric of paranoia, the Mobilization for Survival conference call, entitled "Building a Strategy for Survival," warned that "We face an imperative of unprecedented urgency" because "Our nation's political institutions have moved sharply to the right" and "The President-elect and much of the new Senate represent the most dangerous combination of foreign militarism, domestic reaction, and callous disregard for the environment."

Although single-issue antinuclear power groups comprise the majority of the MFS local membership, the conference call made it plain that for the coalition leadership, U.S.-Soviet relations and disarmament/democratic struggles are the priorities.

Judging by the conference participants, the overwrought rhetoric about "the escalating danger of . . . nuclear disaster" and "merchants of death" inventing "fantastic

technologies for overkill at a cost of \$500 million a day, robbing our communities of jobs, of food, shelter, health care and peace of mind," only alienated the responsible citizens who are genuinely confused and concerned about unclear safety issues.

Most activists from local antinuclear power groups suggested that the 1981 focus of the coalition's efforts should be local nuclear power issues. These groups approved making the Mobilization's highest priority demonstrations on the March 28th anniversary of the accident at Three Mile Island. Indeed, the MFS did accept a Harrisburg demonstration as one priority, but most efforts will be directed against any planned increase in U.S. military defenses and against deployment of new, updated weapons.

The manner in which the disarmament activists who form the majority of the Mobilization for Survival leadership rammed through their programs in a style that would warm the heart of Joseph Stalin brought into sharp focus the fact that the MFS was organized by veteran U.S. leftists who collaborate with the World Peace Council (WPC). The MFS was formed to bring antinuclear power groups into the campaign for Western disarmament long promoted by the Soviet Union through its covert action and propaganda fronts headed by the WPC.

Nevertheless, several antinuclear power strategies were discussed which received warm approval from the MFS rank and file.

BANKRUPT NUCLEAR UTILITIES

The most dynamic antinuclear power speaker was professor Michio Kaku, a young physicist who described a plan by which antinuclear groups will attempt to bankrupt utilities operating nuclear-fueled electrical generating plants.

The key, according to Dr. Kaku, was to take up the issue of nuclear safety. Dr. Kaku maintained that through prolonged, sustained litigation in which antinuclear groups would repeatedly take the utilities to court to demand in every instance that the most expensive plant safety measures, waste transportation and disposal measures and the like be mandated, the utilities could be forced into bankruptcy.

Kaku emphasized that nuclear groups should cultivate an image with the media that their concern for worker and public safety and cancer. Kaku left unmentioned the such compelling issues as the far larger documentable numbers of deaths and disability from coal mining, from oil drilling, oil tanker accidents, and the health dangers posed by coal ash, a substance whose toxicity is permanent.

According to Dr. Kaku, the Three Mile Island clean-up will be the major focus and crucible for testing the bankruptcy by litigation strategy. Issues to be fought in court include transport of waste and opposition to dumping very slightly radioactive water into the Susquehanna.

He repeated again and again that the effort must be to force Three Mile Island's owners to use the most expensive clean up methods, to bankrupt them and block reopening of the TMI power plant "by any means necessary." Kaku was a vocal proponent of the demonstration in Harrisburg on March 28th.

This demonstration, intended to gain publicity and support for the drive to keep Three Mile Island closed by bankrupting its owners, was made a short-term priority of the Mobilization for Survival.

ANTI-U.S. DEFENSE CAMPAIGN

The Mobilization for Survival leadership did not conceal the fact that it views the local antinuclear power groups and other issues basically as grist for the anti-U.S. defense effort. To fight planned increases in U.S. military strength, MFS called for "unity and solidarity" from such diverse "survival struggles" as "unemployment, nuclear power, disarmament, feminism, gay rights, racism [and] housing."

The MFS Coordinating Committee (CC) offered only two Strategy Proposals. Option I concentrated on disarmament and antinuclear issues and was justified by arguments supporting the "inseparability of the energy and armaments issues" such as "the danger that an interventionist President Reagan may actually initiate military involvement . . . in the Middle East or Central America . . . [and] initiate nuclear war; . . . [and] that Reagan may actually try nuclear blackmail to make the Soviet Union back down on some issue." This leads to the obvious implication that for the MFS hierarchy, defense of the Soviet Union is the primary duty.

Strategy Option II, entitled "Build Cooperation with Human Needs/Social Justice Constituencies" suggested the MFS work with women's, welfare rights, unemployment and labor groups on promoting the ERA, opposing welfare cuts and similar issues.

The MFS leadership tried to slant discussion away from these areas. The first of the "Questions to Ask Ourselves" was "Can an organization so heavily committed to antinuclear issues realistically hope to shift its emphasis?" Yet in thirteen of twenty small discussion groups this approach or a compromise linking disarmament to "saving jobs" and "peace conversion" and supporting Marxist revolutionary groups in Africa and Central America was favored.

The specific action proposals adopted as Major Priorities (limited to a maximum of 4 and meaning that "major staff time, resources, and energy" would be devoted to the program; Support Programs in which MFS would "participate nationally along with other groups . . . give some staff time . . . [and] encourage our network to plug into it;" and Endorsed Programs meaning that "the project can list MFS as an endorser [and] MFS will publicize the activity through its newsletter."

PRIORITIES

1. (Short term) March 28, 1981, demonstration in Harrisburg, PA, on the anniversary of the Three Mile Island reactor accident.

(Long term) Development of support programs including a mass demonstration with civil disobedience for the United Nations Second Special Session on disarmament (SSD). SSD-II will take place in the spring of 1982. The first Special Session on Disarmament in 1978 was the vehicle for a major initiative by the Soviet Union against planned deployment by the U.S. and NATO of new defense systems to replace obsolete ones ineffective against the panoply of new Soviet weapons. This campaign against Western defenses was spearheaded by the USSR's principal political warfare front, the World Peace Council (WPC).

In this light it is interesting that the initiator of this MFS long-term priority proposal was the MFS International Task Force. This MFS International Task Force is led by two WPC activists, Kay Camp of the Women's International League for

Peace and Freedom (WILPF) and Terry Provance of the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC). The proposal was supported by the Los Angeles Alliance for Survival, and the War Resisters League (WRL), both groups with individuals and members involved with WPC activities.

The MFS Coordinating Committee had already endorsed a peace petition campaign to "bring out public opinion." Advance work for the SSD will include working with the U.N. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) via the International Task Force and "liaison with other countries through the International MFS."

2. Jobs for Peace—an effort to place "peace initiatives" on local ballots. According to Detroit MFS head Vic Schumacher, similar initiatives have been considered in referendums in Detroit; Madison, Wisconsin; Oakland, CA; San Francisco and Boston. Schumacher said the Detroit "peace initiative" succeeded in winning 54 percent of the vote.

MFS argues that launching these initiatives in selected areas will "demonstrate concretely that the majority in a particular community favor cutting military spending and increasing domestic spending, to create more jobs and reduce inflation; and that they demonstrate "concrete support and linkage of the peace movement for serious economic survival struggles—employment/inflation."

3. Local multi-issue teach-ins "peace education." These will be in the style of the 1980 "Survival Summer."

SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Six programs were selected for support by the Mobilization for survival. They included the following:

G.E. Boycott.—A national consumer boycott of General Electric, "the single largest company that is involved in every phase of nuclear development * * *. Following the rule of divide and conquer, G.E. alone will be targeted for maximum pressure." [Proposed by Citizens Against a Radioactive Environment in Cincinnati and supported by the Milwaukee MFS].

National Blockade of Diablo Canyon.—The Abalone Alliance of California already is preparing for a state-wide blockade of Diablo, the next major nuclear power plant scheduled to go on line (June at the earliest). MFS will "help elevate the blockade to national participation and significance." [Proposed by the Alliance for Survival of Southern California].

Mobilization to Save the Heartland.—For the summer of 1982, prior to the fall Congressional and Senate elections, calls for demonstrations and "public education" in the Great Plains/Midwest states. The MFS said it has "targeted" this region because it contains two of the largest defense contractors, McDonnell-Douglas and General Dynamics (St. Louis, MO); the major strategic nuclear bases (SAC in Omaha, NE, and Whitman in Missouri); large nuclear facilities and waste sites (Paducah, KY; Calloway, MO; Morris, IL); cities in which hospital and industrial closings are issues (Youngstown, OH; Flint, MI; St. Louis, MO); the area of greatest "New Right" activity which MFS defined as "right to work laws and attack [sic] on liberal senators."

M-X Missile.—Adopting the Soviet line that the U.S. intends to use the MX as a "first strike weapon," the MFS will support the drive to prevent deployment of the MX.

The conference participants viewed this campaign as similar to their successful effort to stop the B-1 bomber, and plan an

"intensive, focussed campaign" that they claimed will be supported by "strong local opposition" opposed to land used by the planned MX basing system. Organizers promoting this plan at the conference were desperately looking for some way to give the anti-MX campaign a "positive" flavor. This led some to support a call for transfer of MX deployment funding for "development of solar heating for homes." The anti-MX campaign was sponsored by the Alliance for Survival, whose leaders include a number of veteran Southern California World Peace Council and Communist Party activists formerly involved with the Los Angeles Peace Council's anti-Vietnam efforts.

Price-Anderson Act.—Effort to persuade Congress to repeal or raise liability limits of this legislation because it is "cited as an economic prop essential to the survival of the nuclear power industry." This also was proposed by the Alliance for Survival and was stated to have the support of Ralph Nader's Critical Mass organization and the Environmental Policy Center.

Registration and the Draft.—"To help give political direction to the anti-draft movement * * * [and] link militarism with unmet human needs," the project would focus on "counter-recruitment" and anti-military propaganda aimed at high school students and work in high schools." The proposal was initiated by MFS Field Coordinator Harold Jordan.

FREE TRADE AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE ARE ALIVE AND WELL IN THE SOUTHWEST

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, too often these days we hear that the free trade and private enterprise system is dead, passé, and nonworkable, but let me point out a sterling example of free enterprise that exists in my own State. Holsum Bakery, of Phoenix, Ariz., has been making baked goods for the citizens of Arizona since 1881, the year that the city of Phoenix was incorporated.

Edward Eisele, who in 1884 purchased the Phoenix bakery, forerunner of today's Holsum Bakery, started his operation producing a mere 200 loaves of bread a day. Today, Holsum produces approximately 64,000 units per hour and delivers them on a daily basis to virtually every city, town, and trading post in Arizona, as well as parts of southern California and Nevada.

From its humble beginnings, the bakery operation has expanded to employ over 400 Phoenicians. Through the continual introduction of new equipment, technology, and the expansion of production facilities, Holsum has consistently been rated among the most modern baking facilities in the country.

Under the leadership of Edward Eisele's son, Lloyd, and the present president, Edward Eisele, grandson of

the founder, the bakery has expanded to serve a market area with over 220 different products. Holsum truly exemplifies the spirit of free enterprise and its success parallels that of Arizona, continually growing and expanding for the better.●

MICHAEL W. MURRAY

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute today to a man whose hard work and dedication have dramatically improved the standard of living and quality of life for the elderly, blind, and disabled across this country and particularly in California. On February 18, Michael W. Murray will be leaving his position as principal regional official for region IX of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. With him go the talents of one of the finest human beings ever employed by the Federal Government.

In his post as PRO, Mike has served as the key representative of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, providing leadership, direction, and oversight for all HHS activities in the region. He has been widely recognized for his sensitive leadership of the Indochinese refugee resettlement program. Mike has worked closely with Governors, Members of Congress, Federal, State, and local officials, and, most importantly, local communities to insure quality care and social equality. He has long been a champion of peoples' rights and has richly earned the respect of countless local, State, and Federal legislators. In addition, Michael is an expert in the areas of aging and social security, bringing a special dimension to his appointment as principal regional official.

During his tenure at HHS, Michael was selected by President Carter to serve as Chairman of the Federal Regional Council and coordinated all regional offices and served as the President's representative.

Prior to his HHS appointment, Michael served as a professional staff member of the Select Committee on Aging and as my key staff assistant in both the U.S. House of Representatives and in the California Assembly.

Perhaps the greatest accomplishments of Mike's career are the abolition of mandatory retirement under the Older Americans Act; the creation of an independent and autonomous department of aging in California, providing advocacy for the elderly; and the establishment of an SSI program in California—through passage of AB-135—providing the highest benefit levels of any State in this country.

Michael's community involvement and total selflessness began early in his career. After receiving his A.B. in philosophy and English from St. Patrick's College, he went on to earn a master of divinity from St. Patrick's and a master of social work from Berkeley. He served as a counselor for the San Francisco Boy's Home, as an assistant pastor at St. Vincent de Paul Church, as a trainer for the western community action training program, and as an adult probation officer.

I recognize that this tribute employs almost every superlative in the English language. These, however, do not come near expressing the immense respect in which Michael Murray is held by his many friends and associates. His legislative talents will be sorely missed by those whose lives he has dramatically improved.●

**MISS SHEREE R. DEAN WINS
VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP CONTEST**

HON. CLINT ROBERTS

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, recently the South Dakota Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary conducted a voice of democracy contest in conjunction with the U.S. V.F.W.

The contest is an excellent forum for patriotism for our Nation's high school students. This year more than 250,000 secondary school students participated in this nationwide contest.

I am pleased to submit at this time the winning speech from my State as delivered by Miss Sheree R. Dean of Wessington, S. Dak. The speech follows:

Now, while I am still young, is an appropriate time for me to pause and reflect on my heritage, assess where I stand today, and look ahead to new horizons.

The birth of my country was fathered by iron-willed families. Pioneers gave their time, their energy, and their courage to protect the principles of the American people. My country, under God, prospered through blood, sweat, and tears, as well as wise dedication and spiritual growth. I commit my faith and determination that the American way of life shall grow and flourish.

Remember when President John F. Kennedy challenged each American by saying, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather what you can do for your country." I will nurture my mind with great thoughts for the betterment of my country, for to think is the source of power.

Freedom is the foundation of my nation. My country, America, is the democracy which has given me the opportunity to be in competition. It is my commitment and responsibility to protect my freedoms.

As I grow to adulthood I will face a changing world with new challenges. There will be more people and fewer resources. There will be vital issues in my government that will

call for wise decisions. I will work to solve problems, utilizing the rich blessings of technology and ingenuity.

Young people's growth and knowledge have put my country in a position of leadership. Coming together is a beginning. Keeping together is progress. Working together is success. America can take the responsibility of leadership. I commit myself in service to those around me and to the era in which I live.

My country has for its support beams, freedom of religion, choice in education, responsibility for service, and a wealth of resources from God. To utilize these privileges I will make each day count with wisdom. I will turn my brain power into learning power, my know-how and abilities to work for my country, America.

Patrick Henry said, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no other way of judging the future, but by the past." I cannot change the past, but I can help to shape the future. Facing the future with faith will encourage me with each endeavor. I commit myself to higher standards of excellence, and to utilize my talents in useful channels.

America stands at the corner of great danger and great challenges. It is time to remember, to count my blessings, to cherish my sacred heritage, and to put it to productive use. My commitment is to season my country with the flavor of hope, encouragement and faith.

My country is my heritage fortified by the hard work and faith of my ancestors plus the technology of the present. I pray that I may help to turn the alloy of past experience and modern technology into a steel of mastery and character that will bless my country.●

MEXICO: NAIVE TOWARD LEFT-IST MOVEMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of Chairman E DE LA GARZA, several members of the House Agriculture Committee traveled to Mexico to meet with Mexican leaders and to discuss problems of agriculture and the growing trend of instability in Latin America.

As a member of the delegation, I witnessed firsthand the importance of good relations between our two nations. We share a common border, engage in extensive trade, and are committed to the rights and freedoms of our respective citizens.

My colleagues are aware of the growing unrest in several of Mexico's neighboring countries. The United States has been especially concerned by recent developments in Nicaragua and El Salvador. As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Foreign Policy, one of the chief purposes of my trip was to ascertain whether Mexican officials share our concern for events in those nations and other

Latin American countries troubled by outside interference and subversion.

During personal meetings with Deputy Foreign Minister Alfonso Rosen Zweig-Diaz, I made clear my concerns. Mexico must join with us in being vigilant against groups—both far right and far left—which advocate the violent overthrow of governments. These groups invariably install authoritarian regimes which deny the rights and freedoms of their citizenry with no hope or promise of ever adopting a democratic system. Together we must work for a middle ground. By ignoring the terroristic activities in Latin America, and thus in effect condoning them, I feel that Mexico is leaving itself vulnerable to these very same anarchic possibilities. Mexico is certainly not insulated from these events and should be more active in opposing them.

We must recognize the economic potential of Mexico. We must recognize the important role Mexico has in maintaining the stability of the Western Hemisphere. We must insure that Mexico is a full partner in the efforts to curb subversion and terrorist unrest in Central America.

In recognizing these factors, however, I believe it is consistent that we ask Mexico to face squarely the present threat that the situation in Nicaragua and El Salvador presents to our mutual security. Just as friends can speak and act frankly with one another, so must we speak to our neighbor, Mexico.

My visit with the Deputy Foreign Minister convinced me that Mexico is looking for candor and consistency—as well as frankness—in U.S. policy directed toward Latin America.

We must work with Mexico and other nations toward policies that will restore stability in Latin America. In doing so, it is right that we ask our Mexican neighbors to recognize that the real threat to their security and ours is the subversion emanating from Cuba and other Soviet-sponsored terrorist forces.●

VFW COMMITMENT—TODD ADKINS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest programs in America is the VFW Ladies Auxiliary Voice of Democracy program. Their national essay theme was based this year on "My Commitment To My Country." Throughout the United States thousands of entries were submitted by patriotic young Americans. The best essay in Texas was written by Todd Adkins of Plano, Tex. Todd is

an outstanding young man who is serving as president of the student council of Plano High.

Here is the excellent VFW statement written by Todd Adkins:

Many years ago in the recorded history of mankind, a suppressed and unhappy group of people crossed over a large body of water to land where they would start a new life—a land which was accurately described as a wilderness. With hard work and diligence, these people struggled through starvation, war, invasion, and natural disaster to carve from this wilderness one of the truly greatest nations in the history of all mankind.

Indeed, America has been carved, and with many different tools. Some were tools of the mind, some were tools of the hand, yet all were tools of the heart. And from these hearts stemmed a devotion; a commitment to serve America in one form or another. Some used their worldly knowledge to lead America in the areas of business, politics, and domestic and international policies.

Others used their hands and served as the craftsmen of America. These were the people who built the homes, established the communities, and erected the cities. Many have called these individuals the backbone of our American society. And who can forget still another group whose courage and determination led us through the worst of times. A group who served with their blood.

Some joined the military to fight in combat; others joined to command. Yet all sacrificed their blood; many, their lives. Politicians, craftsmen, soldiers * * * as a whole, all these men and women shared one common goal—to preserve their freedom and justice; to serve and strengthen America. The politicians didn't devote their lives to politics because they loved politics, but because they loved America, and politics was an important aspect in maintaining America's democracy. The craftsmen of America were not so devoted to building and designing society as what they were to helping society with whatever it needed most. If the best method to serve America was through some form of craftsmanship, then truly, that would be the thing to do.

And what of those who served with their blood? In the Revolutionary War there were over 4,400 deaths on the battlefield. The number of combat deaths in World War II reached an astonishing figure of nearly 300,000. Yet these men didn't fight for the military, but for America. These men didn't die on the battlefield because they wanted to, but because that was what was required to best serve their country. For he who serves his country best does so by best serving his country's needs.

So when I ask myself what will my commitment be to my country, it's ill advised for me to reply, "I'll join the army." It's presumptuous for me to reply, "I'll run for president", because the best commitment I can make to my country is the one that is based on my country's needs, and it's premature to try to determine now what my country will need most from me five, ten, or even twenty years from now.

If, however, I can best serve my country by enlisting in the army, then by all means, I will serve. If America calls on me to enter into the political arena, then by all means, I will enter. If America asks nothing more of me than to be a responsible, law-abiding citizen, then this is what I will do.

My commitment to America parallels strongly with the ever-so-famous statement,

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." My commitment to my country is to serve however America needs me most. And so to America I say, "my heart is at your service."●

ELLA GRASSO

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Richard Byfield Ohn of Indianapolis extends these sentiments concerning our former dear colleague, Ella Grasso:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,

December 17, 1980.

HON. ANDY JACOBS.

DEAR ANDY: I ask this tribute to our only lady Governor be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if possible.

ELLA GRASSO

The tireless worker with the happy face
The State as a family . . . old Connecticut
A friend of the family . . . dear Ella
Who stopped by for a while to give a hand,
To solve some problems . . . impossible problems

Who will now be missed so dearly missed
That empty place at the family table.

My best regards,

RICHARD.●

THE TRAGEDY OF EL SALVADOR

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article which appeared in the Sacramento Union by L. Francis Bouchee of the Council for Inter-American Security.

The subject of the article is the devastating effects of the so-called Carter human rights policy on the political situation in Central America and upon the relationship between our country and that vitally important area.

It is Mr. Bouchee's contention, supported with facts and figures, that Carter's selective "human rights" policy, reinforced by socialistic "reforms" offered by the State Department, has resulted in economic decline, political unrest and violence, and in a growing strength of the Cuban-supported guerrilla left in Central America. We all know the tragic results of Carter's policies in Nicaragua, and Mr. Bouchee contends that they have nearly brought El Salvador to the brink of ruin, vulnerable to a takeover by militant Marxism.

It is important to realize that, in spite of the damage Carter's policies have wrought, the situation in Central America is by no means hopeless. With regard to El Salvador and Guate-

mala, however, the Reagan administration can implement policies that will halt El Salvador's decline and reaffirm our support for pro-U.S. forces in that nation and others in Central America.

