

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 27, 1981

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, may we open our eyes and ears to Your constant call, the call to righteousness and justice and peace. Even as we admit we have missed the mark and not acted as we ought, yet we celebrate this day for You still call us above the noise of a clamoring world. Though we have scorned You, You continue to offer us grace; though we have looked at our world with selfish eyes, You accept us with forgiveness and patience. Send Your Spirit to encourage us to reach out to others in reconciliation that together we may build Your kingdom with dignity and with truth. 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.

### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Chirdon, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 734. An act to encourage exports by facilitating the formation and operation of export trading companies, export trade associations, and the expansion of export trade services generally.

### JUDGE REYNALDO G. GARZA DAY

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago Wednesday, April 29, I had the honor of attending the ceremony where the Honorable Reynaldo G. Garza took office as a U.S. district judge for the Southern District of Texas, beginning a very distinguished career as a jurist.

Today Judge Garza serves as a U.S. circuit court judge for the Fifth Cir-

cuit Court of Appeals, which covers the States of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and the Canal Zone.

Judge Garza was named to the Federal bench during the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy through the efforts of my predecessor, Joe Kilgore, and the recommendations of Senators Ralph Yarborough and William A. Blakely and the Vice President at that time, our late President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The judge is the first Spanish surnamed attorney appointed to the Federal bench in Texas and the second Hispanic in the U.S. federal system as a whole.

Born in Brownsville, Tex., in 1915 on the coast of my 15th Congressional District, the judge is a true son of the Lone Star State. He received his law degree from the University of Texas in 1939. He was a city commissioner for the city of Brownsville and a member of the Brownsville Independent School District board of trustees. He served on the Texas Good Neighbor Commission and the State Committee on Education Beyond High School. He was also the Texas State deputy for the Knights of Columbus and has long been active in civic and church affairs.

On the Federal district bench, Judge Garza conducts court proceedings when necessary in both English and Spanish—an invaluable asset in a State which has nearly 3 million persons of Hispanic origin. He is known by his fellow jurists and by those who have dealt with him in the judicial chambers to be a tenderly tough guy who metes out justice firmly and fairly, yet tempers the balancing of the scales with an understanding of the imperfections of human nature.

This mixture makes Judge Garza a fine human being as well as a distinguished jurist. As a fellow south Texan I am proud to honor him this day in the House of Representatives.

### RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL INTRODUCED ON SALE TO SAUDI ARABIA OF AWACS AIRCRAFT

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing my resolution of disapproval of the Reagan administration's plan to sell to Saudi Arabia five airborne warning and control (AWACS) aircraft and offensive

equipment for F-15 fighter to demonstrate our opposition to the sale before it is submitted for congressional review. The sale of additional fuel tanks and air-to-air missiles for F-15's and highly sophisticated AWACS radar reconnaissance planes jeopardizes Middle East stability and Israel's security.

The sale directly threatens the security of Israel. Equipped with the additional fuel tanks, Saudi F-15's could accurately and with little warning strike any target in Israel from any base in Saudi Arabia. The AWACS aircraft would permit the Saudis to survey Israel's defenses, convey tactical information to Israel's other enemies, and coordinate attacks with precision.

Israel's fears are scarcely imaginary. Saudi forces have played an active role in three out of four wars against Israel in the past 32 years. The Saudis currently fund the PLO with hundreds of millions of dollars a year. They have condemned the Camp David agreements, breaking diplomatic relations with and cutting off assistance to Egypt. Just last month, the Saudi Government renewed its call for a Jihad (holy war) to eliminate the Jewish State.

The proposed sale would not solve Saudi internal security problems, would not enable the Saudis to defend against Soviet incursions in the Persian Gulf, would not mitigate Soviet actions in Afghanistan, would not affect the Iran-Iraq war, would directly threaten the security of Israel, and would not contribute to American interests in Middle East stability.

### OPPORTUNITY FOR MEMBERS TO DISCUSS REACTION OF PEOPLE BACK HOME

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to second the resolution that has just been offered in the House by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG). I too am totally in opposition to the sale of military equipment to the Saudis.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my taking the floor is to announce that immediately following our proceedings here and other special orders, I do have a special order on the floor this afternoon to give the Members an opportunity of discussing the reaction of

□ 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.

the people back home during the recent district work period.

I know that I have never had a busier period in the nearly 10 years that I have been in the Congress, nor have I ever had more concern expressed. So, I am looking forward, and I hope Members will join me this afternoon in discussing this in a special order.

#### THINK NOW, BUY LATER

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, last week, Tuesday, the Washington Post carried a column by our distinguished colleague from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH). Now that we are apparently embarking on a major defense buildup, the gentleman from Georgia has most cogently expressed the need for a thorough review of our strategic concepts and organization as well. Calling for an organic rather than mechanical approach, the gentleman stated—

Historically, victory is based on leadership, the power of strategic ideas, and the ability of a well-organized team to use available weapons to heighten its advantages over its opponent, and to lower its opponent's ability to respond.

I wish to associate myself most strongly with my colleague's remarks and to add that even in the mechanical area, we need better organization. As I travel around the Sixth District of Wisconsin, I find that many businesses no longer wish to bid on defense contracts because of the many problems and uncertainties involved. Nationwide, we are losing too many defense contractors. To continue with the gentleman's terminology, we could use an organic approach toward even the provision of equipment.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the rest of our colleagues, I include the column of the gentleman from Georgia to be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1981]

#### THINK NOW, BUY LATER

(By NEWT GINGRICH)

It's clear the the American people will spend much more on defense in the 1980s. It is not clear that they will be better defended.

An effective American military policy must be based on a thorough revision of our strategy, doctrine and officer education before we purchase massive quantities of equipment. Such a revision hasn't taken place since the end of World War II.

If spending money were the primary requirement for a successful defense, then André Maginot would have been the most successful defense minister in modern history. Instead, because Maginot focused first on concrete and equipment rather than on strategy and doctrine, his name became synonymous with failure in defense policy.

Contrast this with the legacy of Elihu Root, the American secretary of war in 1899. Root searched for solutions to the military's inefficiencies and created the American General Staff system, which proved effective during World War I and, according to Trever Dupuy, the military historian, was the major ingredient in the rapid expansion of the U.S. Army in World War II.

Historically, victory is based on leadership, the power of strategic ideas, and the ability of a well-organized team to use available weapons to heighten its advantages over its opponent, and to lower its opponent's ability to respond. Root knew that.

But our present defense establishment rests its hope for a secure America on more things, just as Maginot did, rather than on the power and guidance of better ideas.

Military leaders lack a sense of the organic wholeness of their task. And the military's masters—Congress, the White House and the people—intensify the problem by sharing in and encouraging that misconception.

Congressmen normally debate weapons systems, or the parts, as though they were fundamental: this tank versus that tank, this plane versus that plane, etc. But the central question is not what kind of equipment you give the troops but what you expect them to accomplish with it.

Understanding that the military problem is organic rather than mechanical allows you to see how the parts interrelate, and how they support the overall purpose that brings them together. The organic approach also permits the military to coherently grow over time and gives it a self-sustaining sense of purpose that helps it adapt flexibly to a changing environment.

The most important contribution of the organic approach is its emphasis on people and ideas rather than machines. Trained men with the right strategy can readily and more rapidly shape and adapt to a changing environment.

It takes 10 years or more to create a field grade officer who can command in battle. And it takes years of practice and training to group soldiers into a cohesive fighting force. The keys to success in war are the quality of the leaders and the skill of the troops, particularly the skill of the NCOs.

History is replete with examples of small, well-trained armies that used the right doctrine to defeat huge forces that were less cohesive and used the wrong doctrine. The best examples are the Mongols under Genghis Khan, the Wehrmacht under Guderian in 1940, and the Israeli army in 1967 and 1973.

The grave danger we face is not that the Soviet Union has more men under arms, or that they spend more than we do, or that they have more equipment. The danger is that the Soviet officer corps has begun to be better trained intellectually, more deeply steeped in history, and is asking the right questions about war.

The Reagan administration and Congress are about to make decisions that will shape the military well into the next century. You buy military hardware for a lifetime, not for one congressional term. And that is why now is the moment to begin our doctrinal reexamination.

Across-the-board programs to remedy the obsolescence of our military hardware are not yet in full swing. Therefore, we can rethink what we expect to do in war before we are locked into new systems that are supported by and support old concepts. Five

years from now, it will be too late to rethink what we expect to do in future wars.

Those of us who are conservative and frightened for America's survival understand the danger of underspending. We have shouted from the rooftops that America is in danger, and America has heard and understands.

But there is grave and even greater danger that America must now see with equal clarity. If we buy the wrong weapons systems because we have an inadequate strategy, and we attempt to use those systems with an ill-prepared officer corps, we may think that we are safe when, in fact, we aren't. As the French learned in 1940, there can be no greater delusion.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM CALLED FOR

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the various polls that came out over the weekend showing overwhelming support for the President of the United States. They ranged anywhere from 77 percent on his overall approval record, and I just want my colleagues to know that in my travels back home over this past week my polls were even higher for the President. They reached 85 percent in support of all his actions, and especially his economic recovery program.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are waiting for action from those people on that side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle. I hope we get moving and enact that economic recovery program, and let us make America strong again.

#### WILLIAM L. BEERMAN, JR.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, as the need for cooperation between Government and business becomes increasingly evident, I wish to share with my colleagues remarks about a man who began to force bonds between the two sectors long before the gap between them was apparent to most. I speak of Mr. William L. Beerman, Jr., of Greensboro, N.C., whose contributions have been many.

Bill Beerman began his career as a journalist, writing about the concerns of business and Government. When World War II began, he put aside his journalistic endeavors to become a Marine Corps fighter pilot. After the war, he resumed his goal of bringing about mutual understanding and cooperation between Government and business, and served with distinction as public relations director of the North

Carolina region of the Veterans' Administration and as director of public relations and executive vice president of the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce. In 1953, he joined Burlington Industries, where he continued to pursue his goals, first as director of public relations and later as director of public affairs.

Many of my colleagues have been able to appreciate Bill Beerman's efforts firsthand, since he was so actively involved in trying to improve communication between local employees and the community with Congress. Bill Beerman also initiated, with success, similar communication with State level representatives.

Aware that much can be accomplished through group action, Bill joined and contributed greatly to professional organizations, including the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association and the American Textile Manufacturers Institute. He also served as a director of the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce and as chairman of its governmental liaison council. Bill's professional endeavors did not exclude making time for humanitarian activities on the community level. He has long been active in the Greensboro Kiwanis Club and served on the board of the United Day Care Centers and the board of the Guilford Technical Institute.

Few of us can point to such an outstanding record of involvement, and this is why I wish to honor William Beerman on the occasion of his retirement from Burlington Industries after 28 years of invaluable service.

Fortunately, his plans include government affairs and public relations consulting work—so we will continue to benefit from his knowledge and experience. I salute William Beerman, and on behalf of the citizens of North Carolina, I use this public forum to express my best wishes to him on his retirement.

#### THE PEOPLE WANT CONGRESS TO PASS PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the district and there is no question about it: The people support President Reagan and they want us to pass his economic recovery program.

A poll published in the Los Angeles Times over the weekend shows that people are aware of what the program does—that is involves belt tightening and some sacrifice—but they nonetheless support it overwhelmingly. They realize that we have to reduce inflation, and they do not want another

short-term, quick-fix solution that just puts off that day of reckoning.

Mr. Speaker, our President has presented his program; now it is up to us to act. Congress must not become the obstacle to recovery.

#### LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO PROMOTE SAVINGS

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

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills that I believe will promote savings, an essential ingredient in supply side economics.

My first bill would exclude life insurance proceeds from the gross estate for the purpose of determining the Federal estate tax. Many people purchase life insurance simply to have enough money to pay estate taxes. To tax this money increases the burden and the individual may find it necessary to purchase more insurance; the process becomes circular with the main beneficiaries being insurance salesmen. I do not believe this is the intention of the estate tax law and I hope to see this part of it repealed.

My real concern, however, is with the concept of estate and gift taxes themselves. I consider them to be anti-savings. If we are to take seriously the goal of renewing our economy and providing more jobs, we must find ways of accumulating the capital needed to renew our industries. If individuals are permitted to accumulate estates, knowing that while they are saving and investing this money, it will not be lost to their families, I think that the incentive to save and invest is increased. And with increased incentive comes increased savings and investment so necessary to our economic growth.

Just one facet of this is the farm industry; it is one of the most efficient industries we have and supplies us with our main sources of exports. Efficient farms are large farms, and they are, by and large, family owned. If we wish to preserve the family owned farms, then we must encourage their growth, and this can be done through a change in taxation of them. If a father knows he can hand his farm down to his children, everyone including us, benefits.

Therefore, I am also introducing a bill to repeal the estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers now in existence. Such a repeal, I am convinced, can only harvest benefits and I call for support of it. Thank you.

#### THE LATE HON. TENNYSON GUYER

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce to the House today the death of one of our esteemed colleagues during the Easter recess. TENNYSON GUYER, of the Fourth District of Ohio, passed away in his sleep on April 12.

TENNY was elected to the Congress on November 7, 1972, and has been reelected overwhelmingly by his constituents for each succeeding Congress. Before TENNY was elected to Congress, he served as a State senator in the Ohio Senate for 12 years. People here in the Congress know that TENNY was a friend of all of us. He was an individual who took tough assignments, and he served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, the Veterans' Affairs Committee; and he served on the House Task Force on Missing Persons in Vietnam.

TENNY was a graduate of Findlay College in Findlay, Ohio, and was an ordained minister of the Church of God of North America.

TENNY was a Member who was a friend of all Members on both sides of the aisle, and he will be sorely missed by all of us.

I would just like to summarize my remarks at this time by saying that TENNYSON GUYER was a real American, a real family man, and a real Christian. At a later time I will request a special order so that all Members can pay their respects to TENNYSON GUYER.

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

Mr. LATTI. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I attended TENNYSON GUYER's funeral in Findlay, Ohio. I want the House to know that the gentleman in the well delivered the eulogy, and it was one of the best, most moving eulogies I have ever had the privilege of hearing.

I think all of us Members of the House who were friends of TENNYSON GUYER can be proud of the job that the gentleman in the well did on all of our behalfs at that funeral.

Mr. LATTI. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this matter up this morning. I regarded TENNYSON GUYER as a close personal friend as well as a colleague.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTI. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague in the well for his voice and for his taking the time for a special order in behalf of our beloved colleague, TENNY GUYER. I served with TENNYSON GUYER on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for many, many years, and no one brought a greater wit or more sensitivity to the workings of the Congress. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I extend at this time my deepest sympathy to his family, for the loss to the Congress is a great one, but the personal loss to those close to him has to be the greatest of all, and I feel for them at this moment.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the Congress, we certainly extend our sympathy to Mae, to Sharon, and Rosetta, and the other members of TENNY's family.

#### THE LATE HON. TENNYSON GUYER

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 128) on the death of the Honorable TENNYSON GUYER.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 128

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Tennyson Guyer, a Representative from the State of Ohio.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1215

#### HOW TO CURE DEMOCRATIC PARTY PROBLEMS

(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 know all our colleagues join me in congratulating the Speaker on the very laudatory article about him that appeared today in the Wall Street Journal.

But it would seem from the article that there is dissension in the ranks of the Speaker's party. The Speaker is quoted as saying:

In any other country but the United States, we'd be five splinter parties.

There is a reference to "the Democrat's general gloom."

That news saddens me, since I believe in a strong two-party system. May I therefore offer a suggestion as to how Democrats may get their party—not to mention their act—together?

A recent Associated Press-NBC poll shows that the public is giving the Congress the highest popularity rating it has received in almost 4 years.

The pollsters give two reasons for this change:

A Republican majority in the Senate and a born-again commitment to cutting Government spending.

In other words, the way to congressional popularity is to adopt Republican policies and principles.

Therefore, in the spirit of true bipartisanship that has always marked the Republican leadership, I hereby offer to give free lessons in basic Republican policy to any Democrat willing to learn.

The first lesson begins tomorrow night with the President's speech. Students will be expected to take notes.

#### NEW YORK'S 32D DISTRICT SUPPORTS WHITE HOUSE ECONOMIC PLAN

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

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, move over Gallup and Harris. This past week was the most thorough examination of the American people by Members and the media to determine their response to the \$44 billion question: Do Americans accept the President's plan for economic recovery?

I held five town meetings during the district work period, and from New York 32 the answer is a resounding "Yes." Yes from the dairy farmers, yes from the workingman, yes from the housewife, and yes from middle-income America.

At my North Syracuse town meeting, which was packed with interest groups, a man came up to me and said:

I felt as if I were the only working man at this meeting. I don't feel that I can shoulder the burden of supporting everyone for very much longer.

And, indeed, that man's spending power probably peaked in 1973. From then on it's been downhill.

No; we are not better off now than we were 4 years ago, said the chorus of townspeople. For these people, inflation eats their hopes and dreams and casts their reality in a bleak light.

My constituents believe the President when he says there is hope; they support the President's budget cuts. They want a new beginning. And I, more than ever, am foursquare behind the President.

#### CLOSURE OF SAN ANTONIO OFFICE WOULD THREATEN VETERANS' SERVICES

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

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to issue my strong personal objection to plans underway by the administration which may transfer vital veterans' services from San Antonio to Houston, Tex. The San Antonio offices serve a vast, 60-county district which is one of the most highly concentrated areas of veterans in the Nation. Only San Diego and Norfolk, Va., have a larger concentration of seriously disabled veterans than San Antonio. I think all of America is in agreement that we should cut the fat out of the budget, but only the most insensitive bureaucrat would seek to cut the heart out of our programs for veterans.

I consider it nothing less than a disgrace that the Veterans' Administration would even consider diminishing veterans' services at a time when an ever-increasing number of veterans are in need of aid and assistance from the Veterans' Administration. For many of our veterans, a transfer of the Veterans' Service Division, vocational rehabilitation counseling, and the loan guarantee program to distant Houston would effectively eliminate the benefits veterans have paid for in service to our country.

I would urge in the strongest possible language that the Veterans' Administration reevaluate these plans and that no service to veterans should be displaced or cut in any way.

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

Mr. KAZEN. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I certainly will look into this particular case that the gentleman has brought to our attention. There has been some talk about closing some of these contact offices of the Veterans' Administration around the country. We hope that we have a hold right now from the Office of Management and Budget and also from the Veterans' Administration so that we can take a better look at this and see what we can try to do about cutting back on these contact offices and personnel in San Antonio.