TRAGEDY OF EL SALVADOR—REAGAN MUST REVERSE CARTER'S FAILED NEW DIPLOMACY
(By L. Francis Bouchee)

By mid December it was clear that narrowing the Reagan options in Central America before Jan. 20 was the top priority and last hurrah for the McGovernite, new diplomacy crowd Jimmy Carter placed in charge of the so-called Third World in 1977.

It ends like it began. All in the name of something called human rights. Never mind that there are at least 20 times more political prisoners in Nicaragua today than at the height of Somoza's state of siege, or that El Salvador is now a bloody, political and economic basket case.

Accordingly, the new diplomacy crowd sallied through the State Department, and the journalistic camp followers of revolutionary politics in the press have rushed forward to define the Reagan options: Work with and soothe the radicals, or abandon Carter's noble new commitment to human rights and return to what they try to paint as the dark old days of collaboration with forces of reaction and repression.

Those trying to lock in the failed Carter policies overlook the fact that in El Salvador hundreds of victims have fallen in Castro-supported, civil war style violence with over 9,000 killed in the past 12 months. In the first 10 months of 1979, before Ambassador Robert White and the State Department engineered the overthrow of President Romero, violent deaths did not exceed 150, and for 1976 through 1978 there were only 110 terrorist operations in the country and practically none touched ordinary citizens.

Columnists Anthony Lewis, Mary McGrory and other human rights hand-wringers notwithstanding, real human rights (not to mention the bona fide security of the United States) are likely to fare better under the likes of U.N. Ambassador-designate Jeane Kirkpatrick than they have under human rights assistant secretary Patricia Derian.

Dr. Kirkpatrick's human rights recipe includes ingredients other than taking from the rich to give to the poor and bending over side ways to justify every Cuban trained malcontent who shouts human rights while he riddles a policeman or land owner with a rain of bullets. As professional and careful analysts, Dr. Kirkpatrick and other Reagan advisors and appointees know the record of injustice and consistent economic failure that follows like day and night in the wake of ideological Robin Hoods of the "left."

In the case of El Salvador, do we really want to see that Massachusetts-size country of 4.8 million split up what was, until last year, a prosperous agriculture sector into bitter poor, state owned ejidos a la Mexico, or into tiny uneconomical private poverty plots like folks have in Haiti? Is that the irreversible wind of progressive change with which our experts and ambassadors should sail?

Human rights and free human development is and will be on the Reaganite agenda, but hopefully human rights will not be confused with the coddling of juvenile communists and collectivist economists.

From Argentina and Peru, Jamaica and Chile, not to mention Cuba, the record of populist redistributionism and state collectivist economic policy is plain for anyone who looks at the record. Failure. Dismal and absolute.

When Carter's deputy assistant secretary of state for inter-American Affairs told Guatemalan businessmen last year that their country needs a "mild dose of Marxism," businessmen in the economically-progressive country brought newspaper space to tell Mr. Carter to go try his reforms first in the United States.

Why have so-called U.S. experts gotten away with pushing on our neighbors socialist policies that would outrage voters if they were advocated here at home? Doesn't opportunity for bettering one's own, and one's country's, economic lot qualify as a human right? Or have we let police-enforced equality in poverty become the ideal of American diplomats?

It is patent nonsense to say Reagan doesn't have options, or that (a) Carter policy in Central America has not been an abysmal disaster, or (b) that the so-called "moderates" in places like El Salvador are not, in fact, far to the "left" of George McGovern and even most U.S. socialists.

Begin with the fact that when Jimmy Carter moved into the White House the five Central American republics were stable, pro-United States and prospering. Growth in per-capita income was ahead of Latin America as a whole in both 1976 and 1977. Life expectancy was up, death rates and infant mortality down. Only 6.2 percent of El Salvador's budget went to the military; 32 percent went for education and health services.

Persons who spoke with Salvadorean junta President Napoleon Duarte during his visit to Washington a few weeks ago report that he displayed unbecoming contempt for the private business sector and made clear that he wished to accelerate his unelected government's rush to socialism.

Particularly disturbing was the December appointment of another Christian Democrat junta member, Antonio Morales Erlich, as minister of agriculture. Morales Erlich has long been an advocate of rapid implementation of that phase of the agrarian reform which would nationalize private farms of 250 acres or larger in size.

Attempts to characterize the present junta civilians as being somehow to the political "right" is a full blown fabrication which surfaced two days after Reagan's landslide in a forgery that purported to be an internal State Department "Dissent Memo" and which was widely circulated in Washington, D.C. The Boston Globe said in an editorial that the paper was "apparently" written by present or former officials "with access to classified information."

Some knowledgeable persons in Washington saw the fine hand of Ambassador White and his new diplomacy colleagues in the fake document, which set forth the bizarre contention that the junta radicals with their program for instant socialism was the most "conservative" option available and that to abandon them would invite disaster. It even criticized the junta for its failure to draw in the bomb throwers who are the only elements to their left.

The plain truth is that what the Washington Post characterized as the new diplomats' attempt to preempt the revolutionaries by out-Castroing Castro has resulted in a ruined economy and an exiled managerial class.

Reversal of the Carter-White new diplomacy and the ongoing tragedy in El Salva-

dor should revolve around three propositions:

1. The armed forces of the de facto Duarte government must be provided military equipment, particularly helicopters to counter the communist guerrilla offense and to restore peace.

2. Reform programs, socialistic or otherwise, should be suspended until the country is tranquilized and constitutional elections are held for a truly representative government. (In the meantime, the United States may have to provide substantial economic aid to assist the pacification program.)

3. Some competitive, free enterprise capitalism, not socialism, is the truly progressive course. El Salvador should be used to serve notice to developing countries that when it comes to dispensing assistance funds, the Reagan government will show preference to free enterprise countries. ●

TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S HOSPITALIZED VETERANS

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, by Presidential Proclamation, February 14, 1981, was designated "National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans' Day." It is my pleasure to join my colleagues in recognizing this important event by expressing the gratitude that this Nation rightfully owes its veterans.

Throughout our history, those who have served in the Armed Forces have defended the freedom and principles which are intrinsic to American life. By faithfully serving their country, these men and women have upheld the role of the United States in world affairs and protected the quality of life at home.

The services of our veterans warrant our ongoing support for their needs. The 172 Veterans' Administration medical centers across the Nation constitute a large part of that commitment. We must encourage all Americans to participate in recognizing the 1.3 million veterans who are being treated by these facilities, and to express their collective gratitude for these individuals' many contributions.

I am proud to add my voice in honoring our sick and disabled veterans. This is an expression of support for them and their futures, and of appreciation for their service to this land. ●

SMALL BUSINESS DESERVES A TAX BREAK

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, tonight President Reagan will present his economic recovery program to the American people and the Congress. A tax cut

will be the cornerstone of his proposal and in all likelihood will contain an across-the-board reduction in personal income tax rates and liberalized depreciation schedules for business.

In the coming weeks, members of the Ways and Means Committee, members of the House Small Business Committee, and specifically, the Subcommittee on Tax, Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities, which I chair, will begin to analyze and debate the efficacy of these proposals.

Small business must receive a substantial proportion of the business tax cut: They are the key to revitalizing our tired economy. Small business creates the most jobs, and is the cutting edge of competition. A productive and vibrant small business sector modifies price increases, providing more goods and services at a lower cost. Our Nation depends on our smaller enterprises to create new technologies and new industries.

Relief is needed now more than ever. Interest rates are at an all time high, while our uneven approach to monetary policy has created an uncertain future. Gyration interest rates and the on again, off again recession we have been experiencing, make business planning an uncertain science at best. Business failure rates are at an alltime high and, as everyone knows, an unsuccessful large business can easily merge or restructure its debts, while small enterprises simply fail.

Mr. Speaker, small business must receive a substantial share of the business tax cut. Since the small business sector contributes at least 45 percent to the overall gross national product, it is not unreasonable to conclude that at least 45 percent of the potential tax benefits from a tax cut this year should accrue to the small business sector.

The Small Business Legislative Council has written to key members of the Reagan economic team expressing the hope that small business will play a major role in the coming debate on tax cuts. Because of the importance of this matter to the American people and to the Congress, I am inserting correspondence received from the Council. The material follows:

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Washington, D.C., February 10, 1981.

Hon. HENRY J. NOWAK,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Tax, Access to Equity Capital, and Business Opportunities, House Committee on Small Business, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I felt that you would be interested in the attached letter sent to Treasury Secretary Regan yesterday. We are very much aware that you and your colleagues on the Small Business Committee will be playing a vital role in helping to guide a tax bill through the House which will be responsive to the economy's need for productive capital information and retention incentives in general, and small busi-

ness' specific need for a truly proportionate share of these incentives.

We look forward to working with you in this effort.

Sincerely,

JEROME R. GULAN,
Legislative Director.

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1981.

HON. DAVID A. STOCKMAN,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STOCKMAN: I felt that you would be interested in the attached letter sent to Treasury Secretary Regan yesterday.

The Small Business Legislative Council is a coalition of 86 professional, trade, and small business associations representing with their affiliates over 4.5 million small businesses.

As an extremely broad based economic interest, the small business community will play a key role in revitalizing the economy.

Having long been aware of our full partnership in the Nation's economic growth, we now urge your consideration and awareness of small business as a full economic partner in our combined revitalization efforts.

Please let us know how we can work together in assisting your efforts toward achieving our mutual goal of a balanced budget, enhanced productivity, and economic stability.

Sincerely,

HERBERT LIEBENSON,
Executive Director.

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1981.

HON. DONALD REGAN,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As participants at the economic briefing session last Friday, we were pleased to hear your comments regarding the position of small business in our economic structure particularly regarding their role as the chief employer of our labor force.

There has been a growing recognition of the fact that small business has been and will continue to be the basic provider of new jobs added to the economy. In recognizing this fact, we also must realize that our sector can only continue in this vein if the current economic constraints are lessened. Small business in the aggregate represents a general or public interest rather than one of the "special" interest so often referred to. I am sure that we are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary in order to turn the economy around, and we fully expect that we will be making such sacrifices.

On the other hand, we hope that in your planning for the tax cut message which the President hopes to send to Capitol Hill on February 18, you will recognize that small business must receive a proportional share of any benefits to be derived from a capital formation and depreciation package. Analysis has shown that the benefits of "10-5-3" proposals would have gone primarily to big business. Roughly speaking 70% of the benefits derived from that bill would accrue to some 2000 of the Nation's largest corporations leaving 30% to be distributed to literally millions of small businesses.

I am sure we need not belabor further at this point, but if we in the aggregate are responsible for almost 60% of the jobs, 50% of GNP and value added to the economy etc., it therefore follows that we must receive proportional benefits from any tax cut proposals.

If, on the other hand, small business is asked to bear a full burden of sacrifice and is not offered a full share of benefits essential to growth, and the creation of new jobs, we may find that our vast small business community will be hard pressed to support the administration's economic program.

We would be happy to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss this in greater details.

We will be anxiously waiting for details of your plans scheduled to be released of February 18.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT LIEBENSON,
Executive Director.

THE RELEASE OF IOSEF MENDELEVICH

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received news that I have been anxiously awaiting ever since my election to this distinguished body. I was advised earlier today, through the National Conference on Soviet Jewry and the Bergen County Conference on Soviet Jewry, that Iosef Mendelevich has been released from the Soviet prison system and was heading directly to Israel.

Having symbolically adopted Iosef as a prisoner of conscience and having worked to gain his release for more than 4 years, you can understand why this news is particularly gratifying. I applaud this humanitarian gesture and hope that it represents a first step toward Soviet willingness to comply with previously agreed international accords.

As we know, Iosef was convicted of attempting to hijack an airplane to Israel during the infamous Leningrad trials of June 1970. Of the original 10 defendants Iosef had been singled out for especially cruel treatment because of his adherence to orthodox religious beliefs. On the 10th anniversary of his imprisonment this summer, I circulated among my colleagues a letter to Soviet authorities calling for the early release of the three men who still remained in prison from the so-called Leningrad group. I was proud to have sent this letter to Leonid Brezhnev with the signatures of 64 of my colleagues, and I am delighted that Soviet authorities saw fit to honor our request for Mendelevich's release. I only hope that Soviet authorities will make this action for Mendelevich a rule rather than an exception.

The Soviets must be made to realize that certain truths transcend mere territorial boundaries and demand an international outcry. I know that I will not relent in my efforts to ease the plight of those being denied their fundamental rights as human beings, and that I will continue my campaign

to remind Soviet authorities of our deep concern for certain individuals held in their prisons.●

PRESSING ISSUES FACING COAST GUARD TODAY

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this House and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which I chair, are privileged to have leaders such as our colleague, GERRY STUDDS of Massachusetts. Congressman STUDDS served with distinction as chairman of our Oceanography Subcommittee during the 96th Congress and has now assumed a new role as chairman of the Coast Guard and Navigation Subcommittee. There are many pressing issues facing the Coast Guard today, and Congressman STUDDS has analyzed them succinctly and forcefully in an article published in the January 13, 1981, Boston Globe. I want to share that article with our colleagues now:

SOS, TOSS A LIFELINE

(By GERRY STUDDS)

The United States Coast Guard, long an angel of mercy to those in distress, founders today in a sea of bureaucratic difficulty and is in urgent need of rescue.

The oceans now accommodate far more than pleasure boats and small fishing operations; they have become competitive battlegrounds for limited resources of oil, minerals and protein; they are the globe's most vital means of transportation; they remain a depository for garbage and waste, and a place of concealment for nuclear submarines.

Legislation required to prevent and clean up spills of oil and hazardous substances, to regulate foreign fishing within 200 miles of our coast, to prevent the smuggling of drugs and to recover the oil, minerals and energy found in the sea has burdened the Coast Guard with a plethora of new and complicated duties with which it is demonstrably unprepared to deal.

Consider, for example, that:

The number of Coast Guard cutters has declined from 339 to 246 in the past decade.

The entire fleet of Coast Guard vessels averages more than 22 years in age; the cutter Cuyahoga, which sank in 1978 at the cost of 11 lives, was 52 years old.

Many Coast Guard vessels would be unable to meet the safety of manning standards imposed by the Coast Guard on merchant ships.

The average Coast Guard enlistee has fewer than 2 years experience; re-enlistments have declined by half since 1976.

The Coast Guard estimates it must nearly double in size by 1990 to meet its responsibilities mandated by law.

An OMB study found that "adequate maintenance has not been performed, personnel are undertrained for required tasks, people are required to work excessive overtime and large numbers of experienced personnel are leaving."

The Coast Guard is in trouble primarily because of its inability to compete effectively for budget dollars. As a quasi-military agency, its tendency has been to obey the decisions of its bureaucratic superiors with a minimum of complaint, while adopting a "can do" attitude toward congressmen concerned about their ability to perform assigned tasks. In principle, that is an admirable attitude, but when it is perpetuated in the face of inadequate equipment and manpower, it becomes foolhardy.

The Coast Guard simply will not be able to do its job unless it gets either a hefty increase in funds or a drastic reduction in its responsibilities.

Last summer, for example, the agency was ordered to monitor the chaotic, tragic effort by 100,000 Cubans and 10,000 Haitians to escape their home countries.

Coast Guard personnel must be capable of handling a variety of tasks in a competent, professional manner. Enforcement of the 200-mile fishing limit requires people who are part policemen, part diplomats, part linguists, part accountants, part marine biologists and full-time sailors, but there is no time to give Coast Guard recruits adequate training, and there are too few incentives to keep new recruits around long enough to develop needed skills.

I believe that the missions of the U.S. Coast Guard are vital and that the agency deserves additional funds in order to fulfill its obligations under the law. The Coast Guard will have to work more actively than it has in the past to publicize its needs, so that those sectors of the public that benefit most from Coast Guard activities can be mobilized in support.

Only a few months ago the Coast Guard plucked hundreds of frightened tourists from a burning cruise ship in near-Arctic waters off the Alaskan coast. It will be to no one's advantage if the next time the alarm bell sounds, the distress call emanates from the Coast Guard itself.●

FEDERAL PROSECUTION OF PHARMACY ROBBERIES

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the alarming rise in the crime rate across this country, particularly in drug-related crime, has been well documented in the media. Although the primary battle against violent crime is waged by State and local governments, there are certain areas where it is not only appropriate, but imperative, that the Federal Government serve as their ally.

Clearly, the recent rash of pharmacy robberies for purposes of obtaining controlled substances falls within this category. National efforts to fight illegal narcotics traffic have achieved a certain commendable measure of success, encouraging determined dealers and addicts to turn to an easier prey—their neighborhood drugstore. Ironically, although the Federal Government has jurisdiction to prosecute the improper sale and dispensing of controlled substances, there is no basis for

prosecution when the same types of drugs are taken from the local pharmacy at the point of a gun.

Mr. Speaker, because there is a pervasive Federal interest in controlling drugs, because the recent increase in pharmacy robberies is the result of Federal efforts to thwart the obtaining of these drugs from other illegal sources, and because of the limited resources of the States and localities available to investigate and prosecute these offenses, it is time for the Federal Government to step in and bring to bear all of its resources against these criminals. For this reason, I am today introducing a bill which would make it a Federal offense to rob a pharmacy of any controlled substance. The penalty for this offense is a maximum \$5,000 fine and/or 20 years imprisonment. If the perpetrator assaults anyone or uses a dangerous weapon in the commission of the offense, the penalties increase to a maximum of \$10,000 and/or 25 years imprisonment. Where death results, a mandatory term of 10 years imprisonment is included.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I strongly supported the stalwart efforts of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Hyde) to include this type of offense in the Criminal Code revision bill which we considered last year (H.R. 6915). I hope that my colleagues will join me in the effort to promptly enact legislation of this nature. Although it was never the intent of Congress or the executive that the hard-working neighborhood pharmacist should bear the brunt of our war against narcotics, over 1,700 of these vicious and dangerous robberies occur each year. We should rectify this situation immediately.●

CRIMINALS SHOULD NOT BE AL- LOWED TO "SELL" THEIR CRIMES

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which is designed to insure that those in our society who commit crimes against innocent victims must turn over to those victims any financial gain they realize from selling information about themselves and their involvement in crime.

It is intolerable that a criminal should be able to commit a heinous crime or set of crimes and then receive pecuniary reward from those who are willing to pay for television, film, or publishing rights to information about the criminal. My bill would see that any such financial reward paid to a Federal felon would be seized by the court of original jurisdiction and eventually distributed to the victims of the

crime, or their closest relations, instead.

My bill would also apply to persons arrested but awaiting trial. To give an example which may sound all too familiar to some, suppose an individual were finally arrested after committing several crimes and a magazine paid him a generous sum of money for photographs and other information about himself and his crimes. Under my bill such funds would be subject to being placed in an escrow account under the control of the court in which the trial is pending. The funds would remain in escrow until such time as the arrested person is convicted and has exhausted all direct appeals. If he is not convicted or the conviction is ultimately reversed on appeal, the funds in the account would be released to the acquitted individual, of course. If the person were convicted, however, and the conviction were upheld, the funds would be distributed to the victims or his or her relations upon the exhaustion of the appeals process. Once the funds are distributed to the victims, they would not be recoverable at any future time, even should a collateral attack on the conviction, such as habeas corpus, eventually succeed. Any proceeds accruing to the alleged felon after a later collateral attack has succeeded would, of course, be his.

New York enacted a similar law following the gruesome "Son of Sam" murders, when it was learned that some parties in the media were considering paying the perpetrator of those crimes for movie and television rights to his story. I believe the time has come to extend the principle of that law to the Federal criminal justice system.●

BUSING ORDERS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, education needs to be one of the top priorities in this administration. In the past few years the courts have completely lost sight of quality education in their desire to achieve racial balance.

Since 1964 the cost of educating each child in Dallas has grown from \$361 a year to where we now are paying over \$1,900 a year.

We recently had a court order in the Dallas School District which would require an increase in the annual budget of between \$25 to \$30 million to carry it out. This will be a 10-percent increase in our annual school budget.

Jerry Bartos, who has been active and effective as a member of the Dallas School Board, asked me where we are heading.

In the desire to achieve racial balance, these court orders have moved Dallas in exactly the opposite direction. In 1968, the Dallas School District was 38 percent minority, but today the Dallas School District is 67 percent minority. Perhaps with these new regulations they will be able to get the Dallas School District up to where it equals Washington, D.C., which has a 97 percent minority registration.

We ask ourselves just what has this accomplished.●

OIL COMPANIES' ACTIONS SHOW NEED FOR NEW LAW

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the addition of a new group of cosponsors for H.R. 1362, the Small Business Motor Fuel Marketer Preservation Act of 1981. This brings to 60 the number of Members who have joined in bipartisan support for this important legislation.

There appear to be some in the petroleum industry who do not expect Congressmen to communicate with their constituents. These industry propagandists would have us believe that the recent decontrol of motor fuel has brought an end to the problems encountered by small and independent marketers. But we know that the small businessman's problems are far from resolved.

As I have noted before, the basic problem is the vast disparity in size and resources between the major oil companies and the small business operators. When the two forces go head to head in the same market—especially when one is the supplier and landlord of the other—the concept of competition becomes meaningless.

While Government regulation unquestionably have been a burden and a bother for small businesses in the petroleum marketing area, they also have been a shield. The Government did serve as somewhat of a buffer between the big oil companies and the small businesses.

Now that buffer has been removed. And we have not yet put in place a new law, such as H.R. 1362, to assure small businesses an opportunity to compete on fair and equitable terms in the gasoline marketplace. The results were inevitable, just as they have been swift in coming.

A gasoline station operator on the west coast called my office at the Small Business Committee last week to complain about the actions his supplier, a major integrated oil company, had undertaken immediately after President Reagan decontrolled the pe-

troleum industry. With dismay and disbelief in his voice, the service station dealer said:

Some of the things they're doing, well they're going to force the small businessman right out of the market. . . . I thought they would wait a while at least, but they're not wasting any time.

For those who have any doubts as to the ability of the major oil companies to operate in the retail marketplace without any regard to the traditional concepts of antitrust or even of contract law, at least when it comes to their relations with their own dealers and distributors, I refer my colleagues to an article that appeared on page 2 of the Wall Street Journal on February 12. The text follows:

THREE OIL FIRMS CUT OFF GASOLINE SUPPLY
TO RETAILERS AS U.S. CONTROLS ARE LIFTED
(By Bill Paul and Steve Mufson)

NEW YORK.—Three major oil companies are cutting off gasoline supplies to several hundred retail outlets following the end of federal gasoline regulations. Several more may be planning similar moves.

When President Reagan lifted controls on crude oil and oil products two weeks ago, he freed oil companies from the obligation to find another supplier for a service station before cutting off that dealer's gasoline. Oil companies generally have been reassuring dealers, and the public, that they don't currently plan any immediate cutoffs. But some are under way.

Three companies that have notified customers of cutoffs are Phillips Petroleum Co., Atlantic Richfield Co. and Texaco Inc. In addition, Robert Bassman, a Washington attorney who represents gasoline wholesalers, says he is negotiating with three other oil companies that want to reduce or cut completely supplies to some of those wholesalers.

"We're beginning to see the first trickle of post-decontrol supply problems," says Mr. Bassman, adding that the situation could worsen.

With the current overabundance of gasoline, most of the affected stations shouldn't have any trouble finding new supplies in the short run. But in view of the volatile world oil situation, most major oil companies will probably be reluctant to take on long-term supply contracts. If the world oil market tightens suddenly, the stations might come up short on supplies.

Two of the three companies are settling old scores. Eight years ago, Phillips told wholesalers in the Northeast that the company intended to stop supplying the region. The company had decided that it wasn't making an adequate profit there and that it didn't want to sell more oil products that it was manufacturing at its own refineries.

But federal allocation rules in 1973, which ordered companies to continue supplying historical customers, blocked the move. In the meantime, Phillips dismantled its sales offices in the Northeast and issued repeated warnings of its intentions to wholesalers.

As soon as President Reagan lifted controls, Phillips notified its 27 wholesalers, who service as many as 300 stations, that it wouldn't supply any more gasoline. "We are trying to complete the withdrawal we started back then," says Don Johnson, general sales manager of Phillips' eastern region.

Arco says it was also taking care of old business when it cut off Lerner Oil Co., a

106-station chain based in Gardena, Calif., which had been getting 50% of its supplies from Arco. Arco officials say the company had tangled in the courts with Lerner over the years, and had decided to discontinue supplying the outfit as soon as it was legally possible. Industry observers say Arco even refused to load a Lerner truck that was in an Arco terminal when word came through that controls had been lifted.

Lerner officials refused to discuss the cutoff, or whether the company had been able to line up alternate supplies.

Texaco is cutting off some stations in April. The number isn't known. Last October, Texaco asked the Energy Department to relieve the company of some of its supply obligations. The department refused. According to Thomas West, director of the National Association of Texaco Wholesalers, Texaco then notified some customers that it would end supplies in April. While the original gradual decontrol plan would have blocked such a move, immediate decontrol means some Texaco customers will have to seek new supplies. Mr. West said he didn't know how many stations would be affected.

Texaco couldn't immediately be reached for comment.

If the trend to cut off stations continues, it could cause concern in Washington. Even some officials and legislators who favored immediate decontrol have expressed concern over oil companies' actions aimed at some wholesalers. "We had been hoping for some restraint" on the part of the companies, said an aide to the Republican majority on the Senate energy committee.

When President Reagan signed the decontrol order, Sen. James McClure (R., Idaho), the committee chairman sent letters to the chief executive officers of the nation's 15 largest companies warning them against abusing their new-found freedom. "I believe that your company should provide notice of any major change in marketing policy" to avoid hardships to customers and affected regions, he wrote.

While the Senator didn't threaten the industry with renewed allocation controls, his letter noted pointedly that abrupt company actions "undoubtedly will be used as the basis" for demands in Congress to reimpose some sort of restrictions.

Reagan administration officials have also expressed some concern about company behavior in the wake of decontrol. But they said the administration doesn't have any plans to jawbone or otherwise pressure the companies.●

"FALLEN ANGEL": AN EXPOSE ON CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to "Fallen Angel", a 2-hour television movie for CBS produced by Green/Epstein Productions in association with Columbia Pictures Television which will be broadcast February 24.

It marks the first time that television has produced a dramatic treatment about child pornography, a

loathsome social phenomenon in America which every year affects more than 100,000 children who are recruited from the ranks of an estimated 1 million runaways.

They fall prey to sexual werewolves who coerce them to pose and participate in pornographic films and still photos for sleazy magazines. It is a national disgrace and one, unhappily, that does not appear to be diminishing at all. Yet most Americans are not aware of this vicious form of child abuse.

It is hoped that a dramatic film like this, with actors like Dana Hill, Richard Masur, Melinda Dillon, and Ronny Cox, will be seen by millions of Americans, particularly caring parents and children, who must be made more aware of this horrendous crime.

I especially would like to commend Herman Rush, president of Columbia Pictures Television, executive producers Jim Green and Allen Epstein, producers Lew Hunter—who researched and wrote the script—and Audrey Blasdel-Goddard and director Robert Lewis who had the courage to bring this production to the screen.

SOVIET UNION IS ON THE MOVE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the Los Angeles Times of February 13, Daniel Mariaschin makes a well-reasoned and well-researched case that the Soviet Union is "engaged in a two-pronged, two-continent offensive with the goal of neutralizing Western control of and access to strategic raw materials." Mr. Mariaschin stresses the acute need for the Reagan administration to develop a workable strategic minerals policy.

Daniel Mariaschin is director of national leadership for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, that dedicated organization which continues to do so much important work. I commend Mr. Mariaschin's article to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

SOVIET UNION IS ON THE MOVE—IT FIGHTS WESTERN CONTROL OF STRATEGIC RAW MATERIALS

(By Daniel S. Mariaschin)

As the West fixes its attention on oil and the energy crisis, that crisis is serving as a diversion for the Soviets, who are engaged in a two-pronged, two-continent offensive whose goal is to neutralize Western control of, and access to, strategic raw materials.

Viewed in that context, reports that the Soviet Union is planning to back new efforts to destabilize the political status quo in Zaïre should be noted by the West with more than passing interest. Controlling that country's Shaba province, which provides the bulk of the free world's cobalt, has been a strategic objective of Moscow's surrogates

for nearly two decades. Western military intervention checked the most recent try at wresting this vital territory from Zaïre three years ago after an uprising by Angolan- and Cuban-backed "Shaban rebels."

Whether this latest attempt to overthrow the government of Mobutu Sese Seko will succeed remains to be seen. What is clear is that the Kremlin's moves to encircle the West's sources of raw materials, including oil, is well on its way to fruition. Soviet influence in the Middle East and Persian Gulf is growing daily in a ring around the oil fields and vital shipping lanes of the region.

Through its presence in Ethiopia, the Soviet Union has near-control of the Horn of Africa, a foothold on the Red Sea by its backing of the Marxist government in South Yemen, and a solid presence—through arms shipments and the stationing of military "advisers"—in Syria, Iraq and even the supposedly pro-Western regime in North Yemen.

As the Soviets become net importers of oil in the next decade, their geopolitical position will help them intimidate oil producers into favorable arrangements that can only see Western access to petroleum supplies lessen and Western influence diminish in Arab capitals. But more than just oil is at stake.

Instability on the African continent is a real threat to all of us. The Soviets have nothing to lose in these adventures; of 27 major metals and minerals vital to keeping a modern economy in business and maintaining a strong defense posture, the Soviet Union is self-sufficient in 21, and nearly so in the remaining 6. By contrast, the United States is now mineral-poor. According to statistics published by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the United States imported 90% of its manganese, nearly 99% of chrome ore and 83% of palladium and platinum. Nearly 95% of bauxite, or aluminum ore, was imported, as was most cobalt.

The United States now imports ores and metals to the tune of nearly \$20 billion per year. The Bureau of Mines predicts that this amount will more than double by the end of this century. By law, the federal government must maintain up to a three-year stockpile of 93 strategic raw materials as a hedge against instability or embargo. But stocks of a number of minerals—including titanium, cobalt, alumina and beryllium—are not up to the minimum amounts necessary to get the country through any extended interruption of supply.

What makes the future so tenuous are the sources from which we import these vital materials. Some are secure; much of our nickel originates in Canada, we import tin from Mexico, and Brazil provides columbium. But the bulk of the imports are from Africa—more specifically, central and southern Africa—and that is where the Soviets enter the picture.

South Africa alone is the world's largest exporter of manganese ore, platinum metals and chrome ore. Together with the Soviet Union, it controls the world's market in these materials. Zimbabwe is also a major producer of chromium and manganese. Namibia has large deposits of uranium, and Zaïre and Zimbabwe have tremendous reserves of cobalt. Without any or all of these nations trading on the raw-materials market, the Soviets could control both price and supply to the West.

The current troubles in southern Africa are a good example of what constitutes a real dilemma for the West. The question of majority rule is one close to the hearts of

most Americans. The civil war in Zimbabwe, the effort to bring about an independent Namibia (with the United Nations as midwife) and the increasing racial friction in South Africa are viewed as poignant expressions of a wider human-rights struggle. The Soviets, who have armed and trained anti-Western, "anti-colonialist" liberation movements in each of these areas, have no such higher motives. The raw materials mined in southern Africa—chromium, uranium, the platinum metals group, gold, diamonds—are among the essential ingredients for a strong industrial base. The Russians, by trading on nationalist emotions, are in fact investing in what they see as the West's ultimate economic downfall.

And, while Moscow's hand can be seen at work in the Western Sahara (backing the Polisario guerrillas), in Angola, in Shaba Province and in Chad (rich in uranium), its real objective is the riches of southern Africa. Not only is mineral wealth important there, but fully 70 percent of Western Europe's raw materials and 80 percent of its oil pass the Cape of Good Hope each year.

According to some Western observers, the jury is still out on Zimbabwe and on whether Prime Minister Robert Mugabe can maintain a nonaligned course. Mugabe has downplayed his Marxist orientation, and has pledged to attract Western investment to his nation. His ambitious rivals in the government have indicated that they are not so favorably disposed toward the West or to the whites remaining in the country. Should these opponents eventually move into power, the raw-materials equation in southern Africa could be drastically altered.

Not content with its considerable oil and mineral wealth, Russia is seeking to deny or at least control the flow of these essentials to the free world. What has transpired over the last decade is a fine-tuning of the oft-interpreted, oft-misunderstood warning to the West by former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev that "we will bury you."

Cuba, the Palestine Liberation Organization, East Germany, Bulgaria and others in the Soviet bloc are willing surrogates in the Kremlin's new adventures. With this kind of assistance in Africa and the Middle East, the Soviets can better sustain their losses in Afghanistan while minimizing Third World criticism of "superpower interventionism," a charge increasingly favored by the more powerful of the "nonaligned" nations. So far the approach is working.

Responding to Moscow's oil and mineral dynamic is no easy matter. A good start would be for the Reagan Administration and Congress to establish a workable strategic-minerals policy that would take into account our defense and economic needs as well as environmental considerations. Filling stockpile quotas to assure U.S. freedom from market fluctuations or supply cutoffs should be carried out forthwith.

But foreign policy is another matter. Washington must play "catch-up" in reasserting and reestablishing its influence in regions on which we depend for vital strategic materials. Pro-Soviet and anti-Western inroads in such areas as sub-Saharan Africa (principally Chad), the Persian Gulf and Southeast Asia over the past decade have placed the United States at a distinct geopolitical disadvantage. To cut U.S. losses and roll back Soviet influence, the Reagan Administration must implant selective, efficacious aid programs aimed at winning over mineral producers in the Third World.

Washington must impress on its Western European allies the serious implications of

the mineral scramble in Africa. As dependent as Europeans are on oil, they are equally or more dependent on African mineral sources. France seems to have recognized this; it continues to carry on an aggressive foreign policy in Africa, chiefly among its former colonies but recently in East Africa as well.

Most important, however, is the need for Americans to understand the gravity of the crisis at hand. Most Americans realize the importance of oil to our economy. But mention cobalt or tungsten or vanadium and you'll most likely draw a blank.

More straight talk from the experts and officeholders about the need to check the Soviets' drive to deprive the West of strategic mineral and fuel sources is called for. It has taken nearly a decade for many Americans to understand what the energy crisis is all about. We can't afford the same kind of lethargy on the question of a strategic-minerals supply. ●

ELIMINATE PENALTY FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS IN SCHOOL

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend a provision in the Food Stamp Act which has made it difficult for welfare recipients to obtain an education. My bill will amend the Food Stamp Act to provide that no educational financial assistance received by AFDC recipients shall be considered as income for the purposes of determining their food stamp benefits.

Presently, the Food Stamp Act requires that, except for amounts paid for mandatory tuition and fees, educational aid in the form of loans, grants, scholarships, and fellowships must be counted as income in determining eligibility and benefit amounts under the food stamp program. Specifically, the act does not allow income deductions for the costs of books, supplies, or instructional material, and equipment, even if required for courses in which the student is enrolled. For AFDC recipients who are going to school so they can qualify for jobs that will get their families off welfare, any reduction in food stamps is a serious hardship and penalizes them for making the effort to obtain an education to qualify for a job with a future.

This problem came to my attention last year. One of my constituents, a young welfare recipient with two children, was completing her college degree to qualify her for full-time, productive employment. However, because she received an educational grant which exceeded her mandatory tuition payment, her family has experienced a reduction of \$20 per month in food stamp benefits. This practically forced her to choose between completing her education and feeding herself and her children. Moreover, even

though educational grants or loans are intended to apply to only the 9-month school year, any excess money is attributed to the AFDC recipient's income for 12 months, thus continuing the penalty beyond the school year when the "excess" is presumed available for nonschool use.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would help welfare recipients obtain an education without jeopardizing the food stamp benefits they receive for their families. I think it is proper that Congress should encourage AFDC recipients to make themselves qualified for gainful employment, and this bill represents a modest incentive toward that end. ●

MAKING SCIENCE WORK: AN AMERICAN CHALLENGE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress prepares to consider billions of dollars of cuts which the new administration has chosen to make after less than a month of deliberation, there will no doubt be some omissions and some mistakes. One area where a tragic mistake may be made is in the proposals to cut all types of research and development.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that every constituency can make a compelling case for avoiding budget cuts and even make a case for budget increases. However, I believe the case for supporting long-range research and development deserves special review because the future of our Nation's economic and social health and welfare is at stake. I realize that many Members do not believe this, largely because of their unfamiliarity with the nature and fruits of research, but it is a fact we need to understand.

One of the best science writers in the world today is Lewis Thomas, whose columns, articles, and books have appeared nearly everywhere. He most recently wrote a compelling essay for *Discovery* magazine entitled, "Making Science Work." What is most interesting about this editorial is its relevance to the budget discussions facing the Congress today. Dr. Thomas presented a fine description of the research process, the linkage between research and economic advances, and, finally, the steps the United States must take to maintain its leadership in the world.

I urge my colleagues who wish to concern themselves with the future of this Nation to review the following essay before they make any decision about specific cuts in the Federal research budget. The essay follows:

[From *Discovery* magazine, March 1981]

MAKING SCIENCE WORK

For about three centuries we have been doing science, trying science out, using it for the construction of what we call modern civilization. Every indispensable item of contemporary technology, from canal locks to dial telephones to penicillin to the Mars lander, was pieced together from the analysis of data provided by one or another series of scientific experiments. So were the technologies we fear the most for the threat they pose to civilization: radioactivity from stored bombs or flawed power plants, acid rain, pesticides, leached soil, and depleted ozone and increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Three hundred years seems a long time for testing a new approach to human living, long enough to settle back for critical appraisal of the scientific method, maybe even long enough to vote on whether to go on with it or not. There is an argument, to be sure. Voices have been raised in protest since the beginning, rising in pitch and violence in the 19th century during the early stages of the Industrial Revolution, summoning urgent crowds into the streets any day these days on the issue of nuclear energy. Give it back, say some of the voices, it doesn't really work; go back 300 years and start again on something else, less chancy for the race of man.

The scientists disagree, of course, partly out of occupational bias, but also from a different way of viewing the course and progress of science in the past 50 years. As they see it, science is still a brand-new venture. The principal discoveries in this century, taking all in all, are the glimpses of the depth of our ignorance about nature. Things that used to seem clear and rational, matters of absolute certainty—Newtonian mechanics, for example—have slipped through our fingers, and we are left with a new set of gigantic puzzles, cosmic uncertainties, ambiguities. Some of the laws of physics require footnotes every few years, some are canceled outright, some undergo revised versions of legislative intent like acts of Congress.

Biology presents us with one stupefaction after another. Less than 30 years ago we called it a biological revolution when the fantastic geometry of the DNA molecule was exposed to public view and the linear language of genetics was decoded. For a while things seemed simple and clear; the cell was a neat little machine, a mechanical device ready for taking to pieces and reassembling, like a tiny watch. But now, just in the last few years, it has become almost imponderably complex, filled with strange parts with functions that are beyond today's imagining. DNA is itself no longer a straightforward set of instructions on a tape; there are long strips of what seem nonsense inside and in between the genes, edited out for the assembly of proteins but essential nonetheless for the process of assembly; some genes are called jumping genes, moving from one segment of DNA to another, rearranging the messages, achieving instantly a degree of variability that we once thought would require eons of evolution. The cell membrane is no longer a simple boundary for the cell, but a fluid mosaic, a sea of essential mobile signals, an organ in itself. Cells communicate with each other, exchange messages like bees in a hive, regulate each other. Genes are switched on, switched off, by molecules from the outside whose nature is a mystery;

somewhere inside are switches that when thrown one way or the other can transform any normal cell into a cancer cell, and sometimes back again.

It is not just that there is more to do, there is everything to do. Biological science, with medicine bobbing somewhere in its wake, is under way, but only just under way. What lies ahead, or what can lie ahead if the efforts in basic research are pursued and the field continues to attract and train sufficient numbers of bright young people, is much more than the conquest of human disease or the amplification of agricultural technology or the cultivation of nutrients in the sea. As we learn more about the fundamental processes of living things in general we will learn more about ourselves, including perhaps the ways in which our brains, unmatched by any neural structures on the planet, achieve the earth's awareness of itself. It may be too much to say that we will become wise through such endeavors, but we can at least come into possession of a level of information upon which a new kind of wisdom might be based. At the moment we are an ignorant species, flummoxed by the puzzles of who we are, where we came from and what we are for. It is a gamble to bet on science for moving ahead, but it is, in my view, the only game in town.

The near views in our instruments of the dead soil of Mars, the bizarre rings of Saturn, and the strange features of other planets, literally unearthly, are only brief glimpses at what is ahead for mankind in the exploration of our own solar system. In theory, there is no reason why human beings cannot make the same journeys in person, or out beyond into the galaxy.

It has become the fashion to express fear of computers: the machines will do our thinking, quicker and better than human thought, construct and replicate themselves, take over and eventually replace us—that sort of thing. I confess to apprehensions of my own, but I have a hunch that those are on my mind because I do not know enough about computers. Nor, perhaps, does anyone yet, not even the computer scientists themselves. For my comfort, I know for sure only one thing about the computer networks now being meshed together like interconnected ganglia around the earth: what they contain on their microchips is bits of information put there by human minds; perhaps they will do something like thinking on their own, but it will still be a cousin once removed of human thought, and potentially of immense usefulness.

The relatively new term "earth science" is itself an encouragement. It is nice to know that our own dear planet has become an object of as much obsessive interest to large bodies of professional researchers as a living cell, and almost as approachable for discovering the details of how it works. Satellites scrutinize it all day and night, recording the patterns of its clouds, the temperatures at all parts of its surface, the distribution and condition of its forests, crops, waterways, cities, and barren places. Seismologists and geologists have already surprised themselves over and over again, probing the movement of crustal plates afloat on something or other deep below the surface, meditating on the evidence now coming in for the reality and continuing of continental drift, and calculating with increasing precision the data that describe the mechanisms involved in earthquakes. Their instruments are becoming as neat and informative as medicine's CAT scanners; the earth has deep secrets still, but they are there for penetrating.

The astronomers have long since become physicists, the physicists are astronomers; both are, as well, what we used to call chemists, examining the levels of ammonia or formaldehyde in clouds drifting thousands of light-years away, measuring the methane in the relatively nearby atmosphere of Pluto, running into paradoxes. Contemporary physics lives off paradox. Niels Bohr said that a great truth is one for which the opposite is also a great truth. There are not so many neutrinos being measured from our sun as theory predicts; something has gone wrong, not with the sun but with our knowledge. There are radioastronomical instruments for listening to the leftover sounds of the creation of the universe; the astronomers are dumbstruck, they can hardly hear themselves think.

The social scientists have a long way to go to catch up, but they may be up to the most important scientific business of all, if and when they finally get down to the right questions. Our behavior toward each other is the strangest, most unpredictable, and most unaccountable of all the phenomena with which we are obliged to live. In all of nature, there is nothing so threatening to humanity as humanity itself. We need, for this most worrying of puzzles, the brightest of our most agile minds, capable of dreaming up ideas not dreamed up before, ready to carry the imagination to great depths, and, I should hope, handy with big computers but skeptical about long questionnaires and big numbers.