I would be glad to follow up on this and look into the gentleman's situation.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY), and I know that he always does whatever he can for our veterans.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE CONCERNING APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS ATTENDING THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE TENNYSON GUYER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The Speaker desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of title 2, United States Code, section 124, and the order of the House of April 10, 1981, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did on April 15, 1981, appoint the following Members of the House of Representatives as a committee to attend the funeral of the late TENNYSON GUYER of Ohio:

Mr. LATTA of Ohio;  
Mr. MICHEL of Illinois;  
Mr. ASHBROOK of Ohio;  
Mr. STANTON of Ohio;  
Mr. BROWN of Ohio;  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio;  
Mr. WYLIE of Ohio;  
Mr. STOKES of Ohio;  
Mr. SEIBERLING of Ohio;  
Mr. GRADISON of Ohio;  
Mr. KINDNESS of Ohio;  
Mr. MOTT of Ohio;  
Mr. LUKEN of Ohio;  
Mr. APLEGATE of Ohio;  
Ms. OAKAR of Ohio;  
Mr. PEASE of Ohio;  
Mr. HALL of Ohio;  
Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio;  
Mr. ECKART of Ohio;  
Mr. McEWEN of Ohio;  
Mr. SHAMANSKY of Ohio;  
Mr. WEBER of Ohio;  
Mr. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin;  
Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan;  
Mr. FINDLEY of Illinois;  
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT of Arkansas;  
Mr. MYERS of Indiana;  
Mr. GILMAN of New York;  
Mr. LAGOMARSINO of California;  
Mr. MINETA of California; and  
Mr. LIVINGSTON of Louisiana.

**PROVIDING FOR JOINT SESSION ON TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1981, TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT**

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 116) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 116

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, April 28, at 9 o'clock post meridiem, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS AT ANY TIME TOMORROW**

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair be authorized to declare a recess at any time tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement. After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tomorrow when the Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor and the cooperation of all the Members is requested.

Members will remember that the first three rows are reserved for the Senate and will request all Members to adhere to the traditional middle aisle separation of parties during the joint session.

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 27, 1981.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in the Rules of the House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit sealed envelopes received from the White House as follows:

(1) At 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 15, 1981 and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the eleventh semi-annual report of the U.S. Sinai Support Mission.

(2) At 9:50 a.m. on Monday, April 27, 1981 and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the Ninth Special Message for Fiscal Year 1981 under the Impoundment and Control Act of 1974.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

EDMUND L. HENSHAW, Jr.,  
*Clerk, House of Representatives.*  
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY,  
*Deputy Clerk.*

**SIX REVISIONS TO PREVIOUSLY TRANSMITTED RESCISSIONS AND TWO NEW DEFERRALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 97-47)**

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

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, April 27, 1981.)

**ELEVENTH REPORT OF U.S. SINAI SUPPORT MISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, April 27, 1981.)

**FIFTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, April 27, 1981.)

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, April 27, 1981.)

□ 1230

## VIETNAM VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BAILEY) will be recognized for 60 minutes.

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that two additional statements which I have given to the Clerk be included at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Yesterday, Sunday, April 26, 1981, the United States of America officially recognized her Vietnam veterans. I have requested this special order today to commemorate the deeds and sacrifices of these sometimes forgotten Americans. I have a specific desire here today—I wish to draw particular attention to those who actually did the fighting—the combat veterans—although I in no way wish to exclude the contribution of any Vietnam-era veteran who likewise gave to our country during this difficult period in American history.

I do not speak for those that organized, participated in, or even blithely followed or acquiesced in the antiwar movement in this country.

My purpose in doing so is to accentuate crucial differences in the perceptions that Americans have of what occurred in Southeast Asia and what occurred in our country and around the world during that war. My purpose is to point at the pain, the pressures, the anxieties, the bitterness, the haunting horrible memories, the fears, the frustrations, the feelings of injustice suffered by those that bore the brunt of the myths, the dishonesties, the perversions of truth about that war. The errors which created the public misunderstandings of what was at issue in Southeast Asia and misinterpretations about the feelings, the goals, the purposes of the men who actually did the fighting, should be rectified. To do so, one burning issue—inescapable and everpresent—must of necessity be disposed of.

It is an issue which shall be at the core of any dialog concerning that conflict until this Nation finally resolves the opinions that form its

thoughts on why we were there. No amount of rationalization, no desire to sweep history under the rug, no amount of embarrassment as the tables turn on those who resisted our presence, whether out of good intent or bad, will change the gnawing presence of this ultimate issue.

Did the United States of America fight for a good and proper end? That is the question. That is the question which is at the core of all the psychological pain and suffering that especially Vietnam combat veterans feel.

The supposed answer was the one that justified all the statements in the past, and still does in greatly muted fashion—for all the activities and statements of opponents of the war—so they thought—so now they are beginning to doubt.

Who was right—who did what was right? Wars are not small and petty endeavors. They are much too final for that. They do not lend themselves easily to minor justifications. One cannot kill others or subject oneself to mortal danger for subtle or paltry motivations—and no degree of cynicism can divert the crucial truth that the finality of war is based upon mankind's most deeply held convictions—no matter how explained. We shall never be able to forget this one without responding to the question as to whether it was so derived.

That question and its resolution is the one that tears at the very heart and mind of the person who went overseas, who was under the peculiar pressures of that type of fighting—who returned to a nation that by and large was either embarrassed to face him, or did not wish to try and understand the implications of his role. For to understand might have meant not just to agree but to sacrifice the blood and money to insure success. The totalitarian bloc supplied their money; they supplied their blood, and they succeeded.

At home, stripped of rationalizations and excuses, the Nation's leaders did not have the courage to admit that we lacked the commitment to see the conflict through. To tell that to the combat veteran was too much, was too painful, was too humiliating—so they simply avoided him.

To every combat veteran who gave of his time, who gave of his blood, who sacrificed his friends, who lost them to the war, and especially to those who died there—I want to pay this tribute.

You are the people who, unlike every armchair philosopher in this country, had the courage to maintain your discipline in the face of irrational criticisms—suffered at the hand of many of those in the media who forgot what the words responsibility, balance and objectivity meant, a media who went from reporters to pure editorialists—who in abject foolishness became tools for manipulation

of events, rather than observers and reporters of them—of some politicians who had neither the fortitude nor the perseverance to study the issues at hand, who could not face the sacrifices and who—unlike you on the front lines—could not bear the responsibilities of a truly proper desire to see that some better degree of freedom was brought to a group of human beings to whom that word really meant something.

As a group of courageous and unselfish people, I ask you to accept one final burden. I ask you to extend the same sense of sacrifice for duty and responsibility one step further. Let the vociferous and violent opponents of that war—let the heroes of resistance in Canada—let the Walter Cronkites and the George McGovern—let the Wayne Morses and others—let them bear the guilt for millions of displaced refugees—of attempted genocide against the Meo Tribesmen in Laos, for atrocities committed against brother Vietnamese, Cambodians, Thai and ethnic Chinese, systematically shot, starved, tortured and imprisoned—because they did not agree with the policies of the North Vietnamese Government—let them accept the responsibility for interfering with your desire to do what was right—let them accept the responsibility for this twisted, sick, attempt to deprive these people of their rights and privileges and happiness.

It is they whom history will judge as the fools. It is they whom history will judge as lacking courage. It is they, when the emotions of this period dissolve in history, as history moves on, will be looked upon as lacking in vision, lacking perspective, lacking concern, lacking humility, lacking courage to sacrifice for the rights of a small group of people in a small corner of this Earth.

They are the people who have told you that you were part of a Hitler-like movement, that oppressed the innocents of Southeast Asia. Not only is that a lie now, but it was a lie then. And history as it moves along will judge it even more firmly and strongly an untruth. Millions of dead Cambodians, many summarily executed, millions of displaced and torn families, hungry and starving children, boats awash in the sea, people drowning, people who cannot speak their mind, people that have no freedom of movement, people that cannot criticize their government—all those people—all those souls—all that terrible, horrible oppression is not your legacy. It is theirs.

It is a cross that will be borne by those already mentioned. You have done right by what is right for mankind. You are not guilty of tyranny or selfishness or indifference. You were

not the ones who ran in the face of difficult choices.

Let no one tell you that you were driven from the battlefield—this Nation's leaders brought you home long before South Vietnam fell. This Nation's leaders cut our aid to South Vietnam in half—in the face of an opposite decision by the totalitarian bloc to increase substantially their aid to the North. You performed your task well—in light of the opposition to your efforts while you were there and the limitations placed upon your desire to succeed—you fought under the harshest of conditions and you fought well. You were successful in achieving the severely hampered task that you were assigned.

You did not have the social support that a soldier needs—you did not have the political support at home that a soldier badly wants—the strata of opinionmakers—who form the officialdom that constitutes the class of people who attempt to guide opinion in this country—simply did not support you—now, if they care at all, they will be made cowards by their own consciences—they will always be explaining their actions.

They cannot understand the nuances of political strategy that dominate the way wars are now being fought on this globe—small politically oriented conflagrations that mock patience—that bleed persistence. Conflicts that test whether any democracy can truly survive in the face of persistent tyrannical authoritative goals. That means that a premium is placed on the concept of individual responsibility, and their answer to that concept was rationalization where it was not outright fear or indifference.

You had to become the scapegoat—you had to become the reason for failure—not their actions but yours—not your fears but theirs. The policy needed to fail—or else they were wrong and you were right—that was the rationalization—somehow the good guys became bad guys and vice versa—to suit the ends of the opponents of the Vietnam war.

The North had to win and you were one of the victims—you had to be made the losers because the real causes of failure needed to be explained. Please do not ever, as long as you live, feel compelled to believe or accept such dishonest and unfair things. You do not need to subvert the truth for the sake of a welcome home. It was a test. But I assure each and every one of you that it is a test which you have passed and that when those individuals, most of whom were decent, sincere and well-intentioned people take the next step and say that they were wrong and you were right—when that happens I am hopeful that this Nation and this Government will take the proper steps to insure that the psychological counseling that you

so badly need—that the employment opportunities which you so badly need—that the social acceptance and recognition that you so badly need—will finally be given to you.

You may not realize this, but at this time you are probably the most troubled class of Americans in this society. I can stand before you here today and still feel the stress, the anxiety, the mental torture, the bitterness, that many of you share with me. You cannot—you must not—and for the sake of this Nation's future—you should not suppress those feelings. You were not wrong.

But you must make one final sacrifice—you must first of all extend a hand to those combat Vietnam veterans who, like you, do not regret and refuse to admit, simply for the sake of being accepted here, that you somehow were part of a wrong thing. You must never let the opponents of the Vietnam war win that battle. But at the same time you must understand and you must accept the fact that many of those opponents, even when you cut through the rationalizations and excuses that they used to justify and oppose your efforts out of fear and selfishness, some at least did so probably because they sincerely believed they were right.

No one knows better than us—one one feels more strongly than us—the revulsion and fear of war. But never let that be an excuse to avoid the truth. In their hearts they also thought they were doing what was right. So our task is not only to discuss these matters with a sincere desire to correct the record, but to go beyond the unintentional selfishness, the unintentional lack of loyalty and the unintentional cruelty imposed upon the Vietnam veterans by the opponents of that conflict and say that we would very much like to be welcomed home. But when we cross that threshold we must never forget that it must be with our head held high, with our self-respect and dignity intact—there must be no false supplication for the sake of being comfortably taken in.

□ 1245

Let me digress with a request to this administration, to the people of this Nation. This new President was criticized when he publicly stated that the Vietnam war was fought for a noble cause. I applaud him for that statement. I think that he was right.

Although unintentionally, he also pointed out the basic and still unresolved issue—that causes the psychological pangs suffered by the veterans who fought in Southeast Asia. By exposing the dishonest rationalizations still being perpetrated by those same opponents, now embarrassed by the facts of recent history, he has taken the first step. I applaud the President

because the question really is—was it a proper and justifiable cause?

But I also ask the administration not to eliminate those programs so desperately needed by, not just our Vietnam veterans, but by that whole class of veterans who have suffered and sacrificed, not just for this Nation, but for the basic rights of mankind everywhere. They must never be deserted—they must never be forgotten. President Reagan must not allow those in his administration who are striving to reduce veterans' benefits, some of whom were outspoken critics of the war and who now hope to avoid the embarrassment of the truths we mentioned—he must not allow them to reduce veterans' benefits.

Many case histories bring to light the poor acceptance that this maligned class of people has suffered upon coming home. That poor acceptance based upon foolhardy policies and mistreatment and selfishness and indifference, is at the root of many veterans' problems. We must not augment these difficulties.

I represent the 21st Congressional District in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—no more striking example of the problems and pressures faced by Vietnam combat veterans could be better found than the story of Larry Hall.

Larry Hall is a Vietnam combat veteran presently in a mental institution, who does not understand why he is there. He shot and killed a friend of his. His friend was a man with five children, who was a distinguished and honorable Korean war veteran. Larry came home to the United States, was unhappy, and then volunteered for another tour in Vietnam. That is how strong his feelings were. But when he came home he could not understand why people could not see—why people did not understand what happened in Southeast Asia. He could not understand it when many groups and many people in this country, many news commentators, many politicians—many entertainers in Hollywood—who clapped when Saigon fell—Larry could not understand what they were doing or why. So Larry's mind began to seek an explanation. And in its search Larry Hall's troubled, pained, and confused mind also found a scapegoat, because Larry Hall could not understand or rationalize indifference to him, embarrassment of him, could not understand the stereotypes of Vietnam veterans presented in television stories, news reports that always seemed to work in some form of quote like "disgruntled" or "unemployed" or "angry" or something "bad" Vietnam veteran into the story's lead. He could not understand the headlines and stories in many of our great newspapers like the New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor and the Washington

Post that portrayed the fall of Saigon as a blessing for those people who were being oppressed in Southeast Asia by the Larry Halls of the United States of America.

So Larry in his mind, incapable of blaming his country, began to blame the failure of the war somehow on the black soldiers that fought there. Larry was taken by his father to a VA hospital. Larry was treated there. He was given a partial service-connected disability award. But Larry grew worse. He was taken back to that hospital where a doctor told his father that he needed commitment immediately. His father, Warren Hall, requested help for the boy, but Larry was turned away. Anyone who has been concerned with the problems of veterans in this country knows that the resources to help our returned soldiers with these problems are strained—and they would not be surprised.

Shortly after this incident, Larry killed a black man, a decent good hard-working, honest American, to him part of a nameless, faceless problem that he could not identify. The man was a Korean war veteran who fought for this country and who, incidentally, was a friend of Larry's. We now have five fatherless children and a wife has lost a husband and father to her children because of the convulsed, distorted, and twisted pressures that altered reality for a brave, young soldier who fought for the very principles that have made this country the greatest place on Earth.

If I could commemorate April 26, Larry, to anyone, it would be to you, and a soldier named Brown. Somehow I just cannot accept the fact—I just cannot believe in my heart that we have done right by you. We hope and pray for your recovery. We are terribly and painfully hurt by the loss that the Brown family has suffered. And were it not for the facts in this case which so clearly demonstrate the pressures of the war, and the terrible homecoming which clearly played such a huge part in the mental disabilities which you have suffered, I would not make this appeal on your behalf—that all Americans reevaluate our role in Southeast Asia, and, if possible, join with me in admitting that at least it was a proper cause, fought to advance a proper end—that the tyrannies of the Hitlers and the Ho Chi Minhs shall never dominate the rights of mankind, and that no degree of rationalization shall deter us from at least admitting our responsibility even when we lack the courage to do something about it.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a comment?

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. First of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman for taking

this time and for speaking so eloquently on behalf of the Vietnam veterans.

I had the opportunity yesterday of attending the day honoring Vietnam veterans here in Washington at the site of their new proposed memorial. I listened to a number of speeches that were being made. The one thing that—and the gentleman mentioned it—certainly came through to me was that in the speeches there was a great deal of talk of our indebtedness to these veterans and the recognition, long overdue recognition, by the American public, that these were not people to be ignored or to be disrespected, but to be respected and loved for what they had done. But when we get down to the bottom line, as the gentleman knows, we still have a tremendous number of these people in need of things like counseling, as the gentleman mentioned.

Yet the program and the funds for counseling have been removed from the program that is being projected by the administration. The fact that there are so many of these veterans who are out of jobs and out of jobs because of lack of training and lack of opportunity, and so while I join very fully with the gentleman in what he has said, I am hopeful that we in the Congress are going to find a way of addressing this issue to these Americans who have done so much for all of us and reach out and not receive a cutback at this time on the idea that this cutback is going to solve the problems of our country.

Now we have said that we all must make sacrifices. I think these men and women have made the sacrifices. I would like to see us stand very firm in the area of protection for these people. I am sure the gentleman in the well would share that thought with me.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman very much.

Before I recognize the gentleman from Texas, I would add that one of the things that is very difficult to understand about the many issues that are still unresolved, which swirl around our involvement in Southeast Asia, is that many of the combat veterans who fought there suffer lingering, painful psychological injuries largely because problems either were not shared at home or the homecoming failed to recognize and deal with many of the stresses that they needed to readjust.

Unlike veterans of past wars, it has been very difficult for them to become assimilated, not because the Nation does not care for them and love them, I know that is not the case, but because of a misunderstanding of why they were there. That is the core issue. We can object to the end of time about whether or not the Nation should have become involved and

whether or not we should have fought the war the way we did. But what those veterans need is some recognition of the fact that it was a proper purpose. That psychologically is what tears at many of them.

The Nation, because it is truly a great and open and honest Nation that we are a part of here, will continue to discuss it. History will go over it until that final question is resolved because that is the one that really raises all the others.

I want to thank the gentleman. I know that he and many of the Congressmen here do care very, very much. I know the Nation does. I just hope we recognize that the injuries are more, in many cases, mental than they are physical, that they persist, and that we try to help those people.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I, too, rise to compliment him, thank him very much for his eloquence in a very noble and worthwhile struggle and that is the sustained need to realize the very special and acute and continuing needs of the veteran who served in Vietnam.