Fundamental science did not become a national endeavor in this country until the time of World War II, when it was pointed out by some influential and sagacious advisers to the government that whatever we needed for the technology of warfare could only be achieved after the laying of a solid foundation of basic research. During the Eisenhower administration a formal mechanism was created in the White House for the explicit purpose of furnishing scientific advice to the president—the President's Science Advisory Committee, chaired by a new administration officer, the Science Adviser. The National Institutes of Health, which had existed before the war as a relatively small set of laboratories for research on cancer and infectious disease, expanded rapidly in the postwar period to encompass all disciplines of biomedical science. The National Science Foundation was organized specifically for the sponsorship of basic science. Each of the federal departments and agencies developed its own research capacity, relevant to its mission; the programs of largest scale were those in defense, agriculture, space, and atomic energy. The investment in science by the federal government rose from less than a billion dollars in the late 1940s to about \$30 billion in 1980.

Most of the country's basic research has been carried out by the universities, which have as a result become increasingly dependent on the federal government for their sustenance, even their existence, to a degree now causing alarm in the whole academic community. The rising costs of doing modern science, especially the price of today's sophisticated instruments, combined with the federal efforts to reduce expenditures, are placing the universities in deep trouble. Meanwhile, the philanthropic foundations, which were once the principal source of funds for university research, are no longer capable of more than a minor contribution to science.

Besides the government's own national laboratories and the academic institutions,

there is a third resource for the country's scientific enterprise—industry. Up to very recently, industrial research has been conducted in relative isolation. There are signs that this is beginning to change, and the change should be a source of encouragement for the future. Some of the corporations responsible for high technology, especially those involved in energy, have formed solid links with a few research universities—MIT and Caltech, for example—and are investing substantial sums in long-range research in physics and chemistry. Several pharmaceutical companies have been investing in fundamental biomedical research in association with medical schools and private research institutions.

There needs to be much more of this kind of partnership. The nation's future may well depend on whether we can set up within the private sector a new system for collaborative research. Although there are some promising partnership ventures now in operation, they are few in number; the tendency remains within industry to concentrate on applied research and development, excluding any consideration of basic science. The academic community tends to stay out of fields closely related to the development of new products. Each side maintains adversarial and largely bogus images of the other: money makers on one side and ivory tower dreamers on the other. Meanwhile, our competitors in Europe and Japan have long since found effective ways to link industrial research to government and academic science, and they may be outclassing us before long. In some fields, most conspicuously the devising and producing of new scientific instruments, they have already moved to the front.

There are obvious difficulties in the traditional behavior of the two worlds of research in the United States. Corporate research is obliged by its nature to concentrate on profitable products and to maintain a high degree of secrecy during the process; academic science, by its nature, must be carried out in the open and depends for its progress on the free exchange of new information almost at the moment of finding. But these are not impossible barriers to collaboration. Industry already has a life-or-death stake in what will emerge from basic research in the years ahead; there can be no more prudent investment for the corporate world, and the immediate benefit for any corporation in simply having the "first look" at a piece of basic science would be benefit enough in the long run. The university science community, for all the talk of ivory towers, hankers day and night for its work to turn out useful; a close working connection with industrial researchers might well lead to an earlier perception of potential applicability than is now the case.

The age of science did not really begin 300 years ago. That was simply the time when it was realized that human curiosity about the world represented a deep wish, perhaps embedded somewhere in the chromosomes of human beings, to learn more about nature by experiment and the confirmation of experiment. The doing of science on a scale appropriate to the problems at hand was only launched in the 20th century and has been moving into high gear only within the last 50 years. We have not lacked for explanations at any time in our recorded history, but now we must live and think with the new habit of requiring reproducible observations and solid facts for the explanations. Uncertainty, disillusion, and despair are prices to be paid, from time to time, for

living in an age of science. Illumination is the product sought, but it comes in small bits, and there can be no promise that we will ever emerge from the great depths of the mystery of being.

Nevertheless, we have started to do science on a world scale, and to rely on it, and hope for it. Not just the scientists, everyone, and not for the hope of illumination but for the sure, predictable prospect of new technologies, which have always come along like spray in the wake of science. We need better ways of predicting how a piece of new technology is likely to turn out, better measures available on an international level to shut off the ones that carry hazard to the life of the planet. We will have to go more warily with technology in the future, for the demands will be increasing and the stakes will be very high. Instead of coping, or trying to cope, with the wants of four billion people, we will, sooner or later, be facing the needs, probably desperate, of double that number, and perhaps thereafter, double again. The real challenge to human ingenuity, and to science, lies in the century to come.

How will we meet this challenge? I can think of three essential places to begin:

We should commit a certain percentage of the gross national product to the funding of pure, basic research, covering all fields of science and guaranteeing stability for the enterprise over the long term. It is no longer a question of staying ahead of the rest of the world; it is becoming a matter of catching up. Part of the money should come, as it does now, from government, part (through tax benefits, but as investments rather than just philanthropy) from the industrial sector. The total amount of support for science in general should be at least five per cent of the GNP, and the amount for basic science ought to be at least one per cent.

We should radically improve the country's educational system if we are to have a citizenry with a general understanding of the value and potential of science, and if we are to produce future generations of bright, talented young people for careers in research. The crucial educational periods are in the primary and secondary schools. We are now turning out high school graduates with little or no understanding of chemistry, physics, biology, or astronomy, and with no comprehension at all of real mathematics (a small minority of our high school students learn a small amount of calculus; their Soviet counterparts emerge with two years of calculus).

At the university level, we should be emphasizing the future possibilities of science much more than the past and present accomplishments. College students gain the impression that most, if not all, available bits of scientific information are already at hand, needing only to be mastered by rote in endlessly reductionist detail. The really interesting aspects of science, irresistible in their appeal to the imagination of young people, are the puzzles, the vast areas of ambiguity and plain ignorance about nature that have emerged in the past half century. There has never been a time in human history when it was known that there were so many unknown things lying just ahead, waiting to be found out. Students need to be taught, candidly and in detail, about human ignorance; this is the most exciting and challenging of all the things to be learned in college.

We should also be opening up the primary and secondary school systems for teachers who really know science. For some time to come, the universities will be producing

more advance-degree graduates in science than can be absorbed by the available jobs in the academic or industrial worlds. Some of these people should be teaching science to our children, with positions carrying the same kind of dignity and respect, and financial reward, as are now provided for college teachers. The education of teachers of science should not be the sole responsibility of teachers' colleges, nor be regulated at the state level by teachers' unions; the graduate departments of the universities are better at this.

We should reduce the public pressure for quick and immediately usable results from science, in favor of more pressure for fundamental knowledge from long-term research. It is all very well to worry about the 1980s and the country's needs for improved technologies, but the real worry, for all of us, and our children and theirs, should be the 1990s and the turn into the 21st century. To meet that time we will need to learn a lot more than we know today, and there is no imaginable source of that information, whatever it turns out to be, other than basic research.

I cannot guess at the things we will need to know about from science to get through the time ahead, but I am willing to make one prediction about the method: we will not be able to call the shots in advance. We cannot say to ourselves, we need this or that sort of technology, therefore we should be doing this or that sort of science. It does not work that way. We will have to rely, as we have in the past, on science in general, and on basic, undifferentiated science at that. Science is useful, indispensable, sometimes, but whenever it moves forward it does so by producing a surprise; you cannot specify the surprise you'd like. Technology should be watched closely, monitored, criticized, even voted in or out by the electorate, but science itself must be given its head if we want it to work.●

LIONS CLUB OF WILMINGTON, CALIF., HOSTS COMMUNITY RECOGNITION NIGHT HONORING EVELYNE POINDEXTER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1981, the Lions Club of Wilmington, Calif., will host Community Recognition Night to honor one of my district's fine leaders, Mrs. Evelyn Poindexter.

The Community Recognition Award is given annually to the citizen who has done the most for the community in the past year.

In 1938 Evelyn moved to Wilmington from Colorado with her husband Max. A dedicated homemaker for 44 years, she helped raise two children, Jane and Roy.

In 1953, Evelyn started the Women's Division of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, and served as its first secretary.

In 1956, she served as president of the Wilmington Toastmistress Club. She was honored as Toastmistress of the Year in 1958.

Evelyn became the youngest president of the Wilmington Women's Club in 1959. She served on the Los Angeles Mayor's City Advisory Committee in 1960, and in 1979 was president of the Women's Division of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce.

Additionally, Evelyn has served 32 years with the Red Cross, where she holds a Red Cross certificate for the blood bank. She has been a Girl Scout leader for 5 years, and received the highest of Girl Scout leader awards, the Gold Pin. She also served for years as Cub Scout den mother. She worked on the Cerritos Women's Club for 25 years, presiding over various committees, and has been charter chairman and member of the Los Cerritos District Art Festival for 15 years.

My wife, Lee, joins me in paying tribute to this great lady and her fine record of community participation. The recognition she is to receive on February 18 is truly deserved. We wish the best of success and prosperity in the years ahead for Evelyn Poindexter, her husband, Max, son, Roy Poindexter, daughter, Jane Forsberg, grandchildren, Edwin and Janice Lynn Forsberg and Gary, Brenda, and Scott Eugene Poindexter.●

CASE FOR CB RADIOS ON BUSES A GOOD ONE

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, on most interstate public transportation modes, communications equipment has proven to be not only convenient but also crucial in assisting travelers and reducing the possibilities for serious accidents.

Airplanes, of course, are equipped with communications equipment to not only help the aircraft navigate but to also assist passengers who may have serious medical problems and to assist the aircraft commander in avoiding possibly serious or fatal incidents. Also, all passenger trains are equipped with communications equipment to provide two-way communications.

There is one exception to this, however, interstate buses generally carry no communications equipment.

I have been in contact with bus-drivers across the country who tell of numerous instances of drivers being assaulted, buses being caught in blizzards, passengers having medical difficulties, and accidents occurring because of road hazards.

Let me give you just one example of what can happen. Recently, in St. Petersburg, Fla., 23 people died in a bus accident when a bridge was knocked down during a storm. A motorist with a CB radio was on the bridge trying to

warn drivers approaching the bridge. The bus was not equipped with a CB radio because the bus company did not allow drivers to have CB radios. The driver and all of the passenger perished.

Many bus companies do not allow their drivers to use CB radios because they fear the radios may be a distraction. However, the Department of Transportation, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission have adopted a Federal policy that the CB radio can offer a significant contribution to safety on the highways and encourage its use to provide highway safety and service.

Today I am introducing a bill which will allow the use of CB radios by those interstate busdrivers who desire to temporarily install a CB radio at their own expense. They would be allowed to use the radios for the safety and benefit of the passengers, for assisting operators of other motor vehicles when they are in difficulty, and for aiding law enforcement officials.

With this procedure, we will move toward the solution of this problem with a minimum of regulation and cost.

I am including in the RECORD at this point a column which appeared in the January 25, 1981, Cincinnati Enquirer. It lists a number of incidents which are typical of those I believe might be avoided with the use of CB radios.

CASE FOR CB RADIOS ON BUSES A GOOD ONE

(By Fred Simon)

"I'm not selling anything," said Phil Bezy. "I'm just trying to help improve transportation safety and trying to enlist your help in doing it."

His letter, sent to Breaker-Breaker, several police agencies and others around the country, outlined his one-man campaign. We thought you might be interested.

What Phil is trying to do is to get the interstate bus lines to install citizens band (CB) radios. He has made a pretty good case.

St. Petersburg, Fla.: When a span of the Sunshine Skyway Bridge was knocked out by a freighter during a thunderstorm, a motorist was on the bridge warning drivers via his CB radio. An interstate bus drove past the motorist and plunged off the bridge, killing the driver and 22 passengers. Company policy prevented the driver from having a CB radio.

Charleston, Mo.: At a recently posted detour, an overturned truck was lying on the shoulder of a road. After passing it, another truck driver started warning approaching traffic on his CB. He and four other truckers attempted to warn an oncoming bus of the hazard to no avail. The bus ripped open on impact, killing eight and injuring 44.

McLean, Texas: The driver and 24 passengers were injured when the bus they were on struck a jack-knifed tractor trailer on icy, fog-shrouded Interstate 40.

Binger, Okla.: A man at the rear of a bus became abusive and started arguing with another man. After stopping the vehicle for a third time to break up the ruckus, the driver put the offender into a front seat and

told him he would be put off the bus at the next stop if he moved. The man grabbed the driver by the throat, throwing the bus out of control and into the path of a pickup truck. The bus overturned and burst into flames. Three passengers and the elderly couple in the pickup truck died; 33 other passengers were injured.

Bezy offered many more situations from other places around the country where the CB might have helped the driver of an interstate passenger bus cope with an emergency situation. None is a hypothetical situation; all have been well documented by newspaper clippings.

"Am I saying some or all of the above suffering, deaths and inconvenience could have been avoided if the buses had CB?" Bezy wrote. "Some—yes; all—who's to say for sure?"

Bus drivers have been requesting federal intervention to get CB radios into their vehicles. Allowing the drivers to use CB on the National Emergency Channel Nine would provide them with instant access to help when an emergency arose.

Phil Bezy is asking for help from the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. He has enlisted the aid of a good many congressmen. It is possible his efforts will pay off. ●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL HONORS MENDELEVICH ON HIS DAY OF FREEDOM

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues and the family and friends of Josif Mendelevich who rejoice throughout the world on the occasion of his surprise release from Soviet prison following 10 years of hard labor as a result of the infamous Leningrad trials of 1970.

Throughout this ordeal, Mr. Mendelevich suffered through serious illness and squalid living conditions while managing to cling to his devout Judaic faith and observe strict dietary laws.

Nearly 2 years ago, I was pleased to meet personally with his sister, Rivka Drori of Israel, who came to the Nation's Capital to plead her brother's cause. I share her happiness now—and her hope that her brother will soon be restored to full and robust health in order to enjoy a meaningful and free life.

It is important that we now implore the Soviets to release as well the only two remaining prisoners convicted during the Leningrad trials—Alexi Murzhenko and Yuri Fiodorov. Neither shall we forget the other prisoners of conscience who have languished too long in Soviet camps.

But I perceive the release of Mendelevich—before his prison term officially ended—with some cautious optimism. Is his unexpected release a signal that the Soviets are responding

to dialogs at the Madrid Conference and repeated congressional and other pressures exerted by the U.S. Government? I sincerely want to believe so, and will continue to work toward this aim in every possible way. ●

CETA CAN WORK

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, all too often, certain programs are lambasted and severely criticized for not having lived up to their potential, or for having been supervised incorrectly, or for having spent too much of the American taxpayer's money. One such program that has been placed in these categories by some is the CETA program. I, however, am fortunate to have within my district CETA programs that effectively and efficiently achieve their objectives—giving those in need of training, workplace experience that will enable them to get and hold a job after their time with CETA is over. The CETA program in Torrance, Calif., is one I would like to especially call to your attention. As I have recently discovered, I am not the only one who still has faith in this program, since a public letter from the president of the Torrance chapter of the League of Women Voters, Kay White, has put it very well for the whole world to see. This letter is especially significant as it comes from a non-Government source with no parochial ax to grind. It is refreshing to note that a private citizen feels that a CETA program can and does work well, and that in the bargain, can be recognized for the good it contributes to the entire community.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Ms. White's "Letter to the Editor" of the Torrance Daily Breeze, which appeared in the December 28 edition, as evidence that not all CETA programs should be dispensed with. I hope that my colleagues will make note of it, and perhaps they will discover that some of the CETA programs in their districts are also recognized for the benefits they provide.

CETA PROGRAM A SUCCESS

EDITOR, THE DAILY BREEZE: In response to your editorial of Dec. 8, "Phase out CETA," the League of Women Voters of Torrance would like to point out that there are municipal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act programs which are highly successful and beneficial, an example being the Torrance program.

We find our local CETA program is efficiently and effectively administered, avoiding many of the pitfalls of the program elsewhere.

Specifically, there is a strong antinepotism policy that precludes relatives of city

employees from participating in the program.

Administration costs are kept low. Good use is made of local training resources and innovative, economical programs.

Statistics from CETA personnel indicate that approximately 60 percent of the participants served each year move on successfully to unsubsidized employment within the regulated time.

Special programs are designed to meet the needs of the elderly, the handicapped, unemployed heads of households, unemployed veterans and low-income youths and young adults.

Last year the Torrance CETA staff was selected as one of the 10 prime sponsors in the country to participate in the Young Integrated Grants Demonstration Project. This national recognition confirms the confidence we place in our well-run program.

KAY WHITE,

President, League of Women Voters.●

A PREVIEW OF PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ECONOMICS

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with research on tax reduction legislation, I have discovered some very interesting testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means that was presented in 1958—23 years ago. That particular appearance before the committee has taken on renewed significance today in the light of the identity of the spokesman, intervening events, and currently evolving fiscal developments.

The testimony to which I refer concerned a Kemp-Roth type tax plan which was then known as the Sadlak-Herlong bill—a tax reduction proposal designed to alleviate the stifling disincentive of excessively high tax rates. Under that bill the tax relief would have occurred within the framework of fiscal responsibility with declining Federal expenditures and increasing Federal revenues. The cut in spending levels and the cut in tax rates contemplated in the bill were designed to provide inflation-free sustainable economic growth. The higher revenues were to be produced by lower tax rates applied to an expanding economic base. Like Kemp-Roth, the Sadlak-Herlong plan would have provided tax reduction in multiple stages over a period of years. The phased-in approach to tax reduction was eventually adopted in the so-called Kennedy tax reduction program, as ultimately approved in 1964.

The appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means to which I allude occurred on January 27, 1958. No presently sitting member on the Committee on Ways and Means was then a member of that committee or even a Member of Congress. The testimony advocating the adoption of the

Sadlak-Herlong plan was offered by a spokesman who represented both labor and management organizations associated with an important American industry. In the witness' statement he made these points which I have excerpted:

*** I represent the Motion Picture Industry Council and the Hollywood AFL Film Council *** the organizations support *** the Sadlak-Herlong bill *** the personal income tax structure is unrealistic, confiscatory, and contrary to the principles of free enterprise *** has tended to stifle *** production *** in this country *** the result is unemployment *** and *** a loss of tax revenue to the government *** the tax problems *** are shared by *** citizens in all lines of endeavor, varying only in the manner in which the taxes adversely affect them and curb their initiative *** and we remember that Karl Marx said, and Lenin echoed, that the way to impose socialism on the people would be to first tax the middle class out of existence *** it is imperative that some relationship *** exist between the individual's sacrifice and the Government's fiscal needs *** such relationship does not exist *** no revenue will be lost *** the normal growth of our economy *** will actually result in the Government's share *** increasing rather than decreasing *** Government spending can be cut *** we are pledged *** support of our system based on individual freedom and liberty *** as against a philosophy of statism and collectivism.

Then the witness effectively and persuasively responded to extensive questioning by several committee members at the conclusion of which our distinguished former colleague from Wisconsin, Hon. John W. Byrnes, said:

May I make a comment that I think Mr. Reagan ought to run for Congress because we need more of his philosophy and persuasiveness here in Congress.

Yes, the witness was Ronald Reagan—the motion picture executive and actor. He did not run for Congress as suggested by Congressman Byrnes but he subsequently was a great Governor of California and, of course, he is now the esteemed President of the United States.

President Reagan is working diligently to restore responsibility and restraint in the conduct of the Nation's fiscal affairs, to remove undue tax constraints on economic growth and opportunity, and to permit the American citizen to retain a larger share of the fruits of his own productivity.

As we confront our urgent fiscal problems, we must recognize the only revenue the Government can spend is that which it takes away from the citizens either through taxes or debt—which is deferred taxation just as inflation is a concealed tax. The Treasury Department has no secret source of revenue of its own. Government spending has to be paid for by the people. And the Reagan administration is committed to spend less of the people's money and to spend it more effectively in providing for the realis-

tic and legitimate needs of our citizens for governmental goods and services.

The testimony by witness Ronald Reagan before the Committee on Ways and Means which I have excerpted can be found in the printed record of general revenue revisions hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, part 2, pages 1980-1993, 85th Congress, 2d session (1958). It is on the record. We should have heeded his sound fiscal advocacy then; we must heed it today if we would expand economic opportunity, curb inflation, and create a revitalized America. The abuses and excesses of governmental programs that do not work must be controlled and curtailed and those Federal programs that serve a legitimate public interest must be re-focused and strengthened to serve better their intended missions.

President Reagan's state of the Union address tonight will outline the steps to be taken now and continued in the future to repress the skyrocketing growth of our Government and improve its efficiency in accomplishing necessary governmental functions. I am fully supportive of the President, and I urge my colleagues to give expeditious approval to the administration's program to restore economic vitality.

Government enterprise must relinquish its depressively dominant role in our economy and in the lives of our people. Private enterprise must be encouraged to move America forward once again to leadership and preeminence in serving freedom's noble cause in peace and prosperity.

The Reagan administration deserves the chance—the time and the opportunity—to correct the errors and excesses of our past ways and to restore our Government to a posture of being servant, not master, of our people. It will not be done overnight but we must begin now, stay steady on the course, and make a sustained and disciplined effort to attain these exigent ends.●

THE SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE OF ILLICIT DRUG ASSETS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, narcotics trafficking and drug abuse have reached epidemic proportions both in this country and abroad. Drug trafficking is a multibillion dollar business estimated to have reached a staggering \$64 billion just in this Nation alone. The profits from the illicit sale of marihuana, cocaine, heroin, Phenylcyclidine (commonly known as PCP or "Angel Dust"), Quaaludes and other dangerous drugs are enormous.

Until recently, our law enforcement agencies have been attacking the drug trafficking problem primarily by interdicting the illicit drugs (including the arrest, conviction and incarceration of the drug traffickers) and by cooperating with host nations to eradicate the illicit production of drugs at their source. In 1978, a third major ingredient was added to our law enforcement arsenal by permitting, under section 881(a)(6) of the Controlled Substances Act, the seizure and forfeiture of the drug traffickers' criminal assets—the cash, boats, aircraft, cars, homes, securities and other financial instruments used in the sordid drug trafficking business.

Mr. Speaker, narcotics trafficking is a highly sophisticated, well-financed operations conducted by international criminal syndicates, independent entrepreneurs, and so-called "respectable citizens." Drug trafficking tentacles reach into every region of the world, undermining the political, economic, and social institutions of every nation and causing human misery for millions of citizens throughout the world. Incarcerating the drug trafficker, such as Kingpin Nicky Barnes, formerly New York City's Mr. Untouchable, is important in removing that criminal influence from society. However, incarceration, as a single law enforcement strategy, only temporarily disrupts the drug organization; it does not immobilize that organization's drug trafficking operations. But the seizure and forfeiture of illegally obtained drug assets strike the drug traffickers where it hurts the most . . . at their pocketbooks.

During fiscal year 1980, our Federal Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), working with the Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Customs Service, and State, local and foreign law enforcement agencies seized a total of \$90.8 million in illicit drug assets, of which more than \$42 million was forfeited to the Federal Treasury. To date, DEA Administrator Peter Bensinger estimates a weekly seizure-forfeiture rate of between \$2 million and \$3 million.

Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the 96th Congress, I introduced H.R. 8233 that would permit Federal drug law enforcement officials to use the proceeds from the sale of forfeited property to purchase evidence and other information in connection with their drug trafficking investigations. Within the next few weeks, I will be reintroducing this legislative proposal. In the interim, in an effort to more fully inform my colleagues of the efforts of our law enforcement authorities to seize illegally obtained drug assets, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD an article from the Los Angeles Times (Feb. 9, 1981), entitled "Forfeitures Up to \$3 Million Weekly:

Seizure of Ill-Gotten Gains Hailed in Fight on Drugs."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 9, 1981]
**FORFEITURES UP TO \$3 MILLION WEEKLY,
 SEIZURE OF ILL-GOTTEN GAINS HAILED IN
 FIGHT ON DRUGS**

(By Ronald J. Ostrow)

WASHINGTON.—For years narcotics agents have confiscated tools of the drug dealers' trade—contraband drugs, cars, guns, occasionally an airplane, as long as the tools were used to make or distribute illicit drugs.

But now, thanks to a recent law, the government can be even tougher on drug pushers.

Recently in St. Louis federal agents seized a Cessna aircraft, a farm, \$300,000 in cash and a private airport after breaking up one of the biggest marijuana smuggling operations in the United States.

In Miami, undercover agents for the Drug Enforcement Administration arranged for the delivery of 8,000 pounds of marijuana and then seized the smuggler's \$1.2-million house, \$34,500 in currency and two expensive cars, a Mercedes and a Lincoln.

CAPITAL HEART OF BUSINESS

In a Midwestern city, the agents targeted 64 automobiles for seizure—including as many as 35 Cadillacs—after cracking down on a curbside heroin and cocaine distribution ring.

The three cases show how the Drug Enforcement Administration is using the new law in the fight against illicit narcotics: seizing not just those items involved in producing and selling drugs; but also the illegally accumulated profits that drug traffickers invest in such entities as a private home or a bank account.

"Capital is at the heart of all businesses, both legal and illegal," said DEA Administrator Peter B. Bensinger. "Depriving drug traffickers of their assets, including their operating tools and their illegally accumulated profits is an essential step in crippling these organizations."

Bensinger said in an interview that many drug pushers have accumulated millions of illegal dollars and "the best way to hit them is in the pocketbook."

"As long as their assets remained untouched, they could quickly replace seized drugs and arrested people," he said.

The new seizure-forfeiture authority was enacted by Congress at the DEA's request in 1978 as an amendment to the Controlled Substances Act.

In Fiscal 1980, the first full year that the DEA went after accumulated drug profits, the agency used the new authority in more than half of its 1,685 seizures, taking over drugs and property it valued at \$90.8 million. Its 521 forfeitures were valued at \$42.6 million.

Bensinger estimated the seizure-forfeiture totals now at between \$2 million and \$3 million a week.

There is nothing new about law enforcement relying on forfeiture—taking illegally used or acquired property without compensating its owner. Bensinger said the practice is thousands of years old.

In 1970, with public concern over crime mounting, Congress enacted two major forfeiture provisions. One was part of the Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organizations statute, the so-called RICO law that has become a major weapon in fighting or-

ganized crime. The other was a Continuing Criminal Enterprise statute.

But problems have developed in the agency's reliance on the laws to pursue illegally accumulated profits, according to Harry Myers, the DEA's associate chief counsel. The corrupt organizations law is almost useless, because courts have held that it does not apply to accumulated profits, Myers said.

He said court rulings have not been as clear on the Continuing Criminal Enterprise law but that the kind and amount of proof required for confiscation makes narcotics agents less likely to use it than the 1978 provision that subjects all money used in drug deals to forfeiture and, most important, all proceeds traceable to illegal drug trade.

If narcotics agents are seeking under the 1978 law to seize a \$500,000 house that an apprehended drug dealer bought, they must prove "to a substantial certainty" that the money used to buy it stemmed from illegal drug activities. That standard of proof is much easier to meet than the "beyond a reasonable doubt" required in a criminal case.

"When you see people suspected of drug dealing who have listed their occupations as bakers and are buying \$500,000 homes, it kind of stretches the imagination," Bensinger said.

Bensinger says his agency's pursuit of drug dealer profits gives it a three-fold strategy for waging the war on drugs at a time when two of the strategies—wiping out drug crops in host countries and stopping drugs at the border—are not as successful as federal officials would like.

"When you have defendants posting bail and fleeing jurisdiction or receiving minor jail sentences, you have to go after them another way," Bensinger said.

The FBI used to defend the agency's vigorous pursuit of car thieves by saying that it saved the taxpayers enough money in recovered cars to pay for the cost of its investigations. Similarly, Bensinger noted that the DEA's "cash flow" has climbed well above last year's level of asset seizures.

As enticing as Bensinger and other drug agency officials find the new enforcement tool, Bensinger said it is no panacea.

Bensinger's agency has drafted a model Forfeiture of Drug Profits Act which it hopes state legislatures will adopt.

"No state can afford to ignore the modern potential of this ancient doctrine," Bensinger said.

Although there are no easy answers or single approaches to effectively waging "war" against drug traffickers, the newly enacted seizure-forfeiture provision of the Controlled Substances Act is a welcome addition to the Nation's efforts to control narcotics trafficking both at home and abroad. In this regard, I commend our law enforcement officials and urge that my colleagues help them to intensify their investigations and seizures of illegally obtained drug assets by providing the personnel, equipment, and funding needed to do the job. ●

TRIBUTE TO ELLA T. GRASSO

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I join Congressman MOFFETT and Members of the Connecticut delegation in paying tribute to the late Honorable Ella T. Grasso. Penetrating that sadness, however, is an abiding admiration for a woman who gave to her elected positions of leadership those qualities of compassion and fair judgment which are all too rare in our fast-paced world.

In her service as Representative of Connecticut's Sixth District, Mrs. Grasso revealed a strong commitment to the needs of her constituency. She won the friendship and professional admiration of her colleagues in the House through her service on the Veterans' Affairs and Education and Labor Committees, and gained the esteem of the people of Connecticut, who elected her Governor in 1974. As the first woman in American history elected in her own right to that position, Mrs. Grasso set an exemplary standard in political office for all legislators, male and female alike.

I know that my colleagues in the House share with me a deeply felt sympathy for Mrs. Grasso's family during this sad and difficult time.●

GREEN BILL—RELIEF TO PUBLISHERS

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would exempt publishers from a crippling Supreme Court ruling which forces them to destroy their inventories of books and discourages publishing of books that are not likely to be best sellers.

Some time ago the IRS ruled that the inventory practice of "writing down" the cost of unsold goods would no longer be accepted. The Supreme Court upheld this ruling and stated that the only way goods could be "written down" for tax purposes is if they are "remaindered"—sold at low prices—or if they are destroyed. The result is that book publishers, long dependent on this system of inventory, are having to destroy books in order to survive and are reluctant to publish new works that may meet the same fate.

This has created an intolerable situation. The Supreme Court ruling has forced book publishers to destroy

thousands of books and is affecting the editorial decisions of publishing houses throughout the country.

Small publishers and academic publishers are being hit particularly hard. There are many books which sell fewer copies than expected and can be disposed of only over a long period of time. Past inventory practices have allowed publishers to "write down" the unsold books and then continue marketing them in the following year. Now, in order to take the "write down" loss, these books are being destroyed. It is making it very difficult for small publishing companies and those companies which specialize in academically oriented books to make a profit.

A typical example is Octagon Books, in New York City. Octagon has destroyed 11,000 books, including copies of "Baudelaire the Critic" and "The Tennessee Yeoman, 1840-60." These books are important, but do not have a mass appeal. The new tax ruling created a situation where it was more profitable for Octagon to destroy these books than to continue to keep them in inventory, because they could no longer be "written down."

What is especially disturbing is the way this decision is affecting editorial decisions. Now that companies know that they have this problem they will be very reluctant to publish books of a specialized nature. As a result, we are risking the loss of many important works.

My legislation would exempt publishers of books, maps, sheet music, and periodicals from this decision. The legislation would change the taxing policy of the IRS for the taxable years ending after December 1979. This was the date the publishers were forced to adhere to this new policy.

Providing swift relief to the publishing industry is critical. I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort to rectify this unfortunate situation.●

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR CONTRACT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, "Does Anybody Labor at the Labor Department," which appeared in the February 8, 1981, Washington Post.

This is the latest in a series of articles written concerning a recent contract negotiated for Labor Department employees.

That contract includes a provision designated "Use of Personal Audio Devices." The provision reads, in part:

Employees have the right to play radios, cassettes, etc. on the worksite so long as the

use does not disturb the productivity of the employee * * *.

I find it hard to believe that any employees—Federal or private—can perform capably, efficiently, and with concentration when radios, cassettes, and possibly televisions can be played near and around them.

I do not think that use of these noisemaking devices can do other than "disturb the productivity" of the worker operating the radio or cassettes or TV, and any other worker in the adjacent area. If their productivity is unaffected, they cannot be doing much to begin with.

Furthermore, the inclusion of the term "etc." in this contract is, maybe, a global first. Certainly this makes the contract so open ended as to be impossible to enforce.

To compound this problem, this Labor Department contract could well become a pattern for Government contracts to be negotiated in the years ahead.

I respect collective bargaining and feel it strengthens the Nation. But, this particular contract could prove very damaging.

It comes at a time when the Nation is desperately trying to increase the rate of productivity in the public and private sectors so America can compete with foreign nations. It comes when we are starting the painful—but necessary—process of reducing inflation which is eroding the strength and vitality of our Nation. This contract flies in the face of all this.

When the public reads about this Labor Department contract it is not hard to understand why Federal service and Federal employees are held in such low esteem.

We are all considered as lazy, incompetent, and inefficient workers. This is not a fair appraisal of our worth and our talent. But that is the appraisal which sticks with the public.

I have written the Department of Labor to express my concerns about this contract. I would ask my colleagues to give this matter careful attention.

The article follows:

DOES ANYBODY LABOR AT THE LABOR DEPARTMENT?

(By Barbara Palmer)

The Labor Department, I've heard, is to federal employe trends what California is to everything else—the place where everything happens first. So when a friend who is a lawyer there told me about a new collective bargaining agreement the department had signed with its employees, I listened.

Quite a progressive agreement, my friend said. Not only did it mandate "flexitime," a new federal program that allowed employees, within limits, to set their own hours; it also provided up to two years' "child care" leave after pregnancy. It even gave employees the right to play radios or tape decks at their desks.

This sounded like some federal paperwork I might actually want to read. I wasted no

time getting down to Labor to see if I might get a copy of the contract. The Frances Perkins Building, Labor's headquarters, is a modern concrete-and-glass facility familiar to many Washington commuters since it straddles Interstate 95 as the highway dead-ends near the Capitol. The gridlike cubicles of the building's facade do little to lift the spirits, and most of the offices inside its vast seven stories have no access to natural light—though I am told that an early problem with carbon monoxide fumes seeping into the lower floors from the freeway has been solved.

Inside, the atmosphere seemed generally relaxed. At one desk, a woman was doing her knitting, while in another office a secretary seemed engrossed in her novel. Farther along I noticed another woman padding toward her office in a pair of fuzzy bedroom slippers.

I wandered deeper into the maze of hallways, pausing every few yards to check whether I was approaching North 4408, the office of Local 12 of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE).

Thumpa, thumpa, thumpa, another one bites the dust.

I glanced in the direction of the sound, but all I could see was a reception area and the corner of a desk. In a nearby office, all of the five or six desks apparently had been left unoccupied. As I passed, a phone was ringing.

A NEW CONTRACT ENCOURAGES KNITTING, SLIPPERS, TV'S, TAPE DECKS AND FLEXIBLE HOURS, BUT TRY FINDING SOMEBODY AT HIS DESK

The contract proved to be an intimidating document 160 pages thick. On the last page was a list of the 14 representatives of the union and the 11 representatives of the department who had negotiated the agreement.

Instead of wading through the text, I decided to save some time by calling the participants directly. It was 2 p.m.—a good hour, I thought, to catch people in their offices. I picked a name from the top of the union list, one Jeffrey Salzman.

"Hello, is Mr. Salzman in?"

"He's not here," came the curt reply.

"Do you know when he'll be back?"

"No."

"Is he expected back at all today?"

"I really don't know."

Next on the list was Doris Thomas, third vice president of the union, according to the contract. I dialed her office in the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"Is Ms. Thomas in?"

"No, I don't know where Doris is."

"Do you know when she'll be back?"

"No, she didn't say where she was going."

"Can I leave a message?"

"I guess so."

Third was Charles Wood. "Yes, this is his office," the reply came, "but he's usually not here. He spends most of his time over at the union office."

After the fourth name, I began to get worried. By the time the ninth person on the list was out of her office ("No, I don't have any idea when she'll be back"), I was getting desperate. I dialed number 10, a Paul Gifford.

Luckily, Gifford was in, and more than happy to talk about the contract.

I asked first about "flexitime." Gifford explained that limited experiments in "alternative work schedules" were going on in various government agencies, but that Labor's contract was the first to ensure that all the employees in the "bargaining unit" who weren't already participating in an experi-

ment would be covered by one of several flexitime plans.

These ranged from a slight variation on the traditional work week to the most liberal plan, known as "maxiflex." In maxiflex, an employee's 40 hours of work can be concentrated into four days between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m., as the employee sees fit—providing he is present during the "core hours" (10 a.m. to 3 p.m.) of the "core days" (usually Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday). Gifford explained: "Maxiflex means that if I get up on a Friday morning and it's an absolutely gorgeous day out, I can say, 'Gee, I'd rather go biking along the C & O Canal than go to work,' and I don't have to bother calling anyone to say I'm not coming in."

Gifford also cleared up some confusion I had over the provision of the contract relating to maternity leave, which reads:

"Child Care Leave: An employee may be granted any combination of annual leave or leave without pay, for a period up to two years for the purposes of pregnancy, or for assisting or caring for the minor children of the employee or the mother of a male employee's newborn child while the mother is incapacitated for maternity reasons."

I told Gifford the syntax of the paragraph struck me as odd. He explained that this was because the provision had been written to apply to fathers as well as mothers, and—in a concession management had initially resisted—to unwed fathers as well as unwed mothers. What the clause means, he said, is that any employee who has a child and takes "child care leave" is guaranteed either his old job or a comparable one when he returns, up to two years later. The union, Gifford said, had originally asked for five years.

Finally, there was this paragraph:

"Use of Personal Audio Devices: Employees have the right to play radios, cassettes, etc., on the worksite so long as the use does not disturb the productivity of the employee or other employees within the worksite and does not distract clientele."

I asked Gifford what the "etc." meant.

"It means televisions."

Indeed, said Gifford, the union interpreted the contract to include TVs under "audio devices." On this issue there seemed to have been some tactical debate within the union negotiating team. Later, Wayne Lauderdale, another union negotiator, told me: "Our biggest problem was whether to include televisions because a lot of clerical people are into soap operas. Originally, the word 'television' was in there, but it didn't cost us anything to strike it because it was covered anyway under 'etc.'"

Otherwise, said Lauderdale, "This provision was no big deal because all it did was affirm a practice that has been fairly widespread in the department for a long time."

Now I was getting somewhere. I decided it was time to check out management's view of all this. So I put in a call to Robert Hastings, the director of the department's Office of Labor-Management Relations.

"Is Mr. Hastings in?"

"No, he isn't."

"Do you expect him today?"

"I'm not sure."

I tried Hastings again the next day, and again the next. He wasn't in, so I left messages. The third day, when he hadn't returned my calls, I asked the receptionist whether he might be on leave, or sick perhaps?

"I'm not sure whether he's on leave or traveling," she said. "Mr. Hastings does travel a lot. But I'll give him your message

when he comes in." She suggested that in the meantime I talk to Isaac Cole, another of the management negotiators.

Tipping my hand somewhat, I asked Cole whether management hadn't found a few of the union's demands unreasonable. Cole got angry.

"I didn't find any of the union's demands unrealistic," he snapped. "I assumed they were all made in good faith . . . It's a good contract. Management wouldn't have signed it unless we thought it was a good contract." Cole added, "I don't accept the premise that there has to be an adversarial relationship between management and the union." When I pressed him on this, he hung up.

I learned later the Department of Labor has historically been one organization where the traditional adversary relationship between unions and management has been successfully tempered, after a fashion.

When collective bargaining in the federal sector was recognized by executive order in 1962, Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg made it a point of pride that his department would be the first to sign an agreement.

To achieve this goal, the story goes, he directed the department's negotiating team to make whatever concessions were necessary to the union.

"Those of us who were all familiar with collective bargaining agreements in the private sector were appalled with that agreement," recalls Leonard Nichols, a department veteran who is a member of management's negotiating team. "We really gave them the store. And once we had a soft agreement to start with, it just kept getting mushier and mushier."

The natural tendency of many Labor managers to sympathize with their union extended into the most recent contract talks last April. Ben Segal, one of the negotiators for the department, is a dues-paying member of the union he was negotiating with (although as special assistant to an assistant secretary he is too far up the management ladder to benefit directly from the contract).

"We recognize the union, accept the union and want it to be more effective," Segal told me. "We in the Labor Department are, in effect, preaching to employers about fair practices and labor-management relations, and I think that gives us an obligation to practice what we preach."

Many of the department's negotiators during the latest contract talks had no previous experience with collective bargaining on either the union or management side, while others were drafted as negotiators at the last minute and had little time to familiarize themselves with the issues.

Nichols recalls that he'd just returned from a two-week vacation and "barely had sat down in my chair before they told me to get over to the Georgetown Inn," where the negotiations dragged on for several weeks at government expense.

"That whole issue of flexitime was so damned complicated," added Nichols, "that at one point we were offering them something much more generous than they were asking for."

Across the table, on the other hand, the union negotiators knew what they wanted and were seemingly less concerned with setting an example of nonadversarial behavior. "We behaved like a union—self-interested," says Jeffrey Salzman. "And we achieved accordingly."

Just how much they achieved will only become evident over the next few years, but

a first impression can be gleaned by looking at the fine print in the contract.

There are, as expected, provisions that go beyond the civil service laws in making it harder to fire or otherwise discipline a non-performing employee. If a supervisor wants a statistician to hit his calculator a little more often and accurately, for example, he must think twice before sidling up to the accountant's desk and saying so. According to the new contract, if the supervisor later attempts to suspend, demote or fire the employee, such "oral counselings, warnings, reprimands or admonishments" may not be used as evidence at the required disciplinary hearing. Only warnings in written memo form count.

If the supervisor, daunted by the task of building a paper record against his no-account accountant, decides to use the time-honored technique of transferring him to an open slot in Spokane or Dubuque, he again runs afoul of the contract. Under the new scheme if an employee doesn't accept a transfer, the department has to try to find him another job in Labor's Washington offices—and provide any training necessary.

Other provisions, which appear blandly innocuous, assume more meaning when they are explained by Local 12 officers. There is, for example, a clause entitled "work plans," which says that "employees have the right to propose new and innovative ways to carry out the mission or function of the department . . . [and] when feasible the department will implement the plan. If an employee's plan is rejected, the department will inform the employee, in writing, as to why it was rejected."

Sounds like nothing more than an official tribute to the suggestion box. But here was how union negotiator Gifford illustrated its importance:

"Suppose you're an investigator in the Bureau of International Labor Affairs and your job is to go out and examine the records of shoe companies or electronics firms to see how foreign imports are affecting their business. But you're also going to law school at night, and the traveling is interfering with your classes.

"Under the work plan provision, you could decide that it's unnecessary to go out in the field because you could really do the whole thing by phone and mail. You could just send forms to the company to fill out and analyze them back in Washington. It might save the government money."

"But what if you send out these forms," I asked, "and the companies send back false information that suits their own interests?"

"Well, management would have the right to bring up that point in its written explanation of why your suggestion isn't feasible," Gifford added that, of course, the union could disagree with management's explanation, and maybe even take the matter to arbitration.

On paper, many of the contract's provisions look sensible enough—unusual, to be sure, but phrased in language that truly cooperative union and management teams might be expected to arrive at. Most of the rights it grants employees are followed by reasonable-sounding qualification:

Employees can play their radios "so long as the use does not disturb the productivity of the employee." They can choose their own hours, but their bosses can set "coverage requirements" to assure, for example, that there are enough people to answer the phones at all times. They can work a 30-hour week, but only if they have built up a 10-hour credit by working overtime the previous week.