I think the record clearly shows that the type of war, not only because of the peculiar environment of the war, but all that was involved in fighting that war, the nature of the terrain, the nature of the weapons and all, made this Vietnam encounter unique in two ways: First, I think that the record of the service medical divisions was outstanding. In proportion to the lives saved in the field by a very special modernized physical equipment to take care of the wounds and the physical damage, the rate of recovery was outstanding, unbelievable, almost 90 percent. Compared to World War II where you had tremendous carnage and death, that would have been prevented with the techniques that were finally evolved in Vietnam. Compared to Korea, even, it was phenomenal.

However, what the gentleman stresses today is the other phenomena and that is the lingering residual psychological detriment suffered by the veteran. We have not recognized, as we did in the case of the physical, the need for updating and upgrading and paying the money that it takes to provide the level of service that is needed.

The gentleman's example, poignant as it is, I can repeat in my district. Especially at this time where we are fighting a rear guard action in behalf of these programs and in behalf of reality and justice against a backdrop of an emergency labeled as a fiscal emergency, as a budgetary emergency and sacrifice this lingering and lasting responsibility we have to the GI veteran of Vietnam on the altar of computer targets.

So we have a great debt to you and I think we ought to recognize it and of course I for one am solidly in support of the gentleman's position and thank him for what he is doing.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman very much. I do not think there are any other Members to speak. So I will just conclude by perhaps expounding on some of the remarks that the gentleman made.

A great many myths and misunderstandings about the nature and conduct of the war, first of all at its height when our manpower commitments to Southeast Asia were at their height we had in the vicinity of half a million people there. At that time we fielded no more than about 50,000 soldiers. Most of those troops were there in support functions and of course the media that existed there with them existed also in that environment.

So in many ways perhaps we cannot be unfair because it is difficult for a country to adjust to new changing political conditions and a new kind of war. But many of the myths that have followed the soldiers home have really been at the root of the problem. Most people are still under the misconception that we were militarily pushed out of the country. That is not true. The North Vietnamese knew very well they could not take the country as long as we were there. We were gone for quite a while, our military presence had been removed for quite a while before they came in.

Given the limited objectives of fighting the war, limited in terms of territory since it was an areawide conflict, the limitations against invading or going to the source of the problem which was in the north, the soldiers performed their task quite well.

□ 1300

They came as the result of just the failure of the policy to be unwitting and unfortunate victims of a policy failure, but one that failed by virtue of choices made here, of strategy, as opposed to how they fought the war or how well they did. The North Vietnamese would admit that quite well, I am sure, if they were so inclined, but those are the things which have hurt, combined with the homecoming, coming back, and seeing the movies, the stereotypes, the images they have had to confront. It has all combined to cause a great deal of pain and discomfort for some innocent people.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), to whom I will be glad to yield, submitted some excellent remarks for the RECORD. He does have a number of these now, and I very much hope that the Members and the public will take the time to read those remarks. They are excellent.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Pa., for taking this time to commend the Vietnam veterans; for all the work he has done on their behalf, because nobody has had more influence in Congress than the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and of course the distinguished gentleman who is chairing this House today, the general from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

But, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the highest decorated combat veteran of Vietnam who is in the Congress today. He served with distinction, and has followed those precepts he learned in Vietnam very well. All of us appreciate the work he has done in the last 2 years that he has been here. We know that he will continue to work in working for the men and women who served in Vietnam, and who have had such a difficult time since they came back.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by repeating a letter which I received recently from a man who resides in the area I represent. I have altered only names and locations, and I believe what this gentleman has to say is very important.

The reason for this letter is the terrible injustice the Vietnam veteran is suffering.

My son went to a V.A. Hospital because of health problems he has suffered with the past several years.

This was yesterday and the Doctor told him as a Vietnam veteran he had no benefits under the present law but said he could be screened for Agent Orange. An appointment was made for next week.

He is really feeling bad about this after having fought in a real war for his country and then being treated so bad.

All other veterans have benefits. Is the country down on the Vietnam veteran because seemingly it is down on the Vietnam War?

I landed on the beaches of Normandy (Omaha Beach) on D-Day many years ago and I feel the Vietnam veteran suffered the effects of combat just as much or more.

Something needs to be done and done quickly on behalf of the Vietnam veteran. These men are feeling the country has let them down and rightly so.

If you will please write my son a letter and let him know that somebody cares.

In the closing words of that letter are the key to what we must remember during this debate: "Let him know that somebody cares." I am sure my colleagues in this debate will discuss all the numbers and studies and tests that show the problems Vietnam veterans are still having in readjusting to society. At the base of those problems, though, rests the fact the Vietnam veteran thinks nobody cares or remembers the contribution he or she made. Unfortunately, in many ways that is correct.

Another veteran of Vietnam wrote to me about proposed budget cuts affecting Vietnam veterans. In one paragraph of his letter he wrote:

Haven't they taken enough from us? Are we doomed to forever be the bastards of a country that refuses to acknowledge our needs, not our wants, as veterans. Because what we need is indeed a far cry from what we may also want. We know that we can never get what we want—acknowledgement and respect as veterans who served their country—but for God's sake can they keep denying us the basic programs that we need?

I served for 1 year with marines in Vietnam, so I know the devastation of the war and the impact on the people who fought in it. In 1974 when I was first elected to Congress, the very first speech I made on the floor of Congress dealt with the need to continue the Vietnam effort. As part of those remarks I said:

I spent a year on the ground and I was out in the field every day. I saw the results of the criticisms of certain Members of Congress. It was devastating to the war effort. I do not agree it shortened the war. \* \* \* Congress sat here in its air-conditioned offices and argued over this while the men who served there were in mud up to their knees and water up to their waists.

Now, 7 years later, we do the same thing. The Government proposes budget cuts to reduce the few programs helping the Vietnam veteran; the VA refuses to budge a single inch on the treatment of men who may be affected with agent orange so their medical problems go unattended; we see unemployment rise with the Vietnam veterans history of often being the last one hired and the first one fired, yet we propose to eliminate jobs programs.

Is it any wonder the Vietnam veteran thinks he has been forgotten? Is it any wonder the Vietnam veteran wonders now why he or she bothered to take time out of their lives to defend the country's principles and fight for what its leaders told them was right?

I congratulate Congressman DON BAILEY for promoting this special order to talk about the Vietnam veteran. It is a step in a long process of recognizing the Vietnam veteran and the job he did, and the needs he still has. As the father wrote to me, today is a step in letting the Vietnam veteran know that somebody cares.

Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, although I received the following letter nearly 2 months ago, I would like to share it with you and our colleagues at this time when we recognize and honor Vietnam veterans. The words of Mr. Palochik are quite sincere and heartfelt:

DEAR SIR: I am a Vietnam veteran, and the reason I am writing you is because of all the past, present, and probably future coverage given the 52 American Hostages. I as an American, am glad that the 52 Americans have returned from being held captive in a foreign country, and that is it. I have never mentioned anything regarding Vietnam for eleven years. I was there from November 21,

1967 until November 20, 1968. During that time Nha Trang Air Base was under constant mortar, small arms attack every day for 365 days. I was assigned duty with the K-9 Sentry Dog Division of the 5th Special Forces, 101st Airborne Division. We covered a 2,500 bed Viet-Cong hospital on Hon-Tre Island, lost 25 American Soldiers, wounded over 50 Americans. That hospital which was buried deep into the mountains, was responsible for the wounded Viet-Cong from Phu-Cat to Saigon. This is only a brief narrative on some events during my year in Vietnam and this includes the Tet offensive.

I volunteered for the service, I volunteered for the Special Forces training, I volunteered for hazardous duty at Hon-Tre Island, I volunteered for Aerial Long Range Reconnaissance, and I was honorably discharged.

Vietnam and the Vietnam veteran are sleeping giants. The past events regarding the hostages have awakened us. When I returned home on November 20, 1968 at 12:30 a.m., the only people to greet me were my loving family. Two distinguished businessmen literally knocked me over at O'Hare International Airport en route to catch a plane for a two week stay in Daytona Beach, Florida. I was bumped from my military stand-by in California (that was the only way a serviceman could afford to travel) by a man my age, 19, so he could fly to Colorado to ski. My records were lost and I could not get paid during my 45 days home, before returning to duty.

After discharge I was respected as much as Ayatollah Khomeini for being a Veteran. Old officers probably were treated differently. I couldn't afford to go to college full time and support a wife and new baby. I had to work from 8 to 5:00 p.m. and go to college 6:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. Under different circumstances many veterans or others could handle it with no problems. But I didn't just come off a four year vacation. It was, to quote an old cliché "hard to adjust".

How many movies, and books have been made or written about a 19-year-old returning Vietnam veteran, gets married, goes back and completes college, gets up and goes to work, and is normal? Zero. That nonsense doesn't sell. We are all depicted as dope addicts, killers, rapists, child and wife beaters, etc.

I just recently bought a home. I tried to get a V.A. Loan; not one Savings and Loan (even the one from the Veterans Administration) would give me any consideration. College is another story. A man can't survive, meet bills, etc. on their money. I have a service connected disability, which I should have made a claim and did not do so. But with all the hassle I got, and my friends received the same treatment, why should I put myself through more humiliation? So I just said I can live with Jungle Rot of the feet.

I don't want a lifetime pass to the Pittsburgh Pirates Games, Pittsburgh Steeler Games, a shopping spree at a mall, month free travel on any airline to anywhere in the United States, a Ticker Tape Parade in Arnold, Pa., or a street named after me, but only a fair shake for serving a Country I love with all my heart and soul.

Thank you for listening.

ROBERT PALOCHIK.

P.S.—If my country needed me again I and probably 90 percent of the Vietnam veterans would return; ask the 52 hostages if they would go back to Tehran.

Mr. Speaker, I have waited until this very appropriate time, when we honor

Vietnam veterans, to include in our Nation's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a beautifully written article that appeared in the Greensburg Tribune-Review on March 29, 1981. It was written by a particularly exceptional journalist named Ruth W. Love.

Mrs. Love has captured many of the feelings and connoted many of the hypocrisies that represent the Vietnam thorn in America's historical side. That these views can be shared with the rest of our Nation, and will remain a part of our historical record forever, I should like to include them in the RECORD today:

#### THOUGHTS ON THE VIETNAM WAR

(By Ruth W. Love)

We are in the season of Lent preceding Easter morn with its glorious promise of Resurrection, of life after death.

There can be no better time for resolving the burden of guilt this country has borne ever since the Vietnam debacle when the United States government abandoned our fighting men missing in action in Korea and those being held prisoners of war in Vietnam.

For the first time in American history, this country has failed to write an honorable end to hostilities in which it was involved.

From the Korean "police action," there remain 389 prisoners of war for whom there has been no accountability.

From the Vietnam conflict, the Department of Defense officially lists 2,546 Americans missing in action.

There should be a full scale investigation to determine answers to these questions: Are these men missing or dead? Are they being held in bondage by an enemy making a mockery of the strength and power of the United States? Are these missing men languishing in some prison stockade with all hope gone and faith in their government dissipated?

As long as these questions remain unanswered, so long will this country be forced to bear the burden of guilt that, for over 20 years, has left us mentally and morally crippled with a sickness that can find a cure only in facing up to the consequences of our criminal negligence.

In that Korean War, 1950-1953, there were 5,720,000 in uniform, 33,629 battle deaths, 157,530 total casualties from all causes.

In Southeast Asia (Vietnam), 1961 through 1977, there were 8,744,000 in uniform, 46,572 battle deaths, 303,704 wounded and total casualties of 360,666.

Those in the Armed Forces met the challenge of loyalty with the same patriotic fervor and dedication that had motivated American fighting men since the Revolution.

The tragedy, the shame, of the Vietnam debacle was written when, for the first time in American history, those in the uniform of our country found themselves abandoned by their own government, forced to wage a losing war, and retire from the field of battle with doubts as to the cause for which they were willing to give their blood and their lives.

Assuming the presidency January 20, 1969, Richard M. Nixon faced growing opposition to the Vietnam war he had inherited from his predecessor, Lyndon Baines Johnson. So Nixon became obsessed with finding only an "honorable" or at least a face-saving

compromise with the enemy. He was caught between the intransigence of the North Vietnamese and the demands of the peace movement at home for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.

Ruling out a military solution, Nixon dismissed Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey as a draft director, pledged to make conscription less burdensome on American youth and labored to beat the timetable for getting out of Vietnam.

Thus was established the pattern of weakness that failed to take into account the sacrifices already made by those fighting the war.

Nothing was accomplished by Gerald Ford, as Nixon's successor.

Throughout another four years, James Earl Carter mouthed a human rights philosophy that was never expanded to demand an accountability for those missing in action but still carrying the brunt of hostilities no one wanted to remember or credit with legitimacy.

The United States moved steadily downhill.

Through the last two decades, the American people remained silent spectators to events aimed at the erosion of their constitutional rights and a rejection of the Judeo-Christian precepts of faith.

Employing the color and hoopla of a Mardi Gras, minorities demanded and received special privileges; an Equal Rights movement that began as a dream in theory became a nightmare in practice spawning evils debasing womanhood and striking at the basic concept of the family as the backbone of the nation; homosexuals sought public recognition of their unnatural lifestyles as teachers in the classroom and as ministers in the pulpit; the public school system became a national disgrace with children as guinea pigs for liberal experimentation leaving them less than fulfilled in educational pursuits; the courts weakened the foundation of law and order.

For more than two decades, the American people have been forced to carry the burden of guilt imposed by those leaders lacking foresight and courage.

We failed our fighting men in Vietnam. And, somehow, we have never been able to overcome the consequences that have left us open to all the evils spawned by irresponsible conduct.

Today, Ronald Reagan occupies the White House. His strength may be the catalyst now stinging the conscience of the silent majority into action.

From it may come a public demand that can dispel the sickness of guilt and force from the enemy an accountability.

Vietnam can be laid to rest.

Or it can remain a ghost forever attesting to the cowardice of those who had been charged with guiding and directing the destiny of our nation.

Easter draws near—symbolizing hope in the Resurrection.

Let us pray that it will also mark some effort by our government to resolve the terrible burden of more than 20 years for those still "missing in action," for the families who wait and hope.

Only then can we be cured of the sickness that has overshadowed our national life and has taken heavy toll of our mental and moral capacity for meeting the challenges of our times.

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with mixed feelings to par-

ticipate in this special order on behalf of veterans of the Vietnam era.

I am angered by the woeful lack of recognition extended to these brave individuals. Whatever extenuating circumstances, one fact remains irrefutable—nearly 2.6 million Americans served in Vietnam, 1.6 million in combat—at the call of their country.

The past failure of this Nation to afford Vietnam veterans the support and praise they so painfully earned, and now so desperately need, has been a source of national embarrassment bordering on disgrace. We have rarely acknowledged their gallant efforts. Many Vietnam veterans rightfully feel their problems have been ignored. It is not only a time to say, "Thank you," but to address the serious problems many of these people now face.

There were no parades or heroes' welcome when the Vietnam veterans came home. It is probably true that the Vietnam war was the most unpopular war our Nation ever waged. But even after the Civil War—which claimed a heavier toll in dead and wounded—towns and cities throughout the North and South erected monuments in tribute to those who fought and died.

It is with great anticipation and rejoicing then, that the American people are now acknowledging—and giving comfort—to the Vietnam-era veteran.

On March 26, 1981, the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously passed House Joint Resolution 182 which designated April 26, 1981, as National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era.

I believe I can speak for all Americans when I say that this recognition is fitting and proper—though regretfully overdue. Through our actions in the House of Representatives, and through similar expressions of appreciation from millions of American citizens, we can begin the sometimes difficult task of reaching out to one who courageously served, and say, "Thank you."

We should do more.

Recent studies reveal that Vietnam veterans have suffered greatly. Vietnam veterans deserve a solid assessment by Federal, State, and local governments of their struggles in the areas of unemployment, education, health care, and social adaptability. In conscience, we can do no less.

The American Nation is embarking on a great new beginning. We are, today, witnessing the rebirth of national pride, enterprise, and hope for the future.

It is good then, as a part of this renaissance, that we make a special effort to acknowledge the Vietnam-era veteran. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

This is the sacrifice—potential and actual—made by every Vietnam veter-

an. To each and every one of them, I extend my sincerest gratitude in recognition of their willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice so that others might live.

I ask all Americans to join me in expressing appropriate thanks.●

● Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, 1 day after the National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era, on behalf of the 2.7 million service men and women who served their country in Vietnam.

I am hopeful that yesterday's belated tribute heralds a time of recognition and acknowledgment for the suffering these forgotten warriors have experienced here at home.

I am hopeful the Veterans' Administration will not trim their budget by \$31 million at the expense of these veterans, whose storefront counseling centers are threatened with extinction.

We must extend the funding for these 91 counseling centers.

If we allow the centers to be closed, we are risking the psychological health and mental well-being of all those veterans who have faced difficulties adjusting to life in a country that seems to have ignored them.

A recent Government study reported that between 500,000 and 1 million veterans still suffer the effects of psychological battle wounds, and may develop such symptoms as flashbacks, nightmares, insomnia, guilt about war events, depression, withdrawal from normal activities, and difficulty in concentration.

The study predicted that the delayed stress syndrome already exhibited by thousands of combat veterans will get worse and worse in the years ahead.

We must not dismantle this program at the time it is needed the most.●

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that we are today honoring Vietnam veterans. Though a week was set aside in their honor almost 2 years ago, I believe it is important to again honor these men who gave so much, yet received so little recognition for their sacrifices. This is especially true in light of the return of the hostages from Iran, who have been showered with affection and goodwill by the America people.

I hope that our efforts to honor and assist these men do not end here. Vietnam veterans have legitimate and pressing needs that must be addressed. As evidenced by a recent study commissioned by the VA, entitled "Legacies of Vietnam: Comparative Adjustment of Veterans and Their Peers," Vietnam veterans are having significant problems readjusting from their wartime experiences. I would like to take this opportunity to summarize the findings of the study:

*Volume I, Findings (overall):* "Years after war-related issues have ceased to be every-

day preoccupations, they continue to evoke confusion, pain, resentment, and mistrust among veterans and nonveterans alike."

"A decade after the peak years of the war, those who actually served in Vietnam are plagued by significantly more problems than their peers."

*Volume II, Education and Work Careers:* "... shows that Vietnam veterans have not achieved as high a level of education as their peers and hold jobs that are, on the average, of lower levels than those held by veterans who served outside the war zone and by nonveterans."