These are the sorts of innovations that might work in an environment where both managers and workers are motivated by a goal of performance—like producing a good product—or are afraid of the consequences of not performing—like getting fired, or going out of business.

Unfortunately, it is this shared motivation to perform that is so notably absent from the federal government, and that, in my conversations, seemed particularly absent from the Department of Labor. The contract's talk of productivity, after all, takes place within the context of a civil service system in which productivity is rarely measured, and mediocre performance rarely punished on either an individual or collective level.

Historically, in this system, about the only assurance of the government's *output* has been the federal work ethic's fairly rigid control over *input*. "9 to 5" was the substance of this ethic, and "I'm giving you my 40 hours" its creed.

One reason the Department of Labor was willing to sign the agreement, according to management negotiator Lockwood, was that, "Basically, there aren't any tangible costs"—no actual wage increases or budget-breaking fringe benefits. Intangible costs, on the other hand, are not so easy to spot, particularly in an organization like the Department of Labor that produces an intangible product.

(Theoretically, at least the flexitime portion of Labor's experiment is being evaluated by the federal Office of Personnel Management, which is scheduled to announce its findings in 1982. But OPM's effort is already bogged down in disputes over whether its evaluation plan will actually measure anything worth measuring. The General Accounting Office, for example, has pointed out that OPM has no plans to ask the public if the services provided by the government offices using "flexitime" have improved or deteriorated.)

It is quite likely that the "advances" embodied in the Department of Labor contract will spread to other agencies, as the AFGE is already urging. Barring hard numbers proving either an increase or decrease in productivity, the basic ratchet-rule of collective bargaining can be expected to take hold. As the AFGE's director of labor-management services, John Mulholland, put it, "Once one agency gets a new package of benefits, it doesn't take long for the rest to catch up."

I decided to give Robert Hastings one last try. A dozen calls over two weeks had produced no response, and only one indication of Hastings's actual presence in the national capital area (he had been "in a meeting"). I dialed.

"Mr. Hastings isn't in right now."

"Is Mr. Hastings ever in?"

"I'm sorry, but he's always in a meeting or out of the office. That's what he does all day."

I thought of Hastings a few days later when I read a report which said that the Office of Personnel Management was considering a new experiment in "alternative work scheduling." This experiment, I read, will go one step beyond "flexitime." It is called "flexiplace." Under it, a federal employee, if he can perform his work at home, would not have to show up at the office at all.

Actually, I had heard this idea before, from Paul Gifford, when he was discussing the demands the union had left to raise at the next round of contract talks.

"I could see," he had said enthusiastically, "where this contract could be improved . . ."

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN PEDRO CHAMBER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COMMERCE HONORS LONG-TIME MEMBERS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 20, 1981, the San Pedro Chamber of Community Development and Commerce will conduct a special recognition luncheon to commemorate 75 years of incorporation.

The main event of this luncheon will be the honoring of the many longtime members.

Special guests at this luncheon include Dr. Roy Smith, the oldest living past chamber president, who served in 1939. Additionally, all members who have held continuous membership for 25 years or more will be honored. Chamber records show 65 businesses will be so honored.

Included in the honorary roll will be: Southern California Gas Co., 63 years; C. J. Hendry Co., Chevron, U.S.A., Inc., Foothills Mayflower, the San Pedro News Pilot, and Seaside Prescription Pharmacy, all with 62 years; Pacific Telephone, 61 years; Harbor Office Supply, 58 years; Louisiana Pacific Corp., 57 years; Louis M. Sepulveda, 53 years; Bank of America, Security Bank, United California Bank, and Van Camp Insurance, each with 52 years; the San Pedro YMCA, with 51 years; Atchison Realty and San Pedro Peninsula Hospital with 50 years each.

Also honored will be Becker Insurance Co. and San Pedro Harbor Ship Supply Co., 49 years; Star-Kist Foods, Inc., 48 years; Palos Verdes Properties, and Safeway Stores, Inc., 46 years; Tolbert's, and Jugoslav-American Club, 44 years; Glendale Federal Savings & Loan Association, and Savage Insurance Agency, 43 years; Anchor Press, 41 years; Pleasure Craft Co., Richard's Cleaners, and Tyler Printing Co., Inc., 38 years; Harbor Insurance Agency, Southwest Instrument Co., and Todd Pacific Shipyards Corp., 37 years; Frank Coletto Ford, Inc., Mesa Nursery, Seaside Supply Stores, Inc., and Supremeco, Inc., 36 years; San Pedro Hardware & Gift Co., 35 years; Independent Press Telegram, 34 years; Green Hills Memorial Park, 33 years; Olsen's Restaurant, 32 years; Lite House Electric Co., Moretti Tire Service, San Pedro Boat Works, Elton C. Spiers, D.D.S., and Union War Surplus, 31 years; Hards-Fleming-Trutanic Insurance, 30 years; California Yacht Anchorages, Inc., Clara's for Flowers, R. J. Frie, M.D., 28 years; McCowan's

Market, McNerney's Mortuary, and Harry B. Meisel, O.D., 27 years; Allen & Son Jewelers, William R. Anderson, M.D., Ben's TV & Appliances, Cross Pharmacy, Robert F. Lande, D.D.S., San Pedro Board of Realtors, Inc., San Pedro Lock & Key, Roy Smith, M.D., George N. Stephenson, Trant's Shoes, and Wilmington Transportation Co., 26 years; Hilja's, Ben Karmelich, William Lusby, A.I.A., and San Pedro Glass & Mirror, 25 years.

The San Pedro Chamber's list of accomplishments is as impressive as its honorary member list. My wife, Lee, joins me in celebrating the chamber's anniversary, and in wishing continued success to an organization that has greatly served the Los Angeles Harbor community.●

RESHAPING POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, February 11, 1981, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESHAPING POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

Most Americans are convinced that their national government does not work well. Every poll shows it, and the declining participation of voters at election time confirms it. Conversations with Hoosiers leave me with the very same impression: the government is simply not responding adequately to the problems the nation faces. Americans lack confidence in the government because many of the adverse events and trends of recent years—the Vietnam War, Watergate, inflation, unemployment, the energy shortage, Soviet adventurism, the hostage crisis—have been perceived by them as failures of government.

I have often wondered why the government has performed poorly. A principal reason seems to be that our political institutions have become so weak that we are not able to use them to build the consensus necessary for effective government action. The President finds his authority reduced by unresponsive civil servants, conflicts between his personal staff and his cabinet, and legislative restrictions Congress has imposed on him. The power of Congress is undercut by a diffusion of leadership among many members, the intense pressure of special interest groups, and antiquated, complicated procedures. The political parties have seen their influence wane because of advances in mass communications, reforms intended to open up the nominating process, and changes in the laws that control campaign financing. The challenge is to reshape these and other political institutions so that they will be more useful.

After thinking about this challenge for some time and reading several new reports, I want to offer a few suggestions on ways to strengthen three key political institutions: the Presidency, Congress, and the political parties. Unless these institutions work well, there will be little support for policies which are in the interests of the general public.

The Presidency: The American political system is not at its best without strong presidential leadership. Only the President can articulate national goals clearly and lead the nation in sensible efforts to reach those goals. The hand of the Chief Executive should be strengthened in several ways. His immediate staff should be small, highly professional, and unbiased, with expertise in international, economic, and domestic affairs. He needs one unit to search for talented people and another to anticipate general trends and develop long-range policies. There must be more cooperation between White House aides and department heads. The President's control of the bureaucracy must be tightened and his ties with Congress improved. Congress must release the President from legislative restrictions, especially those in foreign policy, that have made it more difficult for him to exercise his mandate. In recent years Congress has rejected its traditional deference to the President in foreign affairs, but it has not been able to come up with consistent policies on its own. No one wants it to be a "rubber stamp," but Congress must not ignore presidential leadership altogether.

Congress: Despite all its faults, Congress is still the best national institution for the reconciliation of divergent interests. The public's loss of confidence in Congress, however, can be corrected only by solid performance. Congress must "get its act together" and solve the major problems on the national agenda. If it is to do so, it needs to have its vulnerability to special interest groups reduced, its heavy workload lightened, and its unwieldy procedures streamlined. Congressional committees must be reorganized so that they parallel the functions of government. Responsibilities must be distributed more evenly among them. Both the number of subcommittees and the number of subcommittee assignments per member should be cut. Congressional leadership needs to be fortified, so that Congress can help give the country a sense of direction. It must be allowed to force timely consideration of the issues as it blends the various actions of Congress into a coherent whole. The roles of the Speaker, the key committees, and the party caucuses must be broadened.

The political parties: The consensus-building role of the political parties is probably more important than is generally appreciated. Political parties have often molded majorities out of disparate interests within our country, easing relationships within Congress, between Congress and the President, and among the governors, state legislatures, and mayors. If political parties are to assume their consensus-building role once again, they must be strengthened in several ways. We might increase the percentage of elected officeholders, candidates, and party officials in delegations to nominating conventions. We might shorten election campaigns and require presidential primaries, organized by time zone, to be held on a few dates. We might provide television time to political parties, make voter registration easier, and boost voter participation by declaring election day a national holiday. Public funding for congressional campaigns (with a portion of the funds going to political parties) should be considered, and a limitation should be placed on contributions that a candidate may accept from political action committees.●

TELECOMMUNICATIONS IN AMERICA

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, since its creation in March of 1978, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration within the Department of Commerce has assumed a far-ranging national role in telecommunications and information issues. As such, NTIA is the lead agency in the executive branch for telecommunications-related matters.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of telecommunications to American society, and indeed, to our economy. There are few issues which have an effect on so many of our people. When NTIA formulates telecommunications policies or when it suggests regulatory changes to benefit the industry and the consumers it serves, this agency is making proposals which could have a substantial impact on millions of Americans.

On February 6, as my colleagues are aware, I introduced H.R. 1801, a bill to provide for a regular authorization for the Federal Communications Commission.

I am today introducing an authorization bill for NTIA and many of the reasons which prompted me to introduce the earlier legislation hold true in this case as well.

At present, there is no separate authorization for NTIA. Yet, the agency is making policy recommendations which affect great numbers of people and which involve millions of dollars. With a regular authorization process firmly in place, I believe we would have a mechanism to insure a thorough congressional scrutiny of the agency's activities. Additionally, this would afford us an opportunity to look at the full range of executive branch actions in the area of telecommunications, so that we could insure a comprehensive and coordinated approach in our actions.

This is not to say that NTIA has acted irresponsibly and should now be refined in. I worked very closely with NTIA officials during our attempts to enact the Telecommunications Act last year, and I valued their wise counsel. However, I do feel that the agency has many important functions—management of the electromagnetic spectrum to name just one—and these functions should be reviewed by the Congress on a regular basis. Consequently, I urge my colleagues to work with me to see that this bill is enacted into law.●

PATENT TERM AND
REGULATORY DELAY

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, last year, the President signed into law the most far-reaching amendments to the patent law in nearly 30 years.

These amendments were designed to modernize the patent system so as to promote commitment of the risk capital necessary to develop the advanced technology which is central to our Nation's economic well-being.

Patents and the patent system play an important role in the process of investment in new technology in several ways.

First, the grant of a patent assures to an inventor and investor a 17-year period during which the enormous costs of development may be amortized.

Second, the patent, although creating exclusive rights in an invention, is also a publicly disseminated document, publicized widely and available to competing inventors. This encourages the rapid dissemination of information about new technology which in turn spurs additional inventions.

Public Law 96-517, the bill signed last year, addressed three critical problem areas in the patent system: reexamination, Government patent policy, and patent fees.

However, during the course of hearings and markup on that legislation other issues arose, including the administrative structure of the patent system and the question of loss of effective patent life due to premarket regulatory delay. On the question of loss of effective patent term, members of the subcommittee, in particular my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. Sawyer, graciously withdrew proposed amendments with the understanding that the question of restoring patent term lost due to regulatory delay would be considered separately in the 97th Congress.

It is with that understanding in mind that I am today introducing the Patent Term Restoration Act of 1981.

Proponents of patent life restoration argue that in many cases, especially in the pharmaceutical and chemical industries, the extensive and necessary premarket clearance procedures of agencies such as the FDA and EPA, reduce effective patent life so drastically as to make it increasingly difficult to attract the risk capital necessary to developing useful new products.

It is argued that the negative impact of lost patent life upon innovation is readily apparent in the pharmaceutical field. When a researcher uncovers

a promising new chemical compound, he files for a patent. That patent usually is granted within 2 years, and the 17-year period of protection commences. New compounds are rarely marketable at this point, however, it now takes an average of 7 to 10 years and about \$70 million to complete the testing period and the Food and Drug Administration's approval procedures before medicines are made available to the general public. The effective patent life for such products is, therefore, in the neighborhood of 7 to 10 years.

As a result of declining patent lives and the concomitant increase in time and expenses required to develop and market new therapies, many in the pharmaceutical industry believe that the flow of new medicines to the public has diminished. From 1955 through 1962, an average of 46 new drugs were introduced annually in the United States; today that average is only 17 a year, a decline of 63 percent. Late in the last Congress, I introduced for comment H.R. 7952, embodying the patent term restoration concept. My purpose in introducing the bill was to generate study, comment, and criticism on the issue. That process has now begun and is continuing. For example, we expect that preliminary information on this issue and other patent related matters soon will be forthcoming in connection with a study by the Office of Technology Assessment.

It is my intention that hearings on the bill will elicit many more comments, information, and criticism.

The legislation I am introducing today is very similar to the bill I introduced last Congress with one exception. Last year the legislation covered medical devices, drugs, and other chemical products such as pesticides and industrial chemicals. This year a new provision has been added at section 155(c)(4)(D) to cover other products subject to Federal premarketing review or notification requirements, because a number of people have expressed the concern that Federal premarketing requirements have eroded the patent life in less visible areas as well. Although I take no position on its merits, I have included the additional provision in the bill in order to draw attention to the issue when we have our hearings. Proponents of the broader coverage will be invited to make their case during our hearings, so that members of the subcommittee can make an informed decision on the issue.

I also urge groups representing consumers and other interested parties to plan on presenting their views during our hearings. Such broad participation will insure that there is a full and fair examination of the need for the legislation. ●

BUSINESSES ASSIST ADOPTION

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Nashville Banner printed an article about a number of major companies which are encouraging their employees to adopt homeless children by helping them to pay for the adoption expenses. I find this program refreshing and commendable and want to bring this item to the attention of my colleagues:

BIG COMPANIES HELP WORKER ADOPT CHILD

MINNEAPOLIS.—Big business is reaching out a helping hand to employees wishing to adopt a child.

A typical new adoption policy now offered by Honeywell, for example, provides that the company will pay all direct adoption expenses up to a maximum of \$1,000 per child. Typically adoption costs here range from \$300 for a stepchild to \$3,500 for a foreign child.

"Since the company provides medical coverage to employees who have children through childbirth, we decided it made sense to also help our employees who have children through adoption," explained Ed Lund, vice president of administration.

The policy applies to some 55,000 employees in the United States. Other major firms with similar policies include IBM, Eli Lilly, Hallmark, Abbott Laboratories and Xerox. ●

PUBLIC BUILDING ACT OF 1981

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the Public Buildings Act of 1981, designed to provide Congress with a unique and long overdue process whereby we will have the opportunity to significantly modify ongoing practices of the General Services Administration, with respect to providing the necessary space to house departments and agencies of our Government. This bill represents what I believe to be a culmination of efforts undertaken during the 96th Congress by your House Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.

This legislation does not have a great constituency throughout our country due to the fact that it deals with our housekeeper agency of Government, the General Services Administration. Yet, it is designed to save all taxpayers of our country a significant amount of money within a few years. So I suppose that the support constituency for this bill will be the taxpayers. The public is tired of haphazard operations, mismanagement, un-

necessarily costly and poor quality building and space programs, as pork-barrel solutions. The bill I am introducing will deal effectively with all these problems in a comprehensive way.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation directs that emphasis be placed on increased ownership of Government space and requires a reduction in our dependence on leasing to satisfy the long-term housing needs of our Government. The legislation requires GSA to undertake long-term planning. As an interim measure, during the 96th Congress, the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation approved the following resolution, which has, for the first time, brought about the transmission to the Congress from GSA a plan accommodating the public building needs of the United States through fiscal year 1987:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives, That the Administrator of General Services is directed to submit to Congress, not later than the fifteenth day after Congress convenes each year, a program, for the first fiscal year beginning after such date, of projects and actions which the Administrator deems necessary to carry out his duties under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended. Such program shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(A) a plan for accommodating the public building needs of the United States for such fiscal year and the next succeeding five fiscal years,

(B) a list, in priority order, of construction, alteration, and acquisition projects for which authorization is requested for such fiscal year, including a description of the project and the number of square feet of space involved,

(C) a list, in priority order, of lease and lease renewals for which authorization is requested for such fiscal year,

(D) a list of all public buildings proposed in such fiscal year to be vacated in whole or in part, to be exchanged for other property, or to be disposed of,

(E) a proposed budget for such fiscal year for the Public Buildings Service (including, but not limited to, a proposed budget for such fiscal year for the repair and maintenance of public buildings and the total amount of funds proposed to be expended by the Administrator for leasing space in such fiscal year),

(F) if a prospectus for a project to be carried out, or a lease to be entered into or renewed, in any fiscal year must be transmitted to Congress under section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, the Administrator, whenever possible, shall transmit such prospectus to Congress, together with the annual program for such fiscal year.

Date: December 9, 1980.

HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON,
Chairman.

In addition, I am enclosing pertinent sections encompassed in the report which appear to complement efforts undertaken by passage of the committee resolution:

PBS MANAGEMENT PLANNING SYSTEM, GSA, FY 83 CYCLE

Hon. JAMES J. HOWARD,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works and Transportation, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Volume I of the PBS Management Plan is transmitted in accordance with your committee's resolution of December 9, 1980, directing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to submit to the Congress a plan accommodating the public buildings need of the United States through Fiscal Year 1987.

The prospectus projects shown for Fiscal Years 1983 through 1987 have not been reviewed and approved by this Administration and are tentative until the individual prospectuses are forwarded to the Congress. We are currently scheduled to complete submission to the Office of Management and Budget of prospectuses for new construction, lease and lease amendment and repairs and alterations for Fiscal Years 81, 82 and 83 by the middle of March 1981.

Copies of this volume are being transmitted to the Honorable Robert T. Stafford, Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Sincerely,

RAY KLINE,
Acting Administrator.

PREFACE

This document is Volume I of three volumes which make up the PBS Management Plan and contains the Public Buildings Service Plan for accommodating the public building needs of the U.S. for the FY 81-87 period.

Five parts comprise Volume I. Part One summarizes the key aspects of the PBS Strategic Posture for the FY 81-87 planning horizon. Part Two documents historical populations and space trends over the past ten years and presents the forecasts of Federal population and space requirements for the plan period. Part Three lists the FY 81-87 proposed prospectus projects in priority order for each of the Management Plan years. Parts Four and Five provide the FY 82 PBS Budget Request. Appendices are provided to supplement the understanding of the PBS Management Planning Process and the information contained in this volume, including a special listing of prospectus projects for each of the Management Plan years by major client areas.

Volumes II and III, respectively, contain the National and Regional Program Plans, which cover all PBS multi-year operations. These will be available at a later date.

Inquiries concerning this report should be addressed to the Commissioner, PBS, Attn: Office of Program Support, Management Planning Office, 19th and F Sts., N.W., Washington, DC 20405.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE MANAGEMENT PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Public Buildings Service Posture for the FY 81-87 period represents a significant shift in direction. Emphasis during this period will be increased ownership of space and on reducing our dependence on leasing to satisfy the long-term housing needs of our client agencies.

Because of the demonstrated economies of long-term ownership, the plan proposes to achieve by FY 93 a 60/40 ratio of personnel housed in Government-owned space as compared to those housed in leased space. This ratio will be achieved through a stepped-up construction and acquisition program.

The Management Plan calls for an increase in PBS controlled Government-owned space of approximately 41 million square feet from FY 80-93. This increase achieves the 60/40 ratio and is based on the assumptions that the PBS housed population will grow by less than one percent per year for FY 80-93 and that a 17% reduction in leased space from FY 87-93 can be achieved, as Government-owned space enters the inventory.

Approximately 9 million of the 41 million square feet enters the inventory from FY 80-85 primarily as a result of prior year design starts, acquisitions and lease activity. Total deliveries into the inventory from FY 86 through FY 93 are planned at approximately 32 million square feet as a result of planned design starts and other inventory actions during the FY 82-87 period. Designs starts during the FY 83-87 period will average 5 million square feet per year.

The Management Plan proposes total prospectus level project authorizations of \$5.7 billion for acquisitions and for sites, design and new construction of 31.1 million square feet of space. Repairs and Alterations to the inventory for FY 81-87 are planned at total authorization levels of \$1.0 billion.

To meet the FY 93 target the plan proposes congressional approval of the use of time financing. With time financing the program can proceed at the planned rate of design starts to attain the 60/40 project mix, while cutting estimated rental costs by 29% by FY 93. Without time financing the program would proceed at less than half this rate and the 60/40 objective would not be met.

It currently takes six to eight years to complete major construction projects. Two to three of those years are taken up in project development and obtaining authorization. The PBS Management Plan proposes congressional approval of procedures to allow site selection and design before final construction authorization. The result would be two years eliminated from the process and, therefore, two years of cost inflation eliminated. Other costs control measures to be emphasized include the PBS Capitalized Income Approach to Budgeting, achieving improved utilization of GSA-controlled space, establishing lease terms consistent with conversion to ownership, and energy conservation.

We will also be emphasizing responsiveness to our client agencies and to the public. Important in this regard are the timely delivery of commercially equivalent real property services, and space acquisition.