*Volume III, Post-War Trauma:* "... exposure to combat bears a direct and significant relation to current alcohol and drug use, arrests, medical problems, and stress-related symptoms."

*Volume IV, Long Term Stress Reactions:* Those who served after 1968, when political opposition and domestic pressure intensified are more prone to stress-related problems, as are those with low educational attainment, of minority status, or unemployed.

*Volume V, Dealing with the War:* "... the majority of Vietnam veterans we interviewed have not made substantial headway in working through their war experiences."

The study made the following recommendations:

First, extend the period of eligibility for GI educational and training benefits;

Second, targeting manpower training programs to reach the chronically unemployed veteran;

Third, involve private sector employers and organizations in an effort to assist Vietnam veterans;

Fourth, continue outreach by well-trained veteran peer counselors; and

Fifth, expertise should be developed in the area of post-traumatic disorders through focusing research, training, and treatment innovations.

These recommendations have all at one time or another been introduced as legislation by the Vietnam Veterans in Congress Caucus. Some have been successfully passed in the Congress—such as with the Vietnam veterans outreach centers—others have not.

Our efforts have not subsided, however. I have introduced legislation which will this week be considered by the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care. This legislation will provide for an extension of the veterans outreach centers, authorize both inpatient and outpatient care for veterans affected by conditions they feel are as a result of exposure to agent orange, and also provide additional on-the-job training benefits to Vietnam veterans in need of employment assistance. Though this legislation is not a panacea, I do feel that it will help those veterans seeking to sort out their lives and return to the mainstream of society.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention some of the activities which occurred this past weekend in South Dakota in commemoration of Vietnam Veterans Day. The Vietnam Veterans of South Dakota had a grand

opening of their new headquarters in Rapid City. I was able to meet with this dedicated and spirited group that is making tremendous strides in helping Vietnam veterans in South Dakota suffering from delayed stress in the absence of a veterans outreach center in western South Dakota. Additionally, I was privileged to address a rally of Vietnam veterans in Sioux Falls, who also sponsored a march, and later a dance party for their fellow Vietnam veterans. These and other activities which occurred in South Dakota and elsewhere demonstrate the cohesiveness and self-support ability Vietnam veterans and their organizations now display. In the event that the Reagan administration prevails in its efforts to dismantle those few Government programs which now exist for Vietnam veterans, this self-help ability will be invaluable. ●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I feel very honored to join our colleagues today in paying tribute to the veterans of the Vietnam war. As a society we have not paid enough in the enormous debt we owe to the Vietnam veterans after their great war efforts and sacrifices for this country.

The men and women who served in that conflict deserve better than they have received. They deserve to feel proud that they answered their country's call to duty; they deserve to feel that their sacrifice and loss is recognized; they do not deserve to feel as a pariah merely because the war in which they fought was an unpopular war. But we have not allowed them to feel that their actions mattered, and if any group of veterans deserve our full support and acknowledgement it is the Vietnam veteran.

As a watershed in our recent history, the Vietnam war stands as a reminder that we as a nation must make a commitment to achieve our goals before placing ourselves in an intolerable position. We cannot play with the lives and future of our young men and women while deciding what the policy of our Nation ought to be.

There have been innumerable studies about the Vietnam war and its effects on the over 9 million persons that served in it. These studies show that the lingering effects on those persons years after they served are serious and deep. War is always a horrible and harrowing experience that can be fully comprehended only by those that have gone through it. And when veterans feel that their sacrifices have been for naught, their sense of futility in what they have had to endure is increased.

We should remember to honor the Vietnam war veteran not only with our words but also with our actions and support. We must insure that the medical, educational, and financial help they need continues to be made available to them. The Congress can

do no less and the American people expect no less. I am sure all my colleagues will join me in pledging our continuous support to the Vietnam veteran. ●

● Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Washington is a city of monuments: Marble buildings, wide streets, shrines, museums, and monuments. Monuments, monuments everywhere. Each appropriately honoring an individual or a worthy cause or a crusader. Each monument or memorial in its proper place in a city which is, itself, a thriving monument to the strength of democracy. Venezuela's Simon Bolivar stands at 18th and C Streets. Joan of Arc is in Meridian Park. General Lafayette, Marconi, Adm. Richard Byrd are immortalized in steel and stone and stand like palace guards while the freshest pages of American history are written in the bureaucracy surrounding them.

Many monuments were gifts to the Nation, of course. Others gracing the city were erected at taxpayers' expense. They stand as reminders, as well they should, of wars long past, great deeds, and contributions perhaps overlooked or since forgotten. They stand as reminders, lest we forget.

I stand here today to remind my colleagues of yet another monument for Washington—one yet to be completed. One in which we can personally invest. Last July, the House and Senate approved legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to select an appropriate site in the District of Columbia upon which the Vietnam Veterans Memorial would be constructed. That same bill authorized the creation of the Vietnam veterans memorial fund which has served to coordinate the collection of funds to establish a monument to the 2.7 million Americans who served in Vietnam, and particularly to the 57,000 who died there.

According to the fund, the total cost of the project will be approximately \$7 million. To date, over \$1 million has been raised by donations and contributions from those supporting the memorial and all it represents. I am sure the funds necessary to erect the Vietnam Veterans Memorial will be raised. Not one Federal dollar has been allocated for the memorial, nor will there be. It will be built by the public. It will be erected by those of us who appreciate the Vietnam veteran and understand that the serviceman who went to Southeast Asia, fought in Southeast Asia, and died in Southeast Asia did so honorably for a country that asked them to serve in America's most difficult war, during America's most turbulent times.

Do you know these young people? I mean really know them? Do you remember John Kennedy's cavalier call to "protect any friend \* \* \* oppose any foe?" Let me remind you that the Vietnam veteran did not ask what his

country could do for him during the dark days of Vietnam, but he, instead, demonstrated what he was willing to do for his country.

How often are we in the Congress asked to approve legislation authorizing a project without expecting the Federal Government to financially prop it up? Very rarely. I again stress: the Vietnam Veterans Memorial will be built by gifts and donations. That is particularly noteworthy while the Congress approves billions for defense, but not 1 cent for tribute.

I am not going to pass the hat today. But neither am I going to ignore my responsibility to remind you, and all Americans, that the veteran of Vietnam and his brothers-in-arms who died in Vietnam deserve nothing less than a memorial built by those of us who are truly grateful for their service—not so long ago, not so far away. ●

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this past month the Congress enacted House Joint Resolution 182 designating April 26 as "National Recognition Day for Veterans of the Vietnam Era," honoring those veterans who served in the Armed Forces during that conflict. With the enactment of this resolution, the men and women who served their country during the Vietnam war will be conspicuously on people's minds on this day, which was celebrated yesterday. As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I want these dedicated people to know that my committee, as well as the entire Congress, has had their needs foremost in our minds since this conflict began over 16 years ago.

At the beginning of this fiscal year there were over 9 million Vietnam-era veterans, comprising 30 percent of the total veteran population of over 30 million. Of the 9 million Vietnam veterans, 2.9 million served "in country" in Vietnam; 57,002 deaths are associated with this conflict, with 47,244 dying from action by hostile forces. At the initiative of my committee and the action of the Congress, several major benefit programs and services have been enacted especially for these deserving men and women. These laws encompass the entire spectrum of veterans' benefits and services—from medical care, including readjustment counseling, to increases in the months of training under the GI bill from 36 to 45 months and 10 rather than 8 years from date of discharge in which to utilize educational benefits.

Fourteen percent of all patients in VA hospitals last year were Vietnam veterans and 21 percent of all outpatient visits were veterans who served during that conflict; 50,000 Vietnam veterans have received medical screening and counseling for exposure to the herbicide, agent orange. Over 663,000 Vietnam veterans are receiving compensation or pension benefits. As of

September 1980 more than 2,767,000 guaranteed home loans were made to Vietnam veterans in an amount in excess of \$63 billion. Seventy percent of Vietnam-era veterans have taken advantages of GI bill education and training assistance, compared to 50.5 percent of World War II veterans and 43.4 percent of Korean conflict veterans. VA expenditures for benefits and services for Vietnam veterans to date total more than \$51 billion. It is estimated that this Nation has spent \$258 billion in veterans benefits in the 204 years of our existence, which certainly indicates that the Vietnam-era veterans have received a generous portion of the total veteran expenditures.

Our committee is presently considering important legislation which will significantly enhance benefits for Vietnam veterans including:

H.R. 2157 to expand the scope of the agent orange study;

H.R. 2415 to extend the Vietnam veterans psychological readjustment counseling program;

H.R. 2953 to authorize medical care for Vietnam veterans claiming exposure to agent orange; and proposed legislation to extend the veterans readjustment authority appointments, establish a veterans small business loan program within the Veterans' Administration, and legislation to provide additional employment assistance to certain Vietnam veterans. I am confident that the committee will act expeditiously to report this legislation to the House, and I am convinced that it deserves the support of my colleagues.

I am certain that we will never forget these veterans, especially those who incurred service-connected disabilities while serving their country. I am also certain that while we, as a Nation, have provided billions of dollars to Vietnam-era veterans for medical treatment and readjustment benefits, something other than money is required to fully recognize the service and sacrifice of Vietnam veterans. As the distinguished veteran CBS commentator Eric Sevareid observed on Veterans' Day several years ago: "The moral casualties of the Vietnam war cannot be repaired by the Federal Government alone; family, friends, and neighbors must do that if it can be done."

Let us hope that the recognition day we celebrated yesterday provides the impetus to begin the repairs.●

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to add my sentiments to those already expressed by my colleagues. I am pleased to see that many Members are participating in this special order and that many of them come from outside the ranks of the Vietnam Veterans in Congress Caucus.

I am not especially proud of the fact that this body has waited so long to recognize a very special group of veter-

ans in this country. Vietnam veterans are the victims of a painful period in the history of the United States. The American Government and people have essentially closed the book on this chapter of our national experience by ignoring Vietnam veterans, simply because they symbolize things that Americans would prefer to forget about their country.

But today, the Congress pays tribute to these veterans—through words and ideas. These are symbolic gestures, and they represent with only a few exceptions the sum total of gratitude this country has been able to offer these men who once served us in war.

We now have ample evidence of the toll our neglect is taking on the Vietnam veterans. We have studies that show that Vietnam veterans, particularly those that saw fighting, are plagued by measurably more emotional, social, educational, and job-related problems than are their peers.

Approximately 480,000 Vietnam veterans between the ages of 25 and 39 are unemployed. Unemployment among black veterans of the Indochinese war is three times as high as unemployment for white veterans of the same war; 70 percent of our Vietnam veterans returned to school after their enlistments were up, but only 20 percent of those completed their educational programs.

One out of three who actually fought in Vietnam now have readjustment problems serious enough to impair their day-to-day functioning; 700,000 suffer from delayed stress reaction.

This is tangible proof of the plight of the average Vietnam veteran, yet up to this point, we have been able to do little to alleviate that plight. One very successful effort was instituted under legislation passed during the 96th Congress. That bill authorized a network of readjustment centers to be set up around the country, centers where Vietnam veterans could go to get employment information, benefits referrals, and social counseling. These are centers where veterans could go to share experiences they had not been previously able to share. We have evidence that these centers are not only used extensively by Vietnam veterans, but that they are also very successful in opening up opportunities for veterans that had before been forgotten by their society.

And this year was to have been a landmark year for the Vietnam veterans' cause. Authorization to continue funding for the Outreach program was to have been approved. More important, other issues of relevance were to have been addressed, including the somewhat notorious agent orange controversy. Many of us in the V.V.I.C. feel strongly that a presumption of service connection must be established in relation to herbicide-related com-

plaints. Until that connection is established, we do not believe the Vietnam veterans will ever receive adequate medical care for this condition which is unique to their veterans group. That issue and others were to be addressed in an omnibus bill, to have been passed in the 97th Congress.

But this may not be a landmark year after all. If the Reagan administration has its way, this will be a year of distress for Vietnam veterans. The administration has proposed that the period of eligibility for readjustment services not be extended for many of the services now provided under the outreach program.

I submit that the 97th Congress cannot let this happen. Vietnam veterans have waited long enough for the recognition and the service they deserve. Commemorative activities like the one we are engaged in here today serve a good purpose, as they call to the public's attention the real story behind the Vietnam veterans' syndrome. But commemorative activities alone will not suffice. They do not translate into job opportunities for these men and women. They do not form the basis for readjustment counseling. They do not enable veterans to qualify for special loans. They do not address the medical problems unique to Vietnam veterans. In short, we have been long on words but short on results, and it is time that we began delivering for the Vietnam veterans.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose attempts to cut funding for readjustment programs. I also urge that we look favorably on legislation that seeks to resolve the many other problems these veterans face. We would do not less for our veterans of other wars. It is time this Congress and this country appreciate that all our veterans are entitled to recognition and assistance, regardless of the time or place or circumstances of service.

Thank you.●

● Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as one who served in Vietnam, I take special pleasure in joining this tribute to the Vietnam veterans whose courage and sacrifices I witnessed at firsthand on many occasions.

And yet, I approach this subject with a deep sense of humility. As Abraham Lincoln pointed out with his immortal words of honor for the men who fought at Gettysburg, our words here today pale in comparison to the deeds of those who answered their country's call.

At Gettysburg, Lincoln also spoke of the great task remaining before the Union. We face a different task today, Mr. Speaker, but one that is just as great—the task of giving our Vietnam veterans the recognition and the help that is so long overdue.

The need for that recognition and help was documented most recently by

the study done for the Veterans' Administration by the Center for Policy Research. That study, and others like it, clearly show that those who served this Nation in Vietnam are suffering from an array of social and psychological problems.

I believe all Americans can help overcome those problems by showing our Vietnam veterans the gratitude they so richly deserve. In that regard, yesterday's National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era was long overdue. Admittedly, yesterday's efforts were modest and served as much to illustrate the amount of work remaining as to honor those who served. Nevertheless, in the words of a Vietnam veteran from my district with whom I spoke, "It's a start."

The work we started yesterday, Mr. Speaker, will be complete when those who served in Vietnam can fully participate in the society they fought to protect and in the hallowed traditions and institutions of all those who have fought for this Nation.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 8 years since we ended our involvement in the Vietnam war—the longest, and certainly the most controversial war in our history. For the over 2.5 million Americans who served in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era, we pay a special tribute to them today.

We must not forget these brave men and women, and we must recognize and honor their patriotism and express how grateful and proud we are of them. The Vietnam Veterans Week offers us a timely opportunity to convey our appreciation.

The Vietnam-era veteran must be fully reintegrated into the economic mainstream of American life. This Nation's moral debt to the Vietnam veterans remains outstanding. We must focus attention on the needs of our Vietnam veterans and help provide an opportunity to obtain employment, training, educational and social assistance programs.

I join with my colleagues today in remembering the courage and sacrifice of those Americans who served our country in our Armed Forces in Southeast Asia and appropriately salute them for their valor and service.●

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of April 26, 1981, Vietnam Veterans' Day, I wish to draw my colleagues' attention to a letter I recently received from a western New York veteran. I want to share this letter with you as an example of the outrage and frustration expressed by many, many Vietnam veterans who contact me.

I hope this young man's words will remain with each of us as we focus on the need for improved readjustment counseling and recognition of the impact of delayed stress syndrome, redress for victims of agent orange and

their families, and a modernized GI bill benefit and training package:

I am appalled at the lack of sensitivity that the government has shown us Vietnam veterans. The insensitivity is the result of the reaction of the general public to the massive media-induced campaign of "shame" and "pain" concerning our involvement in Southeast Asia.

We served with pride, dignity, honor, and the realization that we were helping a poor people retain some form of freedom, thereby advancing our American ideals. Those who did not support us should be the only ones to feel shame.

The efforts of the media to present a fair picture of the Vietnam war have been feeble. The war was very individualistic: Each had to deal with it on his own terms; the war was restrained; permission was required to return fire; the war was everywhere; no safe rear areas free from rockets or mortars. No amount of single-dimension celluloid could impart the psychological stress we felt. This lack of John Wayne-type raw material in an Asiatic content confused many; misunderstanding resulted in rejection.

The graphic portrayal of American casualties in American living rooms on a daily basis also fueled the rejection of the war. Unfortunately, all wars have had such goryness; would the public support for the Korean and Second World Wars been as complete had such material been presented, instead of the manufactured stories that came out of Hollywood? It's too late for a parade or a hero medal for us. We had a job to do, and we did it quite well. But how much longer are we going to have to make sacrifices?

I urge you to sponsor and support legislation affecting veterans; for full accounting of POW's and MIA's; for increased educational benefits; for increased housing benefits; for increased quality and quantity of medical assistance in the VA hospitals; for impartial and complete health studies and evaluations of the effects of exposure to Agent Orange; for compensation for problems due to exposure to Agent Orange; for increased reductions in property taxes for residential properties; for bonuses.

We are not going to disappear because we have been ignored; or is that the unacknowledged aim of the government?●

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, as well as my honor today to recognize the sacrifices and efforts of those veterans who served our country in the Vietnam conflict. Yesterday, this country had its opportunity to honor our Vietnam-era veterans, by participating in the activities of the National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era. I was pleased to have been one of the co-sponsors of the legislation to proclaim April 26 as the national day of recognition. I have today asked the Architect to fly a flag over our Nation's Capitol in special recognition of the contributions made by Vietnam veterans in our district, who have recently formed the Kent County chapter of the Vietnam Veterans of America. I sincerely hope that this chapter will become an important voice for the 17,000 Vietnam-era veterans of Kent County.

Unfortunately, the service and sacrifices of Vietnam veterans have never

been appropriately recognized. More than 55,000 Americans lost their lives in that struggle, 300,000 were wounded, and another 50,000 were permanently disabled. In addition, the resulting aftereffects of the war experience have left 280,000 Vietnam veterans with psychological problems, and 480,000 individuals between the ages of 25 and 39 currently find themselves unemployed. These personal costs for veterans of the conflict, to say the least, have not been cheap.

As a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, I am continually working to insure that the needs of Vietnam veterans in the areas of unemployment, education, health care, and social adaptability are not ignored. I hope that this day of recognition for Vietnam vets will cause all Americans to recognize these needs, and the sacrifices which these veterans have made.●

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today in commemoration of the loyal veterans who served our Nation in the Vietnam conflict.

A day of recognition for these veterans comes several years too late, in my opinion. However, it is an important step for America, because our citizens are beginning to realize the bravery and valor of the men and women who traveled halfway across the world to fight for the freedom of the Vietnamese. Perhaps we as a Nation can finally eliminate the feelings of alienation experienced by many of these vets since their return from Southeast Asia.

We cannot ever let our citizens forget that these veterans were performing their duties as soldiers of the U.S. military, and deserve the same credit and acclamation as the American veterans of previous struggles for freedom. If we continue to ignore the Vietnam experience, we are guilty of a great disservice to the thousands of Americans who died in battle in Southeast Asia, as well as the many others who returned to the United States wounded, both physically and emotionally.

In 1973, as the Vietnam vets were returning home, a Harris poll found that many Americans thought of them as losers, or suckers. This is incomprehensible to me. The majority of these men and women have adapted readily into our society, and many are now in positions of leadership across the country at various levels of business and government. These people, Mr. Speaker, are not losers. They are dignified citizens who gave themselves to help their country in a battle against communism, the same communism that has meanwhile forced many Vietnamese people to flee their own homeland.

A day of recognition alone cannot properly thank the millions of men

and women who served in the military during the Vietnam war. We must accord them our respect as well. Although our Nation did not welcome back these veterans in a fitting way several years ago, we can belatedly praise them now for their sacrifices and efforts on behalf of freedom. ●

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, whatever history may say about the role of the United States in the Vietnam war, it will surely say that our soldiers performed their duties with the same amount of courage, perseverance, and self-sacrifice as American soldiers showed in previous wars.

Indeed, history will record that American soldiers in Vietnam labored under the special disadvantage of a badly divided public opinion about the war. As a result, they were deprived of that sense of patriotic support for the troops which is necessary to the maintenance of morale.

But the bitter division of opinion over the war caused many of our soldiers even more anguish after they returned home than when they were overseas. There were few welcoming parades or other demonstrations of national pride.

It is time for us now, as political passions have cooled, to make it clear, both as a nation and individually, that we value the sacrifices made on our behalf by the Vietnam veterans, just as we value the sacrifices made for us by the soldiers of the Korean war, World War II, and previous wars.

For this reason, I joined with other Members of Congress in cosponsoring, and recently passing, House Joint Resolution 182, calling for a "National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era" on April 26, 1981. It is to be hoped that citizens all across America will join together in giving overdue tribute to those who fought so bravely for them in a faraway land.

In this spirit, also, it would be right for us to consider again, and hopefully lay to rest forever, the question of whether there are American soldiers still held captive in prison camps in Indochina. Our late and highly respected colleague, TENNYSON GUYER, was working on this problem before his death. It would be a fitting tribute to his memory, as well as the memory of all who served as soldiers in the Vietnam war, to clear up this question once and for all. ●

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BAILEY) for this very important special order. There can be no doubt that our country should give proper recognition to its sons and daughters who so bravely fought in the Vietnam war and to those who served during the Vietnam war era. Although we have long since come to know that the war was one that we cannot justify, we, nonetheless, should recognize those who served. Their

service should be considered just as noble as that of those who defended our country in the first two world wars. Therefore, I want to join with the many millions of Americans and my colleagues in the Congress in extending to our veterans of the Vietnam war era a special note of appreciation for their service to their country.

This is a very appropriate time for us to be considering the sacrifices made by the men and women who served this Nation during the Vietnam war era. As we do, we should remember their mothers and fathers who suffered along with them. Their sacrifices are many. More than 55,000 of them gave their most precious possession, their lives, and one-third of a million were wounded, with half that many being permanently disabled. If this were not enough, we do know that unemployment is a very serious problem among Vietnam war era veterans, and that more than one-half of a million of them suffer from some type of psychological problems that are attributable to their service in Vietnam.

This brief characterization of the Vietnam war era veteran indicates that they not only need our recognition, but also our financial commitment to programs that will service their needs. It is somewhat of a contradiction to be recognizing their contributions as you are cutting Federal support for programs—Vietnam War Veterans Service Centers—that they desperately require.

We do need to step back at selected intervals and give thought and thanks to those who have fought our wars, but we also need to bring into relief those foreign policy lessons that come from our experiences with war. Such lessons should be applied to our contemporary foreign policy deliberations. In this context, the Vietnam war experience is most instructive. Some still ask was it necessary. As we recognize and speak to our veterans, we should ponder the question, should we again send our sons and daughters into such a situation? Is there a lesson to be learned from them that can instruct us on El Salvador, the Middle East, and other points of possible U.S. intervention? Do we want to again ask them, or those who have now taken their places, to give their lives to support weak, brutal, and unpopular regimes halfway around the world? Do we send them to places around the world where we have no mission? It is only by asking and rationally answering these types of questions, and financially supporting the programs that they need, that we can give substance to our recognition of them. H.J. Res. 182, which designates April 26, 1981, as "National Recognition Day for Vietnam War Era Veterans" should indicate our resolve to address the employment, physical, and psy-

chological needs of these veterans, and to strive for a more sane and rational foreign policy that will preclude future Vietnams.

I want to again commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for providing me the opportunity to recognize and comment on Vietnam war era veterans. ●

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam veteran did not come home to parades and fireworks. His sacrifices were, in fact, largely overlooked, or even condemned by many of his fellow Americans. The men and women who fought in that war, in the end, became its casualties. A recent study confirms that Vietnam veterans as a group are plagued by personal problems to an unusual degree. The study, an 8-year investigation sponsored by the Veterans' Administration, indicates that exposure to combat in Vietnam has a direct relationship to current alcohol and drug abuse, in addition to arrests, medical problems, and stress-related emotional problems.

A total of 2.8 million Americans served in Vietnam. More than 55,000 died. Another 300,000 were wounded, with 150,000 permanently disabled. In any other era, these men and women, and those who returned home safely, would have been honored as heroes. But the Vietnam era was a turbulent time in this Nation's history.

National Day of Recognition for Vietnam Veterans, observed April 26, was an opportunity to pay tribute to those brave men and women and to focus public attention on their special problems and needs. I hope that day marks the beginning of a new awareness and appreciation for the Vietnam veteran. As a member of the Vietnam-era Members of Congress, I am committed to seeing that our Nation does not forget. ●

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today we return from 2 weeks at home with the people who elected us to serve in this distinguished body. During this period of time, I had the opportunity to meet with a number of different groups from all over my district, but the meeting which had the deepest impact on me was one I had last Friday, at the vet center in Huntington, W. Va.

Thirty young men, all of whom served in Southeast Asia came to discuss with me a number of concerns they had. The most prominent being, the substantial cut proposed by the Reagan administration in programs aiding Vietnam veterans.

Frustration does not adequately describe their feelings.

The meeting, as I said, was held at a center dedicated less than a year ago. In that period of time, priceless benefits have been provided to them and other veterans seeking help in finding a job, or just to have someone with

whom to talk about the difficulties they face in adjusting to civilian life.

The administration wants to close the vet center in Huntington, along with 90 others located all over America. The savings would be minimal, but the negative impact on these individuals could not be determined in dollars and cents.

Last year in a speech before the American Legion, President Reagan said, "We have been shabby in our treatment of those who returned from Vietnam."

I agree with the President on this count, but since taking office, he has been shabby in his treatment of the Vietnam vet.

Studies show that this is the time of greatest need for those who served in Vietnam, and it is for this reason that Congress cannot continue the mistreatment of these fine Americans.

The first concurrent budget resolution contains \$600 million more than the President wants in veteran programs. I plan to support this effort, and I hope others do likewise.

Partisan politics should not, and must not, play a role in this debate. The Vietnam war will not go away like a bad dream, and neither will the veterans of that conflict.

I remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle what President Theodore Roosevelt once said,

A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. More than that no man is entitled to, and less than that no man shall have.

I suggest that we do not retreat from this belief.●

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Vietnam veterans across the Nation were the honorees in a long-overdue National Day of Recognition for their service. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. BAILEY, for calling this special order, realizing that our tribute to the veterans of that bitter war must be a continual one, not limited to one commemorative day.

Those who participated in the Vietnam conflict risked their lives for our country, yet we have rarely acknowledged their effort. In fact, many of our Vietnam veterans feel their problems have been ignored.

Vietnam was unlike any other war this country has fought. Territory was not gained or lost and strongholds were not taken. There were no battle lines and few clear victories.

Studies reveal that about 20 percent of Vietnam veterans—some 700,000 people—are markedly impaired by the after-effects of their war experiences.

So, as local communities and veterans groups nationwide salute the profound contribution made by these brave soldiers, it is important that, despite the present need for fiscal restraint, we not forget those who fought so gallantly.

Funds for Vietnam veterans' programs mark a relatively minute portion of the Federal budget. A case in point is the Veterans' Administration's Operation Outreach program that funds 91 storefront readjustment counseling centers across the country. These centers have proven quite effective in dealing with the special problems of Vietnam veterans.

Retaining this program would maintain vital services for people who need them badly at a minimal cost. It is my sincere hope that our efforts here in the Congress will not only help save the program, but strengthen it by extending the deadline for participation in it through passage of H.R. 747, sponsored by my colleague, Mr. EDWARDS of California.

The National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era is a mandate for all of us to not only pay heed to the Vietnam veteran's struggle, but, moreover, to do something about it.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, regardless of our views on the morality or immorality of the Vietnam war, there is no question in my mind that the men and women who served our country in Southeast Asia should be appropriately acknowledged. For Vietnam veterans, this special order will help stand as testimony that the American people care about them and respect their service and their sacrifice.

For many, Vietnam is a rapidly fading memory, but for a good number of the veterans who served in that conflict, the wounds are still open and festering. These men and women never received the welcome we bestowed upon returning veterans of other wars, and in many instances they were discredited and disgraced.

We are here today to let these servicemen and servicewomen know what concern the American people have for them and the regard we all have for their service and their sacrifice. Although our words are important and significant, there are certain actions this Congress must take to show our appreciation. The problems of delayed stress—a disorder that was first recognized in veterans of the Vietnam conflict—have been treated successfully through a VA program known as Operation Outreach. I know that when I speak to people back in the 15th District of Michigan who work in the veterans' centers created by Operation Outreach, that they are reaching out to the Vietnam population most in need. These storefront veterans centers are designed specifically to address the readjustment difficulties faced by many Vietnam era veterans and the program is working. I have cosponsored legislation to extend this highly successful and cost-effective program which is scheduled to expire this year unless the Congress acts to

extend it. It seems impossible that we would turn down this request.

Although I cosponsored and the Congress passed House Joint Resolution 182, which calls for a "National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era", we must affirm this action by passing legislation to waive the 1-year time limitation on veterans' claims for compensation for disabilities and diseases due to exposure to agent orange and other herbicides used in Vietnam. Vietnam veterans must be encouraged to retrieve all military records and medical histories and they should be informed about agent orange. As VA law now stands, service-connected benefits can only be granted for a chronic disease which manifests itself within 1 year of the veteran's date of discharge. Unfortunately, exposure to agent orange rarely shows up immediately. I am also proud to have cosponsored a bill to waive this 1-year time limitation. With the legal right to file a claim, veterans would be encouraged to seek medical advice and be counseled on the genetic alterations they might have to face.

To millions of Americans, the Vietnam war has been costly in a very personal way. Many families were destroyed by the war and it alienated individuals across this land. The time has come to heal the wounds. Today's speeches and yesterday's day of recognition are small tributes when compared to the debt we owe to those who served so courageously in Vietnam.●

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague, Congressman BAILEY's, request, I am submitting a statement about the treatment of Vietnam veterans in this country. This statement, however, is not written by me although it adequately reflects my feelings about the lack of recognition our Vietnam veterans are given for their service to this country. The author's name is Jeri Martinez and she is from Montpelier, Vt. I feel that she has more insight into the problems than most of us do because of her close association with a person suffering from delayed stress reaction, a condition inherent to Vietnam veterans.

The statistics on what has happened to Vietnam veterans since they came home are nothing less than appalling. A little publicized fact, and one which desperately needs to be known, is that more men have died since coming home from Vietnam than died in Vietnam. And considering what they came home to and the burdens they carried home from Vietnam, it is not surprising. The horrendous response of a war-weary populace to the returning soldiers has never been adequately recognized nor dealt with by the Government which sent them to Vietnam.

When the soldiers of World War II returned, they were given parades,

medical, educational, and financial benefits and the thanks of the country. I would imagine that coming home to that kind of recognition and gratitude must have gone a long way to alleviate the stresses imposed on them by the horrors of war. But Vietnam veterans who were forced to fight in an unpopular war under extraordinarily terrible conditions came home to a people who wanted to forget we ever fought a war in Vietnam. The veterans were, as individuals, frequently blamed and castigated for the Vietnam war and the actions of the Government that required them to perform in that war. The Government just let that happen and never took responsibility for its own actions. The men who fought in Vietnam bore the awful burden of Government policies in Vietnam and were left to continue being the Government's scapegoats when they came home by a Government which, by its actions, has proved it did not care.

A suicide rate 33 percent higher than the national average is not the only result of Government negligence toward Vietnam veterans. The number of Vietnam veterans hospitalized for alcoholism or drinking problems has more than doubled in the last 7 years. In addition, it is estimated that between 40 percent and 60 percent of the vets have persistent problems with emotional readjustment. The responsibility for this outrageous situation is to be laid, I think, squarely on the shoulders of the U.S. Government.

So now the question arises, what is the Government going to do about it? President Reagan's initial response was to propose budget cuts that would destroy the Vietnam Veterans Outreach program. With Government benefits for Vietnam vets virtually nonexistent, the vet centers provide the only place to which a Vietnam veteran can go with his problems. The understanding and support that can be offered by a fellow Vietnam veteran cannot be overestimated. From the little that is known about the delayed stress reaction, it would seem that discussion with and counseling from their peers in suffering are the only ways to help these on-going victims of the Vietnam war. The people who work out of the vet centers do tremendous work helping vets with emotional and other service-related problems. I venture to say that the death rate of Vietnam vets would be a lot higher without the support of these dedicated people.

What we must not forget is that the Vietnam war is not over. It goes on every day for these men. We who sat at home and viewed that war on our television screens, and who have not had to deal directly with the horror, owe an incredible debt to those men who not only gave their lives in Viet-

nam, but who are daily paying the price.

We cannot, as a country, continue to ignore the sacrifices these men made and are making. We owe it to these men to do whatever we possibly can—to reach out with love and understanding. Not only should funding for the vet centers be continued, but it should be increased. In Vermont, a rural State with very limited public transportation, we have only one vet center for the entire State. As a taxpayer, I feel very strongly that our tax money is better spent on humanitarian programs like the vet centers than on an increased military budget to enable the Government to do to our young men of today what they did to the young men of the 1960's. How can we demand military service from our young people when they know from example that the Government will use them as it sees fit and then forget them completely when they have completed their service?

Finally, I want to remind you that although we cannot change our veterans' past, we can and must change their future.●

● Mr. WEBER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, who are the victims of the Vietnam war?

The heroic American men and women who served in this unpopular war are the victims as surely as the natives of the country where the battles were waged.

Just who were these American men and women who served in Vietnam? Their numbers were not large—2.6 million men and women served in the combat zone during the Vietnam years. They were not dropouts and misfits. It is important to remember that Vietnam veterans at the time of their induction, had on the average more than 12 years of education, as opposed to World War II veterans with 9 years. Yet these same Vietnam combat vets suffered from delayed stress syndrome at a much higher rate than veterans of any other American conflict. Dr. John Wilson, a psychologist at Cleveland State University, studied this phenomenon and came up with some amazing results:

First, among black combat veterans, unemployment was 48 percent; second, among white combat veterans, unemployment was 39 percent; third, 31 percent of black and 22 percent of white combat veterans were divorced; fourth, 41 percent of all Vietnam combat veterans had alcohol problems; fifth, 37 percent of black combat veterans, and 28 percent of the white combat veterans, had negative attitudes about themselves; and sixth, over 25 percent of those in combat in Vietnam have been arrested following their return to the United States.

What caused these men and women this trauma? Certainly the horrors of war are partially responsible, but in

this case the trauma of returning to civilian life seems to be the real culprit. These vets were heavily affected by a return marked by jeering, hostile fellow countrymen, instead of the parades, bands, and cheers that greeted returnees from other wars.

Yesterday, April 26, 1981, was declared a "National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era." That was a long overdue tribute. But one day set aside in their honor is not enough to compensate those Americans who gave so generously of their lives for us. It is our responsibility to do all in our power to help these veterans return to a normal productive way of life.

Offer a Vietnam vet a helping hand.●

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, how does one survey the toll of a divisive, prolonged, and unnecessary conflict, like the experience that our Nation endured throughout the 1960's and 1970's, as we struggled, both militarily and emotionally, with American involvement in Vietnam? Do we consider domestic terrorists, who took the illogical route of countering violence with violence, by destroying people and property, in defiance of what they believed to be an immoral war? How about the six students murdered on the campuses of Kent State and Jackson State Universities, as they exercised their constitutional rights to freedom of speech and assembly? And what of our national defense effort, which came to be viewed with distrust, then disgust, and consequently was dangerously neglected in the years immediately following the cessation of hostilities in Southeast Asia.

The above examples are but the tip of a bitter iceberg of domestic turmoil, the likes of which our Nation had not experienced since the Civil War. However, this unrest pales in comparison to the intense personal tragedies of the millions of brave young Americans who left family and friends behind, to face the horrors of this jungle war. Consider the cold numerical facts: Almost 3 million men engaged in combat over the course of our involvement, 57,692 of whom made the supreme sacrifice by dying for their flag; over 300,000 wounded, of which about 75,000 are permanently disabled and will bear physical and mental scars for the rest of their lives; and, finally, approximately 1,600 men still listed as missing in action.

Unfortunately, when the survivors of this national nightmare returned home, they were not greeted as heroes, with marching bands and ticker tape parades. Rather, they were, somehow, unreasonably blamed for the entire conflict and found a collective cold shoulder, both from their fellow Americans on the street and prospective employers in the work-

place. Combine this with the various psychological scars, the potential time bomb of agent orange and now, the proposed reductions, by the Reagan administration, of programs primarily utilized by veterans of the Vietnam era, and the effect is devastating. We, as a Congress and a nation, should be ashamed of ourselves.