PART I—KEY CONCEPTS OF THE PBS STRATEGIC POSTURE

MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY AND STRATEGIC DIRECTION

On June 16, 1980, the Commissioner of PBS approved the management philosophy and strategic direction for the FY 81-87 plan period, as recommended by the PBS Planning and Project Review Board. This will govern implementation of the PBS Management Plan toward attainment by the end of the plan period of the directed operating posture.

A copy of this posture statement is attached as Enclosure A. Within this statement, the key concepts which provide the foundation for development of the PBS Facility Plan are:

a. Emphasis upon government ownership of the space inventory, and

b. Use of time-financing to finance new construction, purchase of existing buildings and conversion projects.

EMPHASIS UPON GOVERNMENT-OWNERSHIP IN THE SPACE INVENTORY

One of the Key Strategic Posture statements governing the preparation of the Facility Plan is the commitment on the part of GSA Management during the decade of the eighties to move toward increased ownership of buildings to be used for the principal offices of personnel housed by PBS. The actions proposed in this Facility Plan are keyed to achieving the targeted 60/40 ownership mix by the end of FY 93.

This commitment is based upon studies, which show that under expected ranges of discount and inflation rates, it is more beneficial for the Federal Government to own the majority of its space. In addition, it will also enable GSA to reduce significantly its dependence upon leased space, where rates are continuing to escalate at a very rapid rate.

In a recent study, a decision model based upon life cycle costs was used to examine Federal construction and lease alternatives.¹ Annual costs for comparable construction and lease projects in 126 geographic areas representing 84 percent of the current Federal office space inventory under GSA control were used to synthesize a national build/lease mix.

The study showed that the key factor in a build/lease decision centered upon the difference between the discount and inflation rates. Figure 1 illustrates this point. As the amount by which the discount rate exceeds the inflation rate increases, a lease decision becomes more favorable.

Historically, this difference has remained at approximately 2.5 percent as shown on Figure 2. This chart is based upon the assumption that the discount rate usually is equivalent to the Treasury bill rate. The assumption has been recognized as valid by GAO studies. Using this 2.5 percent difference as a basis, the evidence would support an economic decision to build rather than lease in most cases.

However, provisions of OMB Circular A-104; now require that GSA/PBS economic lease/build analysis be made when the difference between the discount and inflation rates is 7 percent. Figure 1 shows that this requirement will almost always result in a lease decision. Appropriate changes to the circular have been recommended to OMB based upon study results as discussed above.

Even without changes in OMB Circular A-104, recent dramatic increases in rental costs are driving PBS analyses toward government ownership. In prospectuses that are now being prepared, the decision is consistently in favor of owning the building when annual rental rates for comparable leased space approach or exceed \$20 per occupiable square foot.

PART II—GSA HOUSED POPULATION AND SPACE TRENDS

PLANNED GROWTH IN HOUSED POPULATION AND GSA CONTROLLED

As stated in the Strategic Posture, (Appendix A), space-needs projections in the PBS Management Planning System are community based. They are derived from forecasts in Federal-population-to-be-housed in GSA controlled space. A summary

of the Plan projections for space requirements over the FY 80-87 period are shown in Table 1. These projections are based upon the following assumptions:

a. That, as previously stated, a ratio of 60% personnel housed in government-owned space to 40% in leased space will be attained by the end of FY 93, and

b. That government population housed in GSA space will grow very modestly, (slightly less than 1% compounded per year) from 861,000 in FY 80 to 977,000 by the end of FY 93.

This personnel growth pattern compares favorably with projections made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and by the Office of Personnel Management. This magnitude has also been independently confirmed through the results of a GSA regression multiples model, which forecasts space as a function of Federal white collar population and utilization rates.

Under these assumptions, a need for a total of approximately 41 million additional Government-owned square feet is projected above the FY 1980 amount. Leased space decreases from a high of 100.3 million sq. ft. in 1987 to 83.2 million by 1993. Planned deliveries from prior year space actions will bring approximately 9.2 million feet of Government-owned space into the inventory between 1980 and 1985. Since the FY 1982 program has been submitted, and allowing five years for site selection and acquisition, design, construction, and delivery of newly constructed space, 32 million square feet must be planned, approved, and funded over the seven-year period, FY 1983-1989, or approximately five million square feet of deliveries per year for FY 87-93.

REDUCED DEPENDENCE UPON LEASED SPACE

As demonstrated in Part I, the planned construction program will be a more effective way to satisfy housing requirements.

Figure 3 shows the historical mix of the percent of personnel housed in all GSA-owned space to leased space. Since FY 71, leased office space has risen from 35.7 million square feet or about 37% of the inventory to 68.1 million square feet or 47% of the inventory in 1980. This trend must be reversed if GSA is to reduce its dependence upon leased space, where sharply rising rental rates have become a major characteristic of the market place.

Figure 4-A depicts the impact of the planned stepped-up construction and acquisition program. By that date, the government-owned space inventory will approximate 183.4 million square feet, whereas leased space will total 83.2 million square feet. As new space deliveries begin to reach the inventory leased space levels drop sharply commencing in FY 88.

Figure 4-B, on the other hand, shows the more undesirable alternative space inventory pattern if PBS is limited to a small construction program comparable to the last five years of about 800,000 square feet annually. In this case by FY 93, 115.6 million square feet of space must be leased while 158.1 million would be government-owned.

Figure 5 shows the detrimental cost impact that would be experienced if the present lower-scale construction program is continued. Over the FY 80-93 period, rental costs would rise from approximately \$500 million to 2.8 billion. Implementation of the program, as set forth in the PBS management plan would reduce this escalation,

with rental costs rising from \$1.3 billion in FY 87 to 2.0 billion in FY 93.

PART III—FISCAL YEARS 1981-87 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION PROGRAM

The attached list represents the General Services Administration's (GSA) proposed construction and acquisition program by Fiscal Year (FY). This includes those projects in the FY 1981 proposed budget, currently pending before Congress, the FY 1982 proposed budget, presently in the submittal process, and the balance of the plan for the period FY 1983-1987. The FY 83-1987 listings are in priority order based on current planning assumptions, and the review and evaluation of data available at this point in time.

This national program plan has been reviewed and approved by the Public Buildings Service's Planning and Project Review Board, after a series of board meetings and presentations by the GSA regional office staffs.

This proposed program was developed consistent with the GSA policy of housing Federal agencies in Government-owned space when feasible and working toward a goal of 60/40 personnel housed in owned to leased space by 1993, in accordance with recent legislative initiatives. It assumes a modest increase of approximately one percent per year compounded through 1993.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Fiscal year	Sq. ft. (millions)	Millions of dollars
1981.....	0.69	18.1
1982.....	1.73	195.8
1983.....	6.18	965.7
1984.....	6.75	1,008.8
1985.....	5.75	1,166.5
1986.....	5.00	1,131.7
1987.....	5.00	1,247.4
Total.....	31.10	5,734.0

PART III-B—REPAIR AND ALTERATION PROGRAM

This portion of the facility plan addresses projects over \$500,000 proposed for accomplishment in GSA-owned buildings and those structures planned for acquisition and renovation. Approximately 2,200 buildings are owned by GSA and of this inventory 60% are more than 35 years old. Four hundred fifty-five thousand (455,000) employees are housed in buildings that are currently available for meeting the space needs of Federal agencies. The Repair and Alteration Program emphasizes the maximum utilization of this existing resource, however, to continue optimum use of these buildings major repairs and alterations are proposed.

Facilities, systems, and equipment that become obsolete due to age, lack of replacement parts, and usage require repair and upgrading. Vacant and underutilized space is converted and upgraded to house employees in government-owned space rather than in leased locations. Alterations are necessary to bring structures into compliance with public laws regarding environmental protection, energy utilization and conservation, and handicapped accessibility. Life and property protection features not required when older buildings were constructed are now mandatory. Special programs in response to one time needs such as the Omnibus Judgeship and Bankruptcy Reform Acts are accomplished when needed.

¹"An Economic Analysis of Future Federal Office Space Requirements and Options," October 1980, GSA Office of Planning and Analysis.

Projects within the facility plan address providing space on a priority basis so that Federal agencies can continue to fulfill their missions. Special one-time immediate program needs are proposed. Repairs and alterations are planned to maintain the existing inventory of buildings in an operational state. Projects planned throughout the Fiscal Year 1983-87 cycle take into account the expiration of leases; availability of space; acquisition schedules; appointment of judicial officers; alterations required by public laws; and condition of existing space, equipment and building systems.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Fiscal year	Millions of dollars
1981.....	67.8
1982.....	97.00
1983.....	133.3
1984.....	206.0
1985.....	184.5
1986.....	145.2
1987.....	185.9
Total.....	1,019.7

Mr. Speaker, legislation affecting public buildings has consisted of various measures going back to 1902 when the First General Act was passed. A significant accomplishment affecting the acquisition and construction of Federal buildings was put in place by passage of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, whereby the Administrator of the General Services Administration was authorized to acquire public buildings by purchase, condemnation, donation, or exchange. At that time, direct Federal construction and acquisition was determined to be the most efficient and economical means of meeting Government space needs. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 remained intact, which authorizes the Administrator of General Services to lease, for a period up to 20 years, existing buildings or buildings to be erected for Government use by private or public lessors.

The futility of seeking funds for direct Federal construction projects in competition with other spending priorities brought about the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972, which set up a 3-year purchase contract program designed to eliminate a backlog of authorized projects which had not been funded. This authority was a stopgap measure, an attempt to reconcile the urgent need for new Federal facilities with lagging annual appropriations for construction.

Under the 1972 purchase contract program, a total of 68 public buildings throughout the country were completed, providing 15 million square feet of occupiable space at an estimated construction cost of \$1.26 billion.

The 1972 amendments also established the Federal Buildings Fund, which began operation in fiscal year 1975. Briefly, collections for rents charged to Federal agencies occupying GSA space are deposited in the funds and made available to GSA for oper-

ation, maintenance, and acquisition of real property. Although GSA officials testified in 1972 that an estimated \$225 million a year would be available from the fund for direct Federal construction of facilities, the reality of the situation soon became clear. Local real estate taxes over the purchase contract term place a substantial drain on the fund's resources. Real estate taxes of \$1.3 billion represent about 30 percent of the fund's liability for purchase contract payments.

Since 1975, the fund has provided only about \$50 million a year for meeting construction needs. In February 1979, GSA officials reported a backlog of approved or pending construction projects totaling \$281 million—that figure has now escalated to \$500 million. As a result of insufficient construction funds, GSA has relied increasingly on leasing rather than Government ownership in meeting space requirements.

Due to the fact that it has been some 20 years since passage of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the need to review past policies and propose a new solution to the problem of how to provide space for Federal agencies in the most efficient and effective manner was clear. A key concern to the committee during the 96th Congress was the considerable expansion in the leasing program of GSA; therefore, it became necessary to look at the resources of GSA and insure the economic use of space by tenant agencies and attempt to facilitate an orderly and economical approach to meeting long-range facility requirements.

Expenditures for leased space have increased from \$364 million in 1975 to the current level of \$728.7 million in fiscal year 1982. An annual rental bill of \$1 billion is right around the corner. It should be noted that the \$728.7 million requested in fiscal year 1982 represents only a partial payment since the gross commitment of all GSA outstanding leases currently total approximately \$2.4 billion. The omission of lease-payment obligations for all future years by the executive branch in submitting prospectuses to the Congress grossly understates leasing costs. This off-budget, hidden expense distorts the true fiscal impact of leasing and falsely understates the real extent of the national debt. It skews decision away from the least costly method of construction and acquisition—namely, Federal construction—and introduces a bias in favor of leasing since costs are only justified on an annual basis. Further, at the end of the lease term the taxpayer only has rent receipts and not a valuable asset.

The GSA fiscal year 1982 budget request of \$195.8 million for construction and acquisition of facilities reflects a substantial increase over funds sought for identical purposes in the fiscal year 1981 budget, amounting to

\$37.5 million. Congress has attempted for many years to bring about an emphasis on construction of facilities, as opposed to leasing, and I am pleased to see that our efforts have been productive.

Mr. Speaker, passage of the Public Buildings Act of 1981 will provide for the establishment of a new method of financing Federal construction projects similar to the mortgage system used by the private sector, under which GSA borrows money from the Treasury for such construction and pays back over a 30-year period; will authorize the Administrator to carry out preliminary and design for projects prior to total project authorization, thereby reducing the time and cost for building; will require long-range planning of GSA's building needs; will provide Congress not later than the 15th day after Congress convenes each year a program of projects and actions which the Administrator deems necessary to carry out his duties under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, and shall include but not be limited to, a plan for accommodating the public buildings needs of the United States for the next 5 fiscal years, and a priority listing of projects for which authorization is sought in such fiscal year; will establish policies to be followed in locating Federal offices; will establish procedures providing for better architectural design of Government buildings; will establish the Public Buildings Service; will establish an art-in-architecture program; and for other purposes.

Passage of the legislation early in the 97th Congress, I believe, is essential to bring about more effective Government by reforming GSA's current policies. It is truly a taxpayers' relief and benefit bill by making Government more accountable, efficient, and frugal.●

PUBLIC BUILDING ACT OF 1981

HON. ARLAN STANGELAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, on his leadership in sponsoring this bill and am pleased to cosponsor this important piece of legislation amending the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended. As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, I look forward to working with interested Members of Congress and the new administration to implement major policy changes within the General Services Adminis-

tration in an attempt to reduce the exorbitant lease costs now being incurred to house Federal departments and agencies.

Specifically, in order to insure a thoroughly comprehensive hearing on this legislation, it is my hope that the Reagan administration will provide the committee with executive comments on this subject in the near future. During the previous administration, no official comments were specifically received on proposed legislation, thereby preventing thorough review of all provisions encompassed within this legislation.

By cosponsoring this bill, I do not mean to imply I am wedded to each and every provision contained in it. My main purpose is to join with the gentleman from Georgia in pinpointing these important issues so that our committee will be in a position to report out meaningful legislation at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, it is my expectation that the final product that emanates from our committee will save the taxpayers of this Nation millions of dollars. Thus, I look forward to a successful resolution of this legislation which incorporates many complex issues. ●

ISRAEL: GOOD TO THE LAST DROP

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the February 23, 1981, issue of Newsweek contained a brief article by Peter Gwynne and Milan J. Kubic, writing from Jerusalem, outlining some of the steps that Israel has taken to insure an adequate water supply for its people.

Surely we in the United States can learn from Israel's experience and take some prompt and positive steps to provide the needed water for Americans.

The article follows:

[From Newsweek, Feb. 23, 1981]

ISRAEL: GOOD TO THE LAST DROP

(Peter Gwynne with Milan J. Kubic)

JERUSALEM.—By American standards, Israel is a hydrological disaster area. Its 25 inches of annual rainfall—a drought in many other countries—falls at the wrong time in the wrong place, soaking the remote northern hills in winter while leaving the south and center dry in the summer. The Sea of Galilee, Israel's only reservoir of fresh water, lies 696 feet below sea level and miles from major population centers. And Israel's Arab neighbors bitterly dispute rights to the Jordan River, the largest of its three meager streams.

Yet no one goes thirsty in Israel. An eclectic mixture of age-old habit and computer-controlled engineering squeezes every last drop out of what water there is. Since 1950 the country has increased its water utilization

from 17 percent to almost 95 percent. Experts attribute such success largely to shrewd planning. When Israel became a state in 1948, the founding fathers immediately proclaimed all water a national property and entrusted it to an independent agency known as the Tahal. "We did not wait for a crisis," recalled Yaacov Vardi, a founder of Tahal. "We spent money, we used our best brains, we worried. And, of course, we knew that our backs were against the wall."

CLOUDS

As its first priority, the Tahal began collecting water from every possible source. Along Israel's 125-mile-long coast, engineers dug 30 wells per mile to trap 10 billion gallons of fresh water annually before it could seep out under the sea. Planes regularly seed clouds with silver iodide to encourage rain, while kibbutzniks and farmers burn the chemical in special generators on the ground. The land and air attacks on clouds have swollen rainfall by about 15 percent.

The Tahal distributes its bounty through a system of canals, pipes, tunnels and wells. Each year it channels close to 90 billion gallons of fresh water across the length and breadth of Israel. So flexible is the system that its pipes served Israeli troops stationed at the Suez Canal before the recent pull-back from Sinai. At Avdot, deep in the Negev desert, ecologists from Ben-Gurion University have refurbished a 2,000-year-old network of dry riverbeds and stone-lined conduits to direct the runoff of rain from the hills to nearby fields.

Modern technology ensures that farmers use no more water than their produce requires. Sprinklers have given way to drip irrigation. Computers monitor air temperature, humidity and wind speed and adjust the amount of water delivered to the roots of the crops. In one test, a region that had yielded 9.52 tons of melons per acre using sprinklers produced 17.2 tons with drip irrigation.

Genetic engineers have also joined the battle to preserve water. A miniature peach tree developed by government scientists can be planted at the astonishing density of 3,200 trees per acre (compared with the normal 120). Because the trees grow so close together, they can be drip-irrigated and their fruit harvested quickly. Researchers have divided all fruits and vegetables that are grown in Israel into four categories, according to their tolerance for salt. This allows water managers to stretch scarce irrigation water by mixing fresh and brackish supplies. New varieties of cucumbers, tomatoes, melons and peppers, developed by careful cross-breeding, thrive in water whose salt content is five times greater than normal.

FEES

Israel actively encourages its citizens to save water, combining the carrot of public-service announcements with the stick of stiff fees. Jerusalem households pay 25 cents for their first 4,227 gallons of water each month, but 50 cents for each 264 gallons beyond that. No industrial plant can be built unless water commissioner Meir Ben-Meir has approved its water-recycling plan. "To get a license to dig a private well is *via dolorosa*," says Ben-Meir.

Not every scheme has worked. An experiment to prevent evaporation from the Sea of Galilee by covering it with alcohol failed when winds blew aside the cover. An effort to retain moisture in the soil by spraying it with silicones proved too expensive. Still,

Israel has exported its hydrological know-how to 28 countries. "What we've done is take the existing knowledge and apply it on a large scale," said Yaacov Vardi. "We used all Israel as a laboratory." ●

FREE VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

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

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

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

The imprisonment and treatment of Dr. Brailovsky contravenes the basic tenets of universal human rights, and I am privileged to join in supporting this resolution. ●

CHRYSLER AND THE FUTURE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, only a few short weeks ago the country was treated to another orgy of doomsaying relative to the future of our Nation's third largest automobile manufacturer. I, for one, am getting a little tired of hearing and reading so much "can't do" thinking. Again and again over the past year financial institutions, responsible economists, and the ordinary people who put the pieces together in plants all over this country have, by their personal support, said that Chrysler "can do."

And model year 1981 is proving exactly that. In spite of continuing na-

tional economic problems which adversely impact costs, prices, and interest rates, Chrysler is doing better than it has in years. Because of the commitment of tens of thousands of people to quality and innovation, the future of Chrysler is brighter than it has been for years. While some may disagree with the involvement of the Government in this turn-around, I think that the thousands of workers who continue to labor proud and strong and to produce a fine product are a more vital witness to our system than would be thousands of those same workers in unemployment lines.

Recently, I had the opportunity to read over a review prepared by Chrysler officials of their company's past and future which I believe deserves our careful attention. I am pleased to have this opportunity to bring an encouraging word into the discussion of the Chrysler situation.

CHRYSLER'S FUTURE—JANUARY 1981

I'm glad to be here today to bring you up to date on what's happening at Chrysler Corporation and to tell you about Chrysler's future. With all the attention that has been given to Chrysler's problems, I'm sure some of you are wondering to yourselves whether Chrysler has a future of any kind—let alone one worth telling about. The answer to both questions is yes. Chrysler has a future that people should know about; and I'm here to tell you about it.

For the past two years, a lot of people, including reporters, editors, cartoonists, and editorial writers, have been trying to write Chrysler out of the automobile business. The Chrysler crisis has been the biggest business news story in the country. No other company has ever been through what we've been through—or has ever come back against such incredible odds.

Just over one year ago, we were reported to be on the verge of bankruptcy. And we were.

But 600,000 jobs were at stake. We wanted to save those jobs, and maintain the competitive strength of the nation's 10th largest industrial company. And with the help of the greatest grass roots coalition in history, we succeeded against all the odds. Dealers, suppliers, civic groups, community leaders, customers, and concerned citizens all spoke up on our behalf. Congress listened. They looked at our plans and our future products, and they liked what they saw. Congress passed the Loan Guarantee Bill by a 2 to 1 vote. No one in Washington had ever seen anything like it before.

Then last spring, we fulfilled the terms of the Loan Guarantee Act by putting together a \$7 billion financial restructuring package. All together it involved 400 banks, eight states, five foreign countries, 4,000 dealers, 19,000 suppliers, and thousands of lawyers. The Secretary of Treasury called it the most complicated transaction in history.

And while the legal, finance, and local government affairs staffs were working 24 hours a day, seven days a week to keep our company together, a lot of people in the plants and offices were hard at work building a new Chrysler Corporation with the best products, the best plants, the best quality, and the best fuel economy in the industry.

The company that was once on the leading edge of everything that was wrong with

America was becoming the symbol of everything that was right about the American automobile industry.

And we were on our way. But then last October, just when everything was coming together for us, we were hit with 20 percent interest rates, rising inflation, and fears about the economy.

Almost overnight we were stuck in the worst automotive depression in the history of the business. As a result, we had to apply for an additional \$400 million in loan guarantees. That stirred up all the negative speculation about Chrysler's future all over again.

We didn't quit before when a lot of people tried to write us off. We proved them wrong.

We didn't quit this time, either. Chrysler Corporation is a fighting organization. We're in business to stay.