One of my constituents, Dr. Thomas Dimitry, is a prime example of how we have abused these modern day heroes. After already having served his country once, Tom enlisted to aid our efforts in Vietnam. Tom Dimitry never fired a shot, for he decided to help his fellow GI's in the most altruistic of manners—he became a combat medic. He worked in this life-saving capacity until he, himself, received severe wounds of the legs and back. His indomitable spirit led him to fight this permanent disability and continue his education. After receiving several undergraduate and graduate degrees, Tom achieved the academic distinction of being awarded his doctorate in adult/continuing education. This situation should be the ultimate veterans' success story, except for one detail—Tom Dimitry cannot find a job. Even the Department of Defense, through which Dimitry risked his life and ruined his health, has refused him a job for which he is eminently qualified.

Yesterday's "Vietnam Veterans National Day of Recognition" is a reasonable first step to repay these victims of our ignorance. But it is not enough. I salute my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. BAILEY, for sponsoring this special order honoring his fellow vets. I strongly urge my colleagues to co-sponsor, as I have and will, resolutions dealing with problems unique to these former soldiers, sailors, and airmen; to cosponsor, as I have and will, resolutions addressing the devastating effect of the defoliant, agent orange; to encourage constituent employers, as I have and will, to actively recruit qualified veterans; and to oppose, as I will, many of the massive cutbacks in veterans' programs proposed by President Reagan.

I believe that we owe the Vietnam veteran a great deal and I fervently hope that we display the courage to reverse the heartless policy of discom-passionate neglect.

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, over 7 years have passed since the last American combat units left Vietnam. We soon afterwards left behind the divisions in American life that this hard-fought war created. We must not let those of our fellow citizens who fought the war be left behind us as well.

Today, we of the House of Representatives are met to give recognition to the veterans of the Vietnam war. It is easy to be cynical about our words today, for words are far too often

bloodless substitutes for action. I have not come here today for empty gestures. I speak today because every man and woman of spirit has a natural desire for recognition, for respect. We have helped our veterans with well-considered and necessary programs, programs for education, health benefits, outreach centers, programs that shall and must continue even in an era of fiscal conservatism. We would be worse than foolish if, while providing Vietnam veterans these well-earned benefits, we withheld our equally well earned respect.

It was not for programs or for money that these people fought. It was for America, for honor, for words like these. Our words summoned them from their homes to the mountains and jungles of Southeast Asia, to battles no less fierce than those their fathers and grandfathers faced. Now it is time for the same words to tell them that they have earned our respect and admiration.

The Vietnam war is over. Our national division is over. Today, let us show that our recognition of Vietnam veterans has just begun. The Congress cannot enact respect. It falls on each of us, veterans or not, to honor the people that fought the war. Honor means a great deal to those who cherish freedom. Let this honor become a great unifying force for us all.

Today, we recognize the Vietnam veteran as a valued member of the community, one to be valued all the more for his past actions. We are saying to these veterans that they may tell their families, their friends, and above all, themselves, that they have the recognition and respect of their fellow citizens and that is one thing that neither time nor the politics of the moment, shall ever diminish.

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join with a bipartisan group of my colleagues in the House earlier this year to sponsor legislation—House Resolution 182—designating April 26, 1981, as National Recognition Day for Veterans of the Vietnam Era. This resolution was easily approved by the Congress and signed into law by President Reagan.

I do not believe that there has been a family untouched by the Vietnam conflict. Each one of us knows someone who lost their life in battle there, or someone who returned with physical and psychological aftereffects. Mothers lost their sons—wives their young husbands—and children their fathers. We fought that undeclared war at a time of great turmoil in this country. There were protests all across this Nation—on our college campuses, in our streets, in our convention halls. During all of this, our veterans continued to fight and dodge bullets in the rice paddies of that foreign land, attempting to preserve our freedom and

uphold their duty to their country. Later, when they returned home, they found hostility and were scorned by their peers. Then, they were "rewarded" for risking their lives by watching those who ran away to avoid the war be allowed to return. And those who unlawfully left the military in lieu of going to Vietnam were granted the same discharge for which the Vietnam veteran fought so hard and honorably. Yes; we certainly owe these men a great deal. When the hostages returned from Iran earlier this year, this sparked renewed patriotism in this country and reminded us of our respect for the Vietnam veteran. The national mood of good feeling and patriotism rekindled in our hearts the appreciation we as a nation felt for those brave men and women who served so honorably in that unpopular war in Southeast Asia. It is not too late to say "thank you."

Last year, I was also one of the many bipartisan sponsors of legislation that approved a site in this Nation's Capital for a Vietnam veterans memorial. This having been passed by Congress, plans are now being reviewed for the construction and design of this monument that will pay tribute to the more than 55,000 brave Americans who lost their lives in the war.

Nor can we forget the 600 or so prisoners of war—most of whom were incarcerated for several years in less than humane conditions. To those men, I also want to express my appreciation.

Then, there were those who we thought were POW's but they never came home. We know of few words that can ease the loss or the grief that their families have suffered but we salute them.

I spent my early years in Congress during the Vietnam era. I watched the protests, I listened to the unrest. These memories reflect the times that I will never forget.

I want to join today with my colleagues in the House to pay special tribute to the more than 2,500,000 men and women who served their country honorably and bravely during the Vietnam conflict.

Again, let me say, thank you.

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the "National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era." It was a day in which the country was called upon to participate in various programs, ceremonies, and activities to recognize those veterans.

Our Vietnam veterans risked their lives in an unpopular war. Yet they were rarely recognized for their sacrifices. There were no parades or warm welcomes for these veterans when they returned home from the war. Their homecomings were marked by loneliness and resentment, as if those who fought in Vietnam had been re-

sponsible for the war and our losses there. Many feel that this country has failed them, that we have ignored their problems. They feel as though they were left to struggle alone to readjust to civilian life, rehabilitate shattered bodies or minds, try to find decent jobs or finish interrupted educations. They certainly did not expect to be treated as second class citizens. It is time for us to correct this injustice. We must insure that Congress provides the benefits and services to which they are entitled.

I have long been concerned with the special needs of our Vietnam veterans and I will continue to do whatever I can to see that those needs are met. ●

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a courageous yet often forgotten segment of our society, veterans of the Vietnam war.

On Sunday, April 19, Congress called upon Americans throughout the country to observe the "National Day of Recognition for Veterans of the Vietnam Era." One day of tribute, however, is not enough. This recognition should grow into a greater national awareness of the plight of Vietnam veterans and a willingness to be more helpful to them.

An 8-year study conducted for the Veterans' Administration recently documented the tragedy and despair that have pierced the lives of the veterans in the aftermath of the Vietnam war. These brave men and women are still haunted by the horrors of that tragic era. Young Americans, once strong in mind and body, are now suffering severe psychological and readjustment problems. Disheartening emotional, social, educational, and job-related problems are just a few of the lingering difficulties that still plague their lives.

The Vietnam war had a particularly profound effect on those men and women who were directly exposed to death. The study found that Vietnam veterans who endured combat duty had unfortunately turned to alcohol and drugs at a higher rate than other Americans. Although women were not on the front lines, they too bore a major brunt of the battle. The continuous flow of wounded and lifeless bodies in military hospitals imprinted too great an impression to be easily erased. Flashbacks, depression, alienation, and guilt torment their lives.

Although the homecoming of the Vietnam veterans was largely neglected by our Nation, the serious problems that afflict these heroic veterans must not be ignored. Our Vietnam veterans deserve a solid assessment by the Federal, State and local governments, and the public, of their struggles to obtain jobs, education, health care, and social acceptance.

Eight years after the end of the Vietnam conflict, it is time that we, as

a nation, uphold our obligation to aid those who were called upon to defend our country and fight for its cause—and who performed courageously in that task. ●

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, 2.6 million Americans served their country in Vietnam. They fought in an unpopular war and instead of the admiration and respect Americans have given to our soldiers for 200 years, those who fought in Vietnam were the object of much scorn, ridicule, and contempt.

The soldiers who served in Vietnam were not necessarily like those portrayed in the movie "Apocalypse Now." Many did not ask to fight. Many who were drafted performed their duties capably. They were kind, carrying individuals with families who had to adjust not only to the trauma of war, but to the possibly greater trauma upon their return.

What kind of hero's welcome did we give our soldiers? They came home to record a suicide rate 33 percent higher than the national average. Half a million to a million of them have permanent psychological scars; 150,000 are crippled for life and nearly half a million are unemployed. Vietnam veterans are more likely to be divorced, more likely to drop out of school, more likely to be drug addicts, and more likely to be alcoholics. This homecoming is hardly a ticker tape parade.

Our recognition of the sacrifices Vietnam veterans made is long overdue. But even as we honor our veterans, President Reagan proposes an \$831 million spending cut in veterans' programs. To those Vietnam veterans who are already frustrated and bitter about the way we have treated them, a slash in counseling, hospital, and job programs is just one more slap.

The proper way to honor our Vietnam veterans is to maintaining these services. The House Budget Committee supports funding for these crucial programs in its budget proposal. I will work for its passage.

Vietnam veterans fought for us. Now it is time we did some fighting for them. ●

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, because of widespread interest and concern for the life of Ida Nudel, and because many Members of this House were not able to be present today, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be open for their remarks and that they be able to revise and extend their remarks for 5 legislative days following my special order of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### THE 50TH BIRTHDAY OF IDA NUDEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today to mark the 50th birthday of a single brave woman: Ida Nudel, prisoner of conscience in the Soviet Union.

Today marks the third year that Ida Nudel, the only woman held as a prisoner of conscience, has had to mark this anniversary in Siberian exile. It is the third year since she was sent to Krivosheino in Siberia, to start a 4-year sentence for "malicious hooliganism"—the peculiar phrase in Soviet doubletalk that is reserved for those who speak out for freedom and truth.

Ida Nudel's crime was an unspeakable offense in the Soviet Union: She was born a Jew.

She compounded her felony by living her life with pride—pride in her Jewish faith, pride in her worth as an individual, and pride in the nation of Israel, the homeland to which she hoped to emigrate.

Pride, faith, and a sense of individual worth—they seem to be dangerous traits in the Soviet Union, because they all lead to a common goal, the freedom of the spirit. In the Soviet Union the spirit is seen as an agent of treason, and freedom is a crime against the state.

Ida Nudel realized that. All she wanted was to leave. In 1971, she applied for an exit visa, to emigrate to Israel. The Soviet Government refused her request, on the grounds that as an economist she was too valuable, and knew too much, to leave.

That is why Ida Nudel began her crimes against the state. She began caring for the sick and lonely men who had been imprisoned by the Soviet Union because they, too, had asked to leave, and had asked too loudly. She spent 7 years caring for them, and became known as the angel of the prisoners of conscience—someone who would provide them the basic humane care that the Soviet Government refused to give.

Stories of Ida Nudel's compassion and dedication fill the accounts of those few prisoners of conscience who have completed their ordeals, and been allowed to leave. She became a symbol to these men, giving them a reason to live and hope. And that is why she was so dangerous to a government that cannot afford to let its people hope.

For those 7 years Ida Nudel was harassed by the Soviet KGB: frequently arrested and interrogated, and constantly followed. She was branded in the local press as a lunatic, a dangerous counterrevolutionary, and a criminal; many of those who read the press

reports threatened her with violence. But she would not stop her work.

In 1978, she hung a banner outside her apartment window that read: "KGB give me my visa." That banner—visible to visitors and journalists from the West—was a message to the rest of the world that the Soviet Government could not tolerate. It was a message of individuality and defiance, neither of which is supposed to exist in the so-called worker's paradise.

Ida Nudel received a trial, of course. And she was convicted, of course. Her trial was a mockery of justice, and her imprisonment remains a mockery to all the standards of civilized life that the Soviet Union pretends to uphold.

But the Soviet Government made a grave mistake in thinking it could rid itself of Ida Nudel simply by sending her off to exile. Ida Nudel remains free, at large, in the most important sense: She has not been intimidated, she will not recant her crimes, and she will not stop thinking as a free human being.

The French writer Voltaire once wrote "Liberty of thought is the life of the spirit." Ida Nudel's case proves that: She will not surrender her liberty of thought, and her spirit will not be imprisoned.

We in the Congress, and across America, have a special responsibility to Ida Nudel. She is, after all, what we once were: Someone who struggles for freedom against oppression. And she is what we will become once again, if we do not live up to our responsibility as the most persuasive voice for freedom in the world.

There are many reasons why Ida Nudel has a special importance for all of us. As a woman, as a fighter for religious freedom, and as one who has dedicated herself to caring for others, she reminds us all that freedom and equality must be fought hard for, and carefully guarded. She has sent us out a message, and it is vital that we answer it.

Today, on Ida Nudel's 50th birthday, we have the chance to answer that message. Across the country those who know of her plight are marking the occasion: here in Washington the National Conference on Soviet Jewry has organized a vigil and a day of remembrance. I think it is appropriate that we in the Congress join them.

That we let the Soviet Government know that we have not forgotten Ida Nudel, and the thousands like her.

And that we let them know that they cannot forever imprison the conscience of their own nation, and ignore the dignity of their own people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Soviet Government to free Ida Nudel; to allow her to leave for Israel; and to end its ruthless oppression of religious beliefs.

And it is time for us to be heard on her behalf, defending the basic liberties that are our heritage.

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in commemorating the 50th birthday of exiled Soviet refusenik Ida Nudel. Of all those who have been sent to prison or placed in exile as a result of their desire to emigrate, Ida Nudel stands out for her courage and her vigilance in the face of harassment, intimidation, and imprisonment. Since her arrest on June 21, 1978, she has persevered the harsh conditions of her incarceration.

It is entirely fitting that Members of the House of Representatives join together to remind the American people and the Soviet Union that we have not forgotten about the plight of Ida Nudel. The struggle of this brave woman is the struggle of all peoples to secure and exercise their fundamental human rights. These rights are guaranteed by the Helsinki Final Act signed by the Soviet Union, the United States, Canada, and 32 other European States in 1975. These rights are guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And most importantly, these rights, particularly the right to emigrate, is guaranteed under the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

For nearly 10 years, Ida Nudel has longed for only one wish—an exit visa so that she may leave the U.S.S.R. and live in Israel. Her sister, Elana Friedman anxiously awaits her arrival there. Ms. Friedman's tireless efforts on her sister's behalf are a source of strength and inspiration. I am sure, for Ida Nudel as she endures long months alone. Most recently, Elana Friedman traveled to Madrid where she appealed to the participants of the Helsinki Review Conference to raise Ida Nudel's case.

The release of Ida Nudel would be a significant gesture on the part of the Soviet Union. At a time when East-West relations are at their lowest point in years, a Soviet willingness to extend to her and others exit visas would be a hopeful sign.

Ida Nudel's arrest and subsequent exile for her attempts to obtain an exit visa are indicative of a blatantly repressive policy against Jews who wish to emigrate. I call on all those concerned about human rights to protest Ida Nudel's continued incarceration. ●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly condemn the Soviet Union for its hideous treatment of Ida Nudel, the only Jewish woman now held in the U.S.S.R. as a prisoner of conscience. Ida Nudel is now in internal exile in Siberia, a victim of Moscow's official policy of systematic repression and its continued violation of human rights.

Ida Nudel first applied for a visa to leave the Soviet Union for Israel in

1973. Her application was denied, and she undertook a major effort to care for and support Jewish prisoners who were jailed for their beliefs. Her unwavering commitment to these individuals earned her the title "guardian angel of the prisoners of conscience."

After she was rebuffed in applying to emigrate, and as a result of her devotion to Jewish dissidents, Ida Nudel was subject to the most vicious harassment by Soviet officials. Finally, on June 1, 1978, in utter desperation, she placed a banner outside her apartment window stating: "KGB, Give Me a Visa to Israel." She was arrested for "malicious hooliganism" and sentenced to 4 years of internal exile.

Ida Nudel now languishes in the far off wastes of Siberia. She has serious medical problems, yet she has been denied permission to travel to Moscow for medical tests. I deplore this treatment, which contradicts Soviet promises made as part of the Helsinki accords. The Soviet violation of the Helsinki accords is yet another reason for maintaining the grain embargo which regrettably has been lifted.

During her trial, Ida Nudel demonstrated her indomitable spirit and magnificent character with a message that should be heard by everyone:

During these years I learned to hold my head high with pride as a human being and as a Jewish woman. These years were filled with continuous struggle for myself and for others. And every time I succeeded in saving the life of another victim, my heart was filled with an incomparable uplifting feeling. \* \* \* Even if all the rest of my life will be grey and monotonous, these seven years will warm my soul and vouchsafe that my life was not in vain. Not one of you, my judges, can pass a sentence that will erase the triumph and victory of these years.

Ida Nudel is a courageous woman who has withstood the heinous crimes of the Soviet system. We in Congress must do everything in our power to press Soviet authorities to grant her immediate release and free emigration to Israel. ●

● Mr. LEBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th birthday of the "guardian angel of the prisoners of conscience" in the Soviet Union, Ida Nudel. The only Jewish woman held in the Soviet Union as a prisoner of conscience, Ida Nudel stands as a dual reminder that: First, the Soviet Union continues to be one of the most perverse political systems ever to darken and stain the pages of human history; and second, the fear and torture on which it thrives cannot destroy the spirit of man.

The plight of Ida Nudel began 10 years ago which she first applied for a visa to emigrate to Israel. With her request refused, she began her efforts to care for and support Jewish prisoners who had been jailed for their beliefs. Subjected to continuous harassments, interrogations, and a malicious press

campaign, she was finally arrested on June 1, 1978, and charged with "malicious hooliganism." After trial in which she was allowed no representation, nor any witnesses to testify on her behalf, she began her sentence of 4 years in internal exile.

On a tape smuggled out of Siberia in 1979, she described her situation:

I do live now as a human being, but it's a life alone, without friends or people to speak with. Without anyone to help when I am ill. \* \* \* The first days of my life here were so terrible that there aren't enough words even in Russian to express it. \* \* \* Not even the imagination can create a situation like that.

People are afraid to have contact. Even children who play with my dog, they are questioned. \* \* \* Only the knowledge that maybe my suffering will give ground to people of good will to understand \* \* \* will bring to me some sort of satisfaction.

Those who torture Ida Nudel—and other prisoners of conscience—also signed the Helsinki accords on August 1, 1975. In signing this document, the Soviet Union pledged to abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

And yet, in Soviet society, these principles continue to have no meaning. Despite all the rhetoric, the Soviet leadership continues to set loose throughout the entire fabric of society a wickedness which finds no equal in scale or intensity in the history of man. Fear is the sole bond of unity in the U.S.S.R. and it has created a system that grows evermore dehumanizing.

As thoroughly destructive as Soviet Marxism is, however, it cannot destroy the spirit of man. As Ida Nudel says:

No matter how I am tormented by the chastisers or after I cried out of weakness, loneliness and seemingly senselessness of my present life, I do not regret and I do not renounce any of my actions.

The spirit of man cannot and will not be destroyed and, eventually, the good, the true, and the just will conquer all. Ida Nudel's life has made this clear for all to see.●

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join the special order taken by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Congresswoman HECKLER, to honor Ida Nudel.

Today marks the 50th birthday of the only Jewish woman still held in the Soviet Union as a prisoner of conscience, Ida Nudel. It has been 10 years since she first applied for a visa to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. For the past decade she has been the guardian angel of the prisoners of conscience inside the Soviet Union, caring for them and supporting them in the plight. As a consequence of her efforts on behalf of the Jewish prisoners and as a consequence of her efforts to emigrate, she was convicted of "malicious

hooliganism" and sent into Siberian exile.

Ida Nudel's plight is one that all of us in Congress must deplore. The treatment she and here fellow prisoners of conscience have endured at the hands of the repressive Soviet regime is unacceptable. She must be released from prison and allowed to emigrate to Israel now. As someone committed to the cause of human rights and to the cause of Soviet Jewry, I am honored to join in today's tribute to Ida Nudel, and to be a part of the ever growing number of voices demanding her freedom.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to rise today to pay tribute to Ida Nudel, a courageous and utterly unselfish woman who is observing her 50th birthday in exile somewhere in Siberia. Before I continue, however, I would like to take this moment to commend my distinguished colleague from the State of Massachusetts, MARGARET HECKLER, for her work in having this special order for so special a human being as Ida Nudel. Time and time again MARGARET HECKLER has shown her concern for Jewish prisoners of conscience who are held against their will in the Soviet Union.

You will notice that I omitted the word "celebrated" when I acknowledged Ida Nudel's birthday. While we here in the United States are celebrating birthdays today safe and secure in the freedoms afforded us by a Government entrusted with protecting the rights of the people, Ida Nudel's lot is a different story. Her 50th birthday is devoid of happiness, devoid of loved ones she so desperately seeks to rejoin, and devoid of the basic human rights all human beings are entitled to cherish.

Ida Nudel is imprisoned in Siberia because she dared to speak out and tell the world of the Soviet Government's unrelenting and systematic harassment of Jewish prisoners of conscience who languish and suffer in Soviet prison camps, jails, and psychiatric hospitals. She was sent to Siberia as punishment for her humanitarian efforts on behalf of Jewish prisoners by sending packages of medicine, food, and clothing to them. She was punished because she dared to ask the Soviet Union to grant her an exit visa, an exit visa she had waited 7 long and harassed years for. Her world today is one of primitive living conditions and improper medical care.

Ida Nudel should serve as a reminder to us that we must never take for granted the joys of spending time with our loved ones. We must never take for granted our freedom from religious persecution by the Government, and we must never take for granted the freedom from harassment for speaking out against injustices. Ida Nudel, the only Jewish woman now held in the Soviet Union as a prisoner of con-

science, and untold men who are, too, prisoners, whether they be in jails or cities, deserve their freedom and the dignity which comes to anyone when afforded human rights. The holiday of Passover, which commemorates the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, and is known as the Season of our Freedom was recently celebrated by Jewish men and women around the world. Let us hope and pray that someday, before its too late, Ida Nudel and the rest of the prisoners of conscience will too, be delivered to their promised land.●

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join our colleague, Representative HECKLER, in commemorating the 50th birthday of a noble and courageous woman, Ida Nudel. As we all know, Ida Nudel, known as the guardian angel of Jewish prisoners of conscience because of her selfless activities in behalf of those imprisoned, is herself a tragic victim of Soviet repression. Sentenced in 1978 to 4 years of internal exile, Ida has spent the last 2½ years in a remote Siberian village, amid hostile neighbors and under primitive conditions. Her health has deteriorated and her spirits have lagged as a result of the nearly 3 years of isolation she has endured, virtually cut off from her family in Israel and her many friends in the Soviet Union and the West.

At the now-recessed Madrid review meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Ida Nudel's plight was cited by the U.S. delegation to demonstrate Soviet disregard for the human rights commitments it undertook in 1975. As Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and as a vice chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Madrid meeting, I am gratified by the widespread support the United States received for its strong human rights stand by the other Western nations. I sincerely hope that this pressure will have some effect on Soviet policies and result in the eventual release of Ida Nudel and the many others suffering similar fates in the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, a birthday celebration customarily includes a party, a cake, champagne, and lots of good cheer. While, this year, there is no shortage of well-wishers for Ida Nudel, I hope that she will be able to celebrate her 51st birthday—with all the trimmings—among her family and friends in Israel. Let us commit ourselves to working together toward that end. Thank you.●

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, Ida Nudel made her first request for an exit visa to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. As happens with exit visa applicants, Ida Nudel lost her job as an economist almost immediately thereafter. She was then

labeled as "an enemy of the Soviet State," a "malicious hooligan," and a common criminal. The constant harassment, KGB interrogations, and a smear campaign in the press, did not dissuade Ida Nudel from her determination to obtain emigration rights for her fellow Jews. Acting on behalf of those seeking exit visas, she became known as the "guardian angel," providing material and emotional support to Jews imprisoned in Soviet labor camps. In 1973, shortly after appealing directly to Chairman Brezhnev for an exit visa, Ms. Nudel was arrested, tortured, and sexually assaulted by her captors.

Ida Nudel married in January of 1975. In April of the same year, her husband and sister received permission to leave for Israel; Ms. Nudel did not. Her efforts to bolster the spirits of her fellow Jews were not dampened in spite of continual arrests and KGB harassment. In June of 1978, Ida Nudel was again charged with being a "malicious hooligan" and sentenced to 4 years in "internal exile." She has been in a Siberian labor camp ever since.

This is a glaring Soviet violation of the Helsinki human rights agreement. Mr. Speaker, I have corresponded regularly with Ms. Nudel's sister, Elena Fridman, who now resides in Israel. This past week, Ms. Fridman wrote saying that the volume of mail reaching her sister in Siberia has recently dropped off considerably. We cannot be sure whether or not this is due to diminished efforts on the part of concerned citizens worldwide or to Soviet interference with the mail's delivery whichever is the case, it is crucial for us to reassure Ida Nudel—and equally importantly the Soviet authorities—that public opinion is still active, concerned, and keeping a close watch on Ida Nudel's well-being.

Today Ida Nudel marks her 51st birthday, and the end of nearly 3 full years in Siberian exile. Her "crime against the Soviet state" consists of her desire to leave the Soviet Union and live a free life in Israel. This fundamental right is supposedly guaranteed by the Helsinki accords. By marking this occasion, I salute Ida Nudel's courage and tenacity, and at the same time I renew my pledge to help effect her release and her reunion with her husband and sister in Israel.●

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, once again we rise to protest the wanton disregard of the Soviet Union for human rights. For 10 years, Ida Nudel has fearlessly spoken out against the vicious and brutal policies of the Soviet Union, which refuses to allow her to emigrate. In spite of the degradation of a public trial, a campaign of libelous press statements against her, and numerous other official forms of persecution, Ida Nudel has persevered

in her quest for freedom from the totalitarian regime of the U.S.S.R.

It is difficult for us to imagine the dreadful conditions this brave woman has endured in her effort. As Americans enjoying our constitutional freedoms, we must continue to bring the message of Ida Nudel to our own citizens and to all men who cherish the dignity of the individual. Her dauntless courage and irrepressible spirit stand firm in the midst of a nation where terror and oppression have crushed the hopes and dreams of millions.

Today, I ask that we all pause for a moment and reflect on our own good fortune as citizens of this great Nation. I also ask that we pray that some day Ida Nudel and the people she stands for might share in our blessings.●

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, while a 51st birthday is usually an occasion for celebration, Ida Nudel is spending her birthday today in isolation in Siberia. She is presently serving 4 years of internal exile for the crime of "malicious hooliganism." In reality, Ida Nudel's only crimes were her fervent desire to emigrate to Israel and her work on behalf of other Jewish "prisoners of conscience," which earned her the name of "guardian angel."

During the years prior to her exile, Ida Nudel devoted her efforts to alleviating the plight of the Jewish "prisoners of conscience," serving as a one-woman support system through letters and packages. Since her arrest, Ida Nudel has suffered under the inhuman conditions of her exile; yet her spirit remains unbroken.

As the only woman "prisoner of conscience," Ida Nudel plays a special role in the history of the Jewish resistance in the Soviet Union. She has earned the respect and devotion of many of her fellow dissidents for her courage and perseverance. This truly amazing woman deserves our support and recognition and I urge my colleagues to work on her behalf to insure religious freedom for all Soviet Jews.●

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleagues in protesting the continued imprisonment of Ida Nudel by Soviet authorities. After repeatedly denying Ida an exit visa and subjecting her to various forms of harassment, the Soviet Union found her guilty on charges of "malicious hooliganism" and sentenced her to 4 years of Siberian exile. Despite her failing health and the harsh Siberian environment, she remains a pillar of courage in the face of religious oppression. She continues to function as a rallying point and a beacon of hope for the hundreds of Jewish dissidents suffering similar plights.

Ida Nudel's sentence represents a travesty of justice which, unfortunate-

ly, is becoming all too familiar. Hardly a week passes without a similar plight coming to my attention. Despite the fact that the Soviets are voluntary co-signers of the Helsinki accords, they have failed to extend guaranteed liberties to thousands of Soviet Jews. Instead, they have pursued a course of discrimination and forced assimilation. Increased emphasis on anti-Semitic propaganda and substantial declines in the numbers of Jews allowed to pursue higher education are just two examples of this policy.

With the lifting of the grain embargo, it is now more important than ever that we work in behalf of all the Ida Nudels throughout the Soviet Union so that we do not convey the false impression that the United States is willing to overlook human rights violations. I, for one, will continue to remind the Soviet Union of its human rights commitments and to urge the easing of repressive measures directed against its Jewish population.

Finally, as a Nation, we must not relent in our efforts until the Soviet Union sees fit to honor its international commitments which today remain unfulfilled.●

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to join my colleagues in this tribute to a most remarkable woman, Ida Nudel. Her courage, eloquence, and determination in challenging the brutal Soviet tactics of religious persecution and oppression have won worldwide admiration and respect. I commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) for making possible this recognition of Ida Nudel. It is greatly encouraging to see so many Members taking part. We can be sure our voices will be heard in the Kremlin.

April 17, 1981, marks a milestone in Ida Nudel's life—her 50th birthday. She is spending this day, as she has each day for more than 2 years, in lonely exile in the isolated primitive wastelands of Siberia. She was sentenced to exile for just one reason and one alone: As a Jewish citizen of the Soviet Union she sought the freedom to practice her religion in the country of her choice—Israel. Like so many Soviet Jews, her attempts to secure permission to leave the Soviet Union brought on the crudest forms of harassment, persecution, and, finally, arrest and exile. Ida Nudel's harsh fate should make clear to every thinking person in the world that the Soviet Union's blatant suppression of human rights is applied as harshly to women as to men.

Two years ago, Ida Nudel was adopted as my Fourth Congressional District's "prisoner of conscience." Each week since then, I have written to her, informing her of efforts being made in this country to secure her freedom

and offering what encouragement and support I could. Each week, too, I have written to Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev, calling attention to the outrageous violation of the Helsinki accords on human rights he was committing and demanding he release Ida Nudel, a demand in which many Members of Congress have joined.

Earlier today, a strong demonstration of support for Ida Nudel was made by a strong delegation of Members of Congress and a number of distinguished Americans in a special birthday ceremony on Capitol Hill. As one of the hosts of this ceremony, I was heartened by this outpouring of support for Ida Nudel. At this ceremony, we all joined in signing a birthday greeting to Ida promising her we would intensify our campaign for her freedom.

I call upon my colleagues assembled here this afternoon to join in that pledge. Let Ida Nudel know that we will not rest until she is able to join her family in freedom in Israel. Every effort we make here in the Congress adds to the pressure on the cruel leaders in the Kremlin to grant her freedom.

Make no mistake about it, Ida Nudel is aware of our efforts. I treasure a postcard I received from Ida Nudel—sent from the Siberian village where she being held in exile. She expressed thanks for the letters she has received from me, and for the other efforts being made in America on her behalf and on behalf of other Soviet Jews. She concluded her message by urging everyone interested in her fate to continue every effort to secure her freedom. "Don't give up," she wrote. "Be stubborn and you will succeed."

On this, Ida Nudel's 50th birthday, let her words inspire us to redouble our efforts to help her realize her fondest dream—freedom in Israel.●

● Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, this is the birthday of a brave woman, exiled in Siberia for her work in behalf of dissidents in the Soviet Union, and the families of those dissidents who are often in desperate circumstances.

For speaking in their behalf, for exercising the rights promised in the Final Act signed at Helsinki by the Soviet Union and 34 other countries, Ida Nudel, aged 50 today, has been arrested, tried, convicted, and exiled. Her message to us follows:

IDA NUDEL'S STATEMENT OF GRATITUDE TO  
HER FRIENDS

(Translated From Russian)

DEAR FRIENDS: I would like to express my deep gratitude to each and every one of you, who has been showing his concern for my fate during these painful years of my exile, those who appealed to Soviet authorities for my release, went out to hold demonstrations on my behalf, wrote letters and postcards, sent me parcels with food and clothing, etc. I would like to thank all for what you have been doing for me.

I have been awarded the honor of feeling and experiencing the great force and significance of human solidarity. Your daily and hourly care and intervention on my behalf are protecting me as the authorities realize that they are being held responsible by you for my fate.

Your solidarity is not only providing me with additional strength, thus enabling me to bear the psychological situation in which I have been living, but it is also influencing the people surrounding me. Your solidarity has shocked many people; it also made those of them who are capable of judgment, those who can see the difference between justice and injustice and those who have a dignity of their own and can respect the dignity of others, think.

It seems to me that an individual's opposition to social injustice acquire meaning and significance only when it is supported and encouraged by the men of good will all over the world.

MARCH 27, 1981.

It is fitting that in this free country, Ida Nudel should be remembered.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this, Ida Nudel's 50th birthday, is a solemn time for all of us. Our "guardian angel" who has watched over so many other "prisoners of conscience" and "refuseniks" is celebrating her birthday alone in Krivosheino among hostile townspeople who often accuse her of outrageous acts such as poisoning the local water supply.

Mr. Speaker, a courageous woman may be silenced temporarily, but while she is, there will be many of us to help with the cause. While Ida's struggle for freedom has been halted for the moment, we in this Congress will continue to call attention to her plight and we will remind civilized nations around the world that she, and countless others have been continually harassed and denied the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union as guaranteed by the Helsinki accords.

Ida Nudel's sentence of 4 years in Siberia for the dubious crime of displaying a banner from her balcony that read: "KGB, give me my visa" should be terminated. This woman, whose only crime was to ask that a basic human right be respected, will receive my deepest commitment to help her and others who are being held against their will in the Soviet Union.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th birthday of Ida Nudel, the "guardian angel" of Soviet prisoners of conscience. Ida Nudel remains a symbol of hope for the over 3½ million Jews in the Soviet Union who wish to emigrate to Israel to rejoin their loved ones.

This strong-willed, soft-spoken woman has devoted her life to helping ease the conditions of other prisoners of conscience, and has fought against the Kremlin's unrelenting persecution and oppression of Soviet Jews. Her desperation to leave for Israel in the face of continued Soviet refusal to grant her exit permission led her to hang a banner outside of her Moscow

apartment in June 1978, with a simple plea "KGB, Give Me My Visa." Soviet authorities responded by giving her 4 years of exile in Siberia, for her humanitarian request which they labeled as "malicious hooliganism." Still serving her term in prison, Ida's health continues to deteriorate as she has been unable to receive the proper medical treatment.

Ida Nudel, the only Jewish woman now held in the Soviet Union as a "prisoner of conscience," is one of the most courageous fighters for freedom from the heartless Soviet regime. She has gained worldwide recognition and admiration as she continues to speak out against the injustices and inhumanities that the U.S.S.R. is perpetrating against its own people. The case of Ida Nudel, whose only request is to live where she wishes, is just one example of the harsh actions by the Kremlin. Although Ida has never stopped fighting for the freedom to practice her religion in the country of her choice, the Soviet authorities continue to persecute this brave woman. As we salute Ida Nudel today, we let the Soviet Union know that their persecution of this woman must not be allowed to continue. We must unite in protesting this brutal treatment of a most heroic woman, whose only crime is her desire for freedom. If we allow this type of inhumane persecution to continue without protest, it will simply encourage the Soviets to increase their persecution of the thousands of Soviet Jews who seek to leave the Soviet Union.

I join my colleagues in wishing Ida Nudel a happy birthday under the painful circumstances and in sharing her hopes for freedom for herself and her fellow citizens.●

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am participating in this special order with a sense of pride and a sense of sadness. Today marks the 50th birthday of a truly remarkable crusader for human rights—Ida Nudel, the only Jewish woman now held in the Soviet Union as a "prisoner of conscience."

Ida Nudel's only crime was to request the basic freedoms of living where she desired and practicing the religion of her choice. These are rights that we as U.S. citizens cherish and respect. These are rights that must be upheld worldwide.

Ida Nudel serves as an inspiration to all who fight for human and civil rights. We who live in a democracy and can speak out for what we believe in, must do just that. I urge the Reagan administration to raise Ida Nudel's case in representations with Soviet officials. The U.S.S.R. must be held accountable for its actions and it must live up to its international human rights obligations as a signatory to the Helsinki accords.

I. NUDEL.

I ardently hope and believe that there will come a day when all human liberties will be upheld by each and every nation of the world. The Ida Nudels of the world will not suffer in vain. We hear her and our undying support is with her. ●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today is the 50th birthday of Ida Nudel. Miss Nudel is currently serving a 4-year sentence of internal exile in Siberia. While charged with "malicious hooliganism," her only crime is to be Jewish in Communist Russia.

Ida Nudel is a martyred example of the personal and inhuman reprisal inflicted by the Communist leadership on those who would dare to choose their own religion, or to seek a voice in their own government, or even as she now desires, to flee the tyranny of a regime based in military domination and the power of secret police.