We developed a new operating plan which we submitted to the Loan Guarantee Board along with our application for additional loan guarantees. We cut costs. We brought production into line with sales. We reached new agreements with our employees, banks, suppliers, and others that will lead to new, positive relationships, and a more productive, competitive company. The plan is designed to make us profitable even in a depressed market.

The Loan Guarantee Board and its consultants spent thousands of hours going over every aspect of our plan. Nothing was taken for granted. They challenged all our assumptions. They checked and double-checked all our calculations. And when they were done, they said it is a practical, realistic plan that will keep Chrysler viable for years to come.

We are cutting new ground with this plan. There has never been anything like it before. It is tough. It is historic. It is substantial. Treasury Secretary Miller has called the plan "an economic milestone."

We know we're not out of the woods yet. The economy is still in deep trouble—inflation, recession, unemployment and a prime rate hovering around the 20 percent mark. That's a noose that's being tightened around the necks of automobile companies, their dealers, and their customers. It is choking off business at the wholesale and retail levels.

But we at Chrysler are in a better position to weather this crisis than we have been for some time. As the economy improves in 1981, and as interest rates moderate, the pent-up demand that exists today for cars and trucks will finally be unleashed. Chrysler has the programs and the products to capitalize on that inevitable market turn-around.

Let me tell you about them.

First, we put together one of the strongest management teams in the business, led by our Chairman, Lee Iacocca. All told, five of the top six jobs in the company are filled by experienced auto men new to Chrysler Corporation.

Second, we have six of the most modern automotive plants in the world. At our assembly plants, 98 percent of all welds are made by robots. That means accurate, consistent welds, and solid, durable car bodies.

At our engine plant where we are building our all-new 2.2 liter, 4-cylinder engines, we have installed sophisticated computer-operated engine test stands. Computers run checks on all vital engine functions, with the engine running at a variety of engine speeds—there are over 50 separate tests.

At our transaxle plants, we check every transaxle 70 times during the assembly

process to make sure it meets specifications. Then it goes to an electronic test stand which perform 200 separate quality checks.

Third, our quality is outstanding. One independent survey reported that new car buyers now rate the quality of Chrysler products better than those of GM and Ford. It's the first time in eight years Chrysler has been in first place. It represents a 44 percent improvement in the quality of our products over the last two years.

Fourth, we are leaders in front-wheel-drive technology. It is the way of the future in automobile design. With front-wheel drive, the engine and drivetrain are up front and out of the way so that there's maximum interior space for any given design. In other words, there's plenty of leg room and shoulder room inside a car that's small on the outside. In 1981 Chrysler can offer the American public 1 million front-wheel drive cars. That's about 250 on average for each of our dealerships—three times what Ford and GM dealers can deliver.

Fifth, we have the best fuel economy in the industry—an average of 25.5 miles per gallon. Ford is 22.6, AMC is 23, and GM is 23.1 miles per gallon.

We also have more models that get over 25 miles per gallon than any other company—more than GM, more than Ford, more than AMC—and also more than Honda, more than Datsun, more than Toyota.

And sixth, we have the most competitive product line in our history.

Our cars are priced to sell. In the five segments that account for 75 percent of total sales—subcompact, subcompact sport, compact, mid-size, and mid-size wagon—nobody beats our products on fuel economy or price. We have more models under \$7,000 than Ford or GM. Let me tell you a little bit about these products.

The stars of our 1981 line are the K-cars—Dodge Aries and Plymouth Reliant. We have a 2-door, a 4-door, and a station wagon model.

Aries and Reliant 2-door and 4-door models get 25 miles per gallon in city driving and 41 miles per gallon on the highway. That's the kind of fuel economy you'd expect to get in a subcompact. Yet Aries and Reliant seat six passengers.

In addition, Aries and Reliant are easy and economical to service. Estimated costs for parts and labor for scheduled maintenance are only \$169 for 50,000 miles of normal service. That's just three-hundredths of a cent per mile.

When you add everything up, Aries and Reliant are the most fuel-efficient, economical, six-passenger cars on today's market. That could be why Motor Trend magazine has named the K-car the 1981 Car of the Year. This is the second time in four years we have received Motor Trend's Car of the Year Award for front-wheel drive technology. No other company can say that.

The K-cars aren't the only front-wheel-drive models Chrysler builds that beat out the competition. Dodge Omni and Plymouth Horizon, America's original front-wheel-drive compacts, are pound-for-pound one of the best values on the market today. According to a recent report by the National Automotive Dealers Association, Omni and Horizon hold their resale value a year after purchase better than any other U.S. car.

The Miser model of the Omni and Horizon is the most fuel-efficient 5-passenger car on the market.

Miser gets 30 miles per gallon in the city and 50 miles per gallon on the highway. Fifty miles per gallon is what you expect

from a large motorcycle. Nobody else comes close.

We have the sporty 024 and TC3 hatchback models. And we have some exciting front-wheel drive products from our Japanese partner, Mitsubishi.

That's our front-wheel-drive line. We also have some very competitive rear-wheel-drive cars. LeBaron, Diplomat, Cordoba, Mirada, and the new Imperial—our entry in the luxury car market.

Imperial has elegance, sophistication, and outstanding engineering. It is loaded with space-age electronics, developed by Chrysler engineers who helped develop the systems to send a man to the Moon. It has a unique electronic fuel injection system. And it sets a new standard of quality for the auto industry.

The 1981 Imperial embodies all that is excellent in Chrysler engineering—it's the flagship of our fleet.

We have a good story to tell on the truck side, too. We have a new pick-up for 1981, and a new sport-utility vehicle which Four Wheeler magazine named "Four Wheeler of the Year."

That's a brief description of our 1981 product line. Chrysler's 1981 products are just the beginning of what's ahead for Chrysler and for the entire automobile industry. The industry is moving in a whole new direction—a direction that is being determined by the changing needs and values of American car-buyers.

There is a whole new set of priorities motivating today's car buyers. The public has told us in no uncertain terms that it expects something different from the automobile companies today and in the future than it expected in the past.

People who buy cars today are making hard judgments about value and quality of workmanship. They don't care as much about prestige or loyalty to an old brand. They don't care as much about looks and appearance. The days of style being the only element to consider in designing a vehicle are over. To design something beautiful is no longer enough.

Looks count—they always will. But people want more. They want fuel economy. They want value. They want quality of workmanship. They want a vehicle that starts every time they turn the key. They want heaters and air conditioners to work every time they push the button. They want trim that lines up straight, doors that shut easily, and paint that's smooth as satin. If we ship cars that rust, that leak, that stall, and that just plain look shoddy, we deserve to lose our markets. And we should. Datsun, Toyota, Honda, and every one of the foreign manufacturers are ready to take advantage of every single mistake we make.

At Chrysler, we don't intend to let any of that happen. We are meeting the New Market Values head-on with our 1981 products. And we intend to keep on turning out products that are right for the times year in and year out, from now on. They will be some of the most fuel-efficient, technologically advanced cars and trucks you've ever seen.

We've got a brand-new, front-wheel drive truck coming.

We're bringing out a high-style, luxury version of the K-car.

We're introducing a brand-new, luxury model station wagon.

We've got some exciting sporty models coming that will be great to look at and fun to drive.

And there is much more to come. By 1984, we'll be a 100 percent front-wheel drive car

company. For the rest of the 1980s and beyond, we'll have all the cars and trucks we need to stay competitive in all the major market segments.

I hope I've put to rest some of your doubts and answered some of your questions about Chrysler's future. It's been a long road back. And we're not out of the woods yet. But those of us closest to the action can sense the turnaround. Things are beginning to come our way. 1979 was our year of crisis. 1980 was our year of consolidation. 1981 will be our turnaround year.

We have access to the financing we need. We have an operating plan designed to make us profitable in 1981, even in a depressed market.

We have the best management team in the business.

We have modern plants and equipment.

We have outstanding quality.

We are the leaders in front-wheel drive, value for the money, and fuel economy in the U.S. auto industry.

We have great products just right for America—starting with the K-car—Car of the Year and buy of the year.

We have an exciting line-up of future products.

For all those reasons, Chrysler Corporation is now in a unique position to lead this great country out of its current recession—up onto the high ground of recovery and renewed strength.

In the fall of 1979, people were saying, "You're on the ropes—you can't possibly pull it off." Now that it's 1981, and Chrysler is still in business, some of those same people are saying, "You guys are getting your act together . . . you've got some darn good cars . . . maybe you are going to pull it off after all."

I'll end on that note because we've not only got some darn good cars—we've got a good company and good people. I'm proud to be part of Chrysler, and I thank you for inviting me here to tell you about it. ●

1981—FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National Future Farmers of America Week will be celebrated February 21-28, and once again it is an honor for me to recognize this outstanding organization.

Founded in 1928, FFA now boasts over a half million members. Any young man or woman studying vocational agriculture or agribusiness is eligible to participate until age 21. At present, there are over 8,000 chapters.

The theme for the 1981 National FFA Week is "FFA—Building Tomorrow Today." Certainly this phrase is indicative of the goals and ambitions of this organization. FFA members are encouraged to build upon their classroom knowledge with practical work experience. Activities may range from a field trip to a local farm to an earning-while-learning program on a ranch, to competition at the State fair. Members may strengthen their leader-

ship skills by holding office at the chapter, district, or State level. A spirit of cooperation is fostered when members work together on varied projects. As students increase their knowledge, they may advance from the rank of "Greenhand," to "Star Farmer of America."

The responsibility for feeding tomorrow's generations depends in part on these same students. The FFA member must be aware of new developments in agriculture, while at the same time, helping to improve agriculture himself. These youths are encouraged to better the community in which they live. As the world population increases, emphasis must be placed on developing improved protein resources. All FFA members realize that it is they who are to be the leaders in agriculture in the future.

Today, the Future Farmers of America know that agriculture is more than just farming. As Americans become increasingly aware of the need for energy conservation, the FFA is taking an active part. In 1980, the FFA received an Energy Efficiency Award from the President of the United States. In fact, quite a challenge faces agriculture's new generation. They must help cope with the problems of today while planning for tomorrow's energy requirements.

Together, these individuals are to be commended for their citizenship, patriotism, and dedication. I am pleased to congratulate them on their fine past achievements, and I would like to wish them continued success in the future. ●

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 18, 1981, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

According to a recent federal report entitled "Global 2000," the world may be facing a grim future if we do not act now to prevent it. If current social, economic, political, and technological trends continue, the year 2000 will see people all around the globe living in conditions worse than those they know today. The problems may not engulf us today or even tomorrow, but they will engulf us if we do not deal with them:

Population: The global population will grow from 4 billion in 1975 to 6.35 billion in 2000. The world's people will be adding 100 million to their number each year, one-third more than in 1975. About 90 percent of the growth will occur in the poorest countries.

Income: The wide gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" will be wider still in 2000. There may be more than one

billion people living in desperate poverty, up from 800 million today.

Food: Production of food worldwide will grow about 15 percent per person in the last 30 years of the century, but most of the increase will benefit the well-fed countries. Already inadequate diets will deteriorate further in some regions. The real price of food is expected to double.

Farmland: Arable land will increase only 4 percent by 2000, so most of the gain in food production will result from farming techniques that require scarce oil and gas. An area of cropland and grassland more extensive than Maine will become barren every year. Increased urban sprawl will add to the problem.

Energy: The year 2000 will probably not bring relief from shortages of energy. Output of oil will level off in the 1990's. It will be more difficult for less developed countries to meet their energy needs. A shortage of wood fuel will plague the poorest nations.

Minerals: Minerals will be in sufficient supply through the end of the century, but more investment will be needed to maintain reserves. Increases in the price of energy may make some mining uneconomical. One-quarter of the world's people will continue to absorb three-quarters of its minerals.

Water: Regional shortages of water will be more severe by 2000. The need for water will double in half the world due to the increase in population alone. If standards of living are to be raised, the need will be even greater. New supplies of water will be more costly to develop.

Forest: During the next 20 years the demand for timber will increase, but an area of forest half the size of California is now disappearing every year. Some 40% of all forest in the Third World will be gone by 2000. Growing stocks of timber for commercial use will decline 50% per person.

Atmosphere: Depletion of ozone and concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere may begin to alter the world's climate sometime in the next century. Acid rain may do serious damage, and pollution of the air will threaten health in an increasing number of countries.

Species: The extinction of plant and animal species will accelerate by the close of the century. Hundreds of thousands of species—perhaps 20% of all those in existence—may be lost forever. Since many of them have never been classified or examined by scientists, their value to man will never be known.

The scenario outlined in "Global 2000" is not a prediction. It is a projection of what will happen if nothing is done. We are not locked into a course of events that leads to human misery, material scarcity, and environmental destruction. We can take action to change things, and we have compelling reasons to do so. Not the least of these reasons is our own national interest: development and stability in the Third World, access to resources abroad, and a clean, healthy environment worldwide will make our nation stronger and more secure.

There are several principles we should follow in formulating an agenda of corrective action:

Since no nation can tackle global problems alone, international cooperation will be necessary. An important objective of American policy must be the management of global problems that can only be met if nations act in concert.

The federal government has impressive technical resources we can use to analyze

and help solve global problems, but institutional change will be needed to focus these resources properly. We may want to draw experts from many agencies together into an office under direct control of the President.

If federal agencies are to bring global problems under control, they will require the private support of industry, labor unions, churches, universities, and environmental groups. We should consider the establishment of a public-private institute to channel private expertise into the effort.

Specific solutions to specific global problems are indispensable, but coordinated policy should be our primary goal. By "fitting all the pieces together" we can be assured that our initiatives will not undermine one another.

We know about global problems and we command the means to solve them, but we need an urgent commitment to the task. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 19, 1981, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 20

8:30 a.m.

Armed Services
Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee

To resume closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for theater and tactical nuclear force modernization programs of the Department of Defense.

224 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Richard M. Fairbanks III, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations; Robert C. McFarlane, of Maryland, to be Counselor of the Department of State; and M. Peter McPherson, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

4221 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services
Preparedness Subcommittee

To continue open and closed hearings on operational readiness and mission capability of major Army operational commands.

212 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Resources Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Panama Canal Commission; and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the Department of Transportation.

1318 Dirksen Building

Budget

To continue hearings to review the President's economic proposals.

6202 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Security and Terrorism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

2228 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review the overall economic policy of the administration.

2128 Rayburn Building

FEBRUARY 23

10:00 a.m.

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 31, removing certain limitations on deductibility of business expenses related to residences; S. 239, providing an individual tax credit for the purchase of commuter vans; and S. 452, excluding from tax as ordinary income gain realized on the sale of stock of a corporation with respect to earnings and profits accrued during a year in which such corporation was not a foreign investment company.

2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

To meet in closed session to receive an intelligence briefing.

Room S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, scientific activities overseas, and retirement pay program for commissioned officers of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 for the Department of Energy.
1202 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 24

8:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Civil Services, Postal Operations and General Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 11, establishing the policy with respect to the number of digits which should be used as zip codes, and other pertinent proposed legislation.

3302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Donald I. Hovde, of Wisconsin, to be Under Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

5302 Dirksen Building

*Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds through fiscal year 1985 for the airport development aid program.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Care Financing Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Budget

Business meeting, to mark up proposed revisions to the Second Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1981.

6202 Dirksen Building

Finance

Savings, Pensions, and Investment Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 12, 24, and 243, bills providing certain savings incentives.

2221 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981, and other legislative and administrative committee business.

301 Russell Building

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982 from the Disabled American Veterans.

318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Human Development Services of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budgets for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 for the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture.

3110 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 25

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain museum services, and Indian education programs.

1224 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and of the General Accounting Office on Intergovernmental Matters.

2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Aviation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds through fiscal year 1985 for the airport development aid program.

235 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To resume hearings on alleged corruption in the International Longshoremen's Association's influence and control over the waterfront industry along the east and gulf coasts.

3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider its rules of procedure for the 97th Congress.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the conduct of monetary policy.

5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

Business meeting, to continue markup of proposed revisions to the Second Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1981.

6202 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

International Economic Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine current U.S. interests in developing countries and alternative strategies to advance U.S. interests.

4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Inspector General, Office for Civil Rights, policy research programs, and departmental management programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Joint on Printing

To hold an organizational business meeting.

S-151, Capitol

FEBRUARY 26

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Woodrow Wilson International Center For Scholars; the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission.

1224 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings on alleged corruption in the International Longshoremen's Association's influence and control over the waterfront industry along the east and gulf coasts.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and of the General Accounting Office on intergovernmental matters.

357 Russell Building

Special on Aging

Organizational business meeting, to consider its rules of procedure for the 97th Congress, and other pending committee business.

457 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain departmental management programs and the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Coast Guard of the Department of Transportation

1318 Dirksen Building

Budget

Business meeting, to continue markup of proposed revisions to the Second Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1981.

6202 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 270, to provide for the deregulation of the radio broadcasting industry.

235 Russell Building

FEBRUARY 27

9:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings on alleged corruption in the International Longshoremen's Association's influence and control over the waterfront industry along the east and gulf coasts.

3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget

Business meeting, to continue markup of proposed revisions to the Second Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1981.

6202 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 270, to provide for the deregulation of the radio broadcasting industry.

235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

International Economic Policy Subcommittee

To resume hearings to examine current U.S. interests in developing countries and alternative strategies to advance U.S. interests.

4221 Dirksen Building

MARCH 2

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to review materials and minerals policy.

235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for elementary and secondary educational programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army Cemetery Expenses, the Office of Consumer Affairs, and the Consumer Information Center.

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for impact aid programs, and emergency school aid programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the

Office of Inspector General of the Department of Transportation; and the National Transportation Safety Board.
S-126, Capitol

11:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive the Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982.

318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for library and learning resource programs and vocational and adult education programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 4

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Water Research and Technology, Department of the Interior, the Holocaust Memorial Commission, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review Government-wide debarment and suspension practices.

3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on S. 234, to encourage the establishment of home health programs and to provide expanded coverage of home health services under the medicare and medicaid programs.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for educational, rehabilitation, and research programs for the handicapped of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs

To resume hearings on the conduct of monetary policy.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the U.S. Fire Administration.

235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain student financial assistance programs of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

235 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To continue hearings to review Government-wide debarment and suspension practices.

3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain school improvement programs, special institutions, and Howard University of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the national Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the Department of Transportation.

1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institute of Education, fund for the improvement of postsecondary education, educational statistics, educational research and training activities overseas of the Department of Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 10

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institute of Building Science, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Credit Union Administration, and the Office of Revenue Sharing (NYC).

1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Indian health service programs, and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Community Services Administration.
 1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Administration, Research and Special Programs and the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation.
 S-126, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, and the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 11

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Railroad Retirement Board, domestic operations programs of ACTION, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.
 1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the President's Commission on Ethical Problems in Medicine.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 12

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Department of the Interior.
 1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
 235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Washing-

ton Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Metro).

1318 Dirksen Building

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To resume hearings on alleged sex discrimination in the workplace.
 4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 17

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Veterans' Administration.
 1224 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
 235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain health professional education and nurse training programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearing on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration of the Department of Transportation.
 1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 18

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 19

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).
 1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain public health categorical programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for national centers for health statistics of the Department of Health and Human Services.
 4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 Labor Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 348, to increase job opportunity by allowing employers to pay young people the minimum wage at a reduced rate.
 4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 25

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for alternative fuel programs and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.
 1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
 235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
 Labor Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 348, to increase job opportunity by allowing employers to pay young people the minimum wage at a reduced rate.
 4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 26

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of the Interior and certain related agencies.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain public health categorical programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
 4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 31

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Management and Budget.
 S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the White House Office, Office of Administration, official residence of the Vice President, executive residence, special assistance to the President, compensation of the President, and other unanticipated needs.
 S-146, Capitol

APRIL 1

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 and for the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Selective Service System.
 S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
 1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain adolescent pregnancy programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Secretary of the Treasury.
 1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Secretary, international affairs programs, Bureau of the Mint, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and Bureau of Government Financial Operations of the Department of the Treasury.
 1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 2

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior; and the Smithsonian Institution.
 1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Veterans' Affairs
 To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982 from officials of Paralyzed Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and Veterans of World War I.
 412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Postal Service.
 S-146, Capitol

11:00 a.m.
 Veterans' Affairs
 To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982 from AMVETS.
 412 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Customs Service, U.S. Secret Service, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.
 S-146, Capitol

APRIL 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the General Services Administration.
 1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Personnel Management, Merit Systems Protection Board and Special Counsel, Federal Labor Relations Authority, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries, and the President's Commission on Pension Policy.
 1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 8

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Council on Environmental Quality, and the National Regulatory Council.
 S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.
 1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain health maintenance organizations of the Department of Health and Human Services.
 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Administrative Conference of the United States, Federal Elections Commission, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Domestic Policy Staff, U.S. Tax Court, and the Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped.
 1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 9

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for strategic petroleum reserve programs, the Energy Information Administration, and naval petroleum reserve programs, Department of Energy.
 1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Internal Revenue Service, and the savings bond division of the Bureau of the Public Debt.

1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Council of Economic Advisers, National Security Council, and the Council on Wage and Price Stability.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 21

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Forest Service programs, the Office of the Federal Inspector for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 22

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Secretary of Energy.

1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain community/migrant health centers and the National Health Service Corps of the Department of Health and Human Services.

4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 23

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1224 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Science Foundation.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 5

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 6

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

1223 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for conservation and fossil energy programs.

1223 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 12

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 13

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Gallery of Art, and the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.

1223 Dirksen Building

MAY 14

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Territorial Affairs, Department of the Interior.

1223 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 20

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 21

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.

1114 Dirksen Building

JUNE 2

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and certain independent agencies.

1224 Dirksen Building