Ida wants only to join her sister in Israel. When I was in Moscow, in March of 1978, she asked me for help in gaining a visa for this same purpose. Now as then, the KGB refuses to allow this woman to leave the country. Her case serves as a vivid example of the fear possessing Soviet leaders; fear of free thought, fear of expression, and even fear of a solitary woman seeking to escape the wasteland of communism. Such is the nature of a government steeped in paranoia and intrigue.

Miss Nudel's birthday is a fine occasion for the Russians to exhibit an enlightenment and humanism we have not seen from them since the people's revolution was usurped by Communist demagogues. Surely the millions entrapped by the empty promises of a better life under communism are enough for the dictators of Soviet Russia, and the continued imprisonment of Ida Nudel serves no further purpose.

I urge that she be released. ●

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th birthday of Ida Nudel, another "prisoner of conscience" in the Soviet Union.

For 10 years, she has been trying to leave that country and emigrate to Israel, and for 10 years, the Soviets have rebuffed her efforts. After years of harassment and intimidation, finally, in June of 1978, Ida Nudel was arrested on the charge of "malicious hooliganism." Her crime was that she hung a banner from the balcony of her Moscow apartment that read: "KGB Give Me My Visa!" She was sentenced to 4 years of internal exile and is now living under very harsh conditions. I appeal to the Soviets to end this outrageous injustice and let her go.

As chairman of the only subcommittee of the Congress that has jurisdiction over human rights, I want to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues so that the Soviet authori-

ties can hear us loud and clear. I want them to know that Ida Nudel has not been silenced.

I commend my distinguished colleague, MARGARET HECKLER, for offering this special order, and want to recall for everyone Ida Nudel's words of last March, when she said: "It seems to me that an individual's opposition to social injustice acquires meaning and significance only when it is supported and encouraged by the men of good will all over the world." ●

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was privileged to sponsor, along with Representative MIKE BARNES of Maryland, other Members of Congress, and the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, a reception honoring Ida Nudel on this, her 50th birthday. Our gathering was a celebration of her life and her commitment to freedom. It served to renew our dedication to securing her liberation from brutal exile in Siberia through her redemption in Israel, and to assisting the thousands of Soviet refuseniks whose only wish is to emigrate. Although Ida Nudel's birthday falls on the day after the last day of Passover, Rabbi Stephen Listfield of Adas Israel Congregation nevertheless chose to invoke a prayer over matzah—the bread of affliction and the bread of hope. Messages were read from Ida's sister in Israel, Elana Friedman. Lev Routburd, who emigrated a short time ago, spoke of Ida as the "Guardian Angel" of the refusenik movement, and voiced his certainty that we would, one day, be able to celebrate together with Ida in freedom. All who have met her—and I spoke with Ida in Moscow in 1978—know that she is an extraordinary woman whose spirit can never be imprisoned. She has done more for Soviet Jewry than any other person, and she has been sentenced to Siberia for her courage. Today, we honor Ida Nudel, and pay tribute to the cause that has united us. Word of our gathering is being taken to Ida in the Soviet labor camp.

I am pleased to attach Ida's final statement to the court, before she was sentenced, and her message of appreciation to all her friends, throughout the world, who are marking this day in special ceremonies:

IDA NUDEL'S "FINAL WORDS" AT HER MOSCOW TRIAL, JUNE 21, 1978

These will be my final words, or else my words will have no meaning.

Out of despair, I carried out an act on June 1st by which I claimed my right to express my protest openly. Although "malicious hooliganism" is the formal charge, I am not being tried for this. Neither my June 1st protest on my balcony (from which she hung a banner, "KGB, Give Me a Visa to Israel") nor my participation in the June 4th demonstration at Trubny Square (at which she and eight other refuseniks held aloft signs, "Give Us Visas to Israel") is the real reason for my trial today.

I am standing trial for the entire past seven years of my life. Moreover, if in a few

years I will have to make a final statement again, I am absolutely certain I will say then, as I say now, that the past seven years of my life for which I sit in the dock today were the most difficult and yet at the same time the happiest years of my life.

During the past seven years I have learned to walk proudly with my head high as a human being and as a Jewish woman.

These seven years have been filled with a daily battle for myself and others. Every time I was about to help another friend, my heart filled with an extraordinary feeling unlike any other. Perhaps the closest such feeling is that which a woman feels when giving a new life.

If the remaining years of my life will be gray and monotonous, these seven years will warm my heart with the knowledge that my life has not been without purpose. None of you, my judges, is capable of finding a punishment that would take revenge and deprive me of the triumph and victory of these seven years.

IDA NUDEL'S STATEMENT OF GRATITUDE TO HER FRIENDS

(Translated From Russian)

DEAR FRIENDS: I would like to express my deep gratitude to each and every one of you, who has been showing his concern for my fate during these painful years of my exile, those who appealed to Soviet authorities for my release, went out to hold demonstrations on my behalf, wrote letters and postcards, sent me parcels with food and clothing, etc. I would like to thank all for what you have been doing for me.

I have been awarded the honor of feeling and experiencing the great force and significance of human solidarity. Your daily and hourly care and intervention on my behalf are protecting me as the authorities realize that they are being held responsible by you for my fate.

Your solidarity is not only providing me with additional strength thus enabling me to bear the psychological situation in which I have been living, but it is also influencing the people surrounding me. Your solidarity has shocked many people; it also made those of them who are capable of judgment, those who can see the difference between justice and injustice and those who have a dignity of their own and can respect the dignity of others, think.

It seems to me that an individual's opposition to social injustice acquires meaning and significance only when it is supported and encouraged by the men of good will all over the world.

I. NUDEL.

MARCH 27, 1981. ●

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman HECKLER, for offering this special order to recognize the extraordinary courage of Ida Nudel, a Soviet prisoner of conscience since June 1978. Ms. Nudel is another of the many thousands of Soviet Jews who are not permitted to leave the country. Her bravery, however, is unique in a group where courage abounds. Despite her small stature, Ida Nudel stands tall among the many courageous people who have dared to question authority.

Before becoming imprisoned, Ida Nudel helped care for the many Jewish prisoners who were jailed for their religious beliefs. Her efforts con-

tinue despite the fact that she is under constant surveillance from government authorities in Siberia. Even today, on her birthday, I am certain Ida Nudel will keep giving the gift of hope to many other refuseniks. Through this special order it is my hope that we will be giving Ida Nudel the chance to fulfill her dream of emigrating to Israel. ●

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th birthday of Ida Nudel, presently being held in the Soviet Union as a "prisoner of conscience" and widely known as the guardian angel of other Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience. While her story is one of misfortune, her spirit has offered strength to hundreds of others in her position and her achievements have brought relief to many.

In May of 1971, Ida Nudel applied for an exit visa to Israel along with her sister Elena. While Elena was allowed to leave for Israel, Ida was denied permission. During the years following the rejection of her application, Ida reapplied several times to join her sister, who is her only living relative. Refusals of her applications have been based on unfounded allegations that she was exposed to secrets while employed at the Moscow Institute of Hydrology and Microbiological Synthesis for Planning and Production where she performed routine duties.

Ida's anguish over Soviet emigration policies soon lead to her involvement as an active figure in the Jewish emigration movement. Her acts of charity and assistance to prisoners of conscience brought on repeated harassments from Soviet officials. Her efforts to publicly expose illegal actions taken by authorities in violation of prisoners' rights and her public demonstrations in defense of the right of Jews to leave Russia and live in the country of their choice, led to Ida's arrest on charges of malicious hooliganism in 1978. She was sentenced to 4 years of internal exile in Siberia. While her living conditions in exile have led to deterioration of her health, Ida's spirit has remained strong. She continues to offer encouragement to prisoners and their families through letters and her protests are still heard from Siberia. In rebuttal to slanderous allegations by Soviet authorities in a campaign to brand her as a criminal, Ida sent this letter to her sister in Israel:

I am not a delinquent. I did not kill or rob, I did not slander anyone. But I dared to go out and demonstrate in defense of the right of Jews to leave Russia. I dared to write and sign open letters in defense of the persecuted and the condemned. I dared to turn to the Soviet leaders and to political and intellectual leaders in other countries with the call and request to carry out the obligation that they took upon themselves voluntarily—the obligation to honor the values of

others and their right to live where they want.

Today, I call on my colleagues to join me in protesting the case of Ida Nudel. Her unjust sentence to internal exile by Soviet officials and their refusals of her requests to emigrate are in gross violation of the Helsinki agreements. We must continue to confront Soviet authorities with this breach of commitment—We must continue to offer hope and encouragement to those who have the courage to demand their human rights. ●

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) will be allowed to speak out of order for 1 minute.

#### FIESTA FLAMBEAU—AMERICA'S GREATEST PARADE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, my home city of San Antonio is universally acknowledged as unique; San Antonio has a special quality that makes it at once exciting and relaxing, a place of truly unique appeal. Part of this quality, this "ambiente," as we say in Spanish, is that each April we have a grand fiesta to celebrate Texas independence. One reason for the fiesta is that the Alamo is, after all, right in the heart of downtown in my district. The other reason is that we love a party.

Our fiesta is a time for street dancing, for the creation of imaginary royalty, a time for carnivals, but most of all a time for parades. There is a waterborne parade that floats down the San Antonio River. There is a daytime parade that is reminiscent of the Tournament of Roses, except that it is much less pretentious, and much more filled with the spirit of fun and festival. But best, and greatest of all is the grand night parade, the Fiesta Flambeau. There is nothing quite like the Flambeau, anywhere in the world. It is America's greatest parade.

The Fiesta Flambeau is a great parade in size. It is a great parade in its bands and floats, and in its spectacle. The Fiesta Flambeau is at the same time a great party; there is a special magic, an interaction between the people in the parade and the people who are watching it. What causes this magic may be the fact that fiesta week itself is so special; it may be the fact that everyone is filled with the joy of the moment; and it may be the fact that the lights and torches cause the feeling of a parade, a fiesta, and the Fourth of July all combined into one gigantic event. Truly, there is nothing like Fiesta Flambeau. The 300,000 people who attended this year's parade can attest to that.

Fiesta Flambeau has taken place for many years under the guidance and inspiration of Reynolds Andricks. If anyone can claim the credit for creat-

ing the magic of Fiesta Flambeau, it is Reynolds Andricks. I think it was he who discovered how to put the ingredients together. Reynolds Andricks is the kind of person who makes San Antonio unique. He understands that being successful is important, all right, but that being happy and helping other people feel happy is important, too. He understands what it is to love a parade.

Reynolds Andricks is one of those people who understands the mystery of what makes San Antonio unique. He understands the things that make people come to love San Antonio. One of those things is that while we are true patriots in our city, and yield to no one in our love of country, we celebrate our State's most solemn moments not just with oratory and wreaths, but with a weeklong festival. Reynolds Andricks is one of the people who created that festival, through his unique, indispensable work on Fiesta Flambeau.

Next April there will be another fiesta week in San Antonio. There will be pageantry and there will be entertainment. Most of all, there will be parades, including Fiesta Flambeau. For that, we have to thank Reynolds Andricks, a great San Antonian, a great American, a great innovator. All of us in San Antonio are proud of Fiesta Flambeau and grateful to its genius, Reynolds Andricks.

#### JONES' BUDGET COMMITTEE RECONCILIATION SECTION AN UNMITIGATED DISASTER

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

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the most important part of the budget resolution we will be considering later this week is the reconciliation section, because that section represents the teeth needed to insure that the spending reductions contained in the resolution are in fact achieved. Without strong reconciliation instructions, the committees are not going to make the legislative changes needed to produce the reductions, and the budget resolution will be worth little more than the paper it is written on.

In this regard, the Jones' Budget Committee reconciliation section is an unmitigated disaster. It requires the committee to produce reductions of only \$13 billion in budget authority in 1982, and less than \$9 billion when an accounting adjustment relating to the Federal pay increase is excluded. This compares with \$52.8 billion in instructions approved by the Senate as the amount of legislative changes needed to achieve the reductions proposed by President Reagan.

Clearly this shows that the Jones' Budget Committee resolution, despite claims to the contrary, in reality represents little more than business as usual. Because most Members are not aware of what the Budget Committee

did in terms of reconciliation, I am inserting in the RECORD a table at this point comparing, for the House committees, the House Budget Committee reconciliation instructions with those approved by the Senate. The Senate

reductions basically represent the savings needed to achieve the cuts proposed by President Reagan. The House instructions allow \$40 billion in more spending in 1982, and the differences grow ever greater in the out-years.

RECONCILIATION REDUCTIONS FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES (HOUSE AND SENATE VERSIONS)

(In millions of dollars)

House committee	1981		1982				1983				1984			
	Senate		House		Senate		House		Senate		House		Senate	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture	645	166	48	374	3,475	3,893	48	357	4,411	4,323	274	486	5,133	5,042
Armed Services	233	233	1,029	1,029	966	966	1,056	1,056	899	899	686	686	511	511
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs	7,146	143			14,139	808			16,534	1,669			18,789	2,632
District of Columbia					39	40			56	64			72	69
Education and Labor	2,282	372	2,020	1,810	9,386	7,458	2,414	2,408	11,716	10,500	3,331	3,116	15,109	13,462
Energy and Commerce	940	129	949	829	5,580	5,625	1,200	1,070	6,154	6,383	1,610	1,480	5,461	7,157
Foreign Affairs				5	1,050	301			600	367			3	531
Government Operations			340	255			340	340			340	340		
Interior	331	84	200	200	815	369	200	200	796	564	300	300	774	654
Judiciary					116	13			133	81			144	124
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	39	39	99	99	389	257	150	150	539	511	160	160	712	701
Post Office and Civil Service			5,430	5,524	4,737	5,163	7,869	8,026	6,304	6,738	9,496	9,742	7,390	7,728
Public Works and Transportation	2,350	68	123	31	6,446	1,218			31	5,122	3,597		31	6,241
Science and Technology	82	35	200	200	78	39	200	200	90	59	300	300	102	83
Small Business	97	67	118	71	526	390	152	144	564	541	211	192	554	533
Veterans	14	14	110	110	446	407	108	108	425	432	106	106	546	544
Ways and Means	36	195	2,885	5,785	4,637	9,377	2,240	7,140	4,885	10,685	1,825	8,625	5,101	11,420
Grand total	14,667	2,353	13,052	15,823	52,825	36,945	15,427	20,684	59,228	47,694	17,879	24,808	68,074	56,937
Appropriations	13,300	1,500				3,200				1,800				1,100

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also that my colleagues may have 5 legislative days to enter their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

A DISCUSSION OF CONCERNS AND FEELING OF AMERICANS

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have just returned from a work period that has gone, really, 10 days now. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say—and I am speaking now for my own district where I have spent that 10-day period—that in the five terms that I have been in the Congress I have never had a period that has been busier, a period that the people I represent have expressed a greater concern over what is happening in this country today.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to take a few minutes today to discuss some of those concerns, some of the feelings that exist out there, and at least have it as a matter of record.

Tomorrow night, we are going to have the opportunity of having President Reagan join us here in the Congress, and I know that I speak for all

of the Members in saying that we are delighted that he is in physical shape to be back here, and having made a remarkable recovery from the recent assassination attempt.

So, we start off applauding him for being here, and thanking the Good Lord, really, that our prayers and the prayers of the American people have been answered in keeping the President in such a way that he can continue fulfilling the job that he has been elected to do.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note what the job of a Member of Congress is as well, who was also elected. Many people have said in the last couple of months, "Support the President; vote for the President's program."

It is my hope that I can as an individual support the President in most of his programs, and I think in many of the things he is trying to do I can be supportive. However, I was not elected, nor my colleagues in the Congress, simply to be a rubberstamp that says, "Yes, Mr. President," because if that is what people expect the Congress to do, then we do not really need a legislative branch.

But, what the people expect, I believe, is for their Representatives to study the programs and to analyze them, to listen to the people that they represent, and then to reach a conclusion on what they should be doing.

□ 1315

Well, in this recent work period I have had number of concerns expressed to me, and the interesting thing is that these concerns have not come from the extremes of the right

or the left politically but have really come from the people, that great middle section of our country which is not on either extreme. And that is why I listened so carefully to what was being said.

It seemed that, No. 1, there is a great feeling in the country today in support of the President as a popular individual, as someone whom the public is pleased to have there as President and who rightfully has a strong following as far as his personal popularity is concerned. But it is also interesting to note that that popularity as a person is not carrying over in the sense of popular support for the program that is being announced by this administration.

In other words, there are many people out there who feel that much of what has been happening and what is being proposed to happen is going to create many more problems than it is apt to solve, and that is what we in the Congress will have to face and what we will be facing, starting this Thursday, as to what we are going to do about it. Let me touch for a minute on some of these programs that, during this last period back home, the people have expressed a great concern to me about.

One program that I have been closely identified with is the student financial aid program and the proposed cuts in education that are being offered by the administration. I have found that middle-income families, poor families, and lower-middle-income families are deeply disturbed at the proposals of the administration on postsecondary education, in other words, the pro-

grams that have been developed over the years to help college students, students seeking higher education. These are programs that have been proven to be valid and successful, and without these programs, it has been projected that in 1982 nearly 1 million students will have to leave college.

Now, the President has said that this country of ours has got to get more skillful, must gain more in technology, and must become more productive, and I agree with every one of those aims. However, I must say I find it hard to understand how we can achieve those goals and be losing nearly 1 million students who are now seeking higher education. Yet that is what will happen if the House budget that is being proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Jones) is not passed here in the coming week.

So there is a great concern out there. Families which have one or two children in school and which are earning \$40,000 a year are concerned. Now, these are certainly not poor families, but in order to send their children to college today, with the average cost of private, independent education in this country at \$6,300 a year, they just do not have \$6,000 or \$12,000 left out of that \$40,000 income. And yet, under the proposed regulations, they would not be eligible even to borrow the money. I am not talking about giving them the money now; we are talking about borrowing \$2,500 a year. So this is one item that is of great concern.

There is another item on which I had comments expressed to me, and this was always addressed by people who were representing mental health centers, people who were representing senior citizens, people who were representing the schools, and people who were representing job programs. They said, "Whatever you do in the Congress on the budget, don't lump all the money together in what is known as a block grant and simply give it to the States and tell the States to work it all out and see that the money gets into these programs." They express this concern because it is practically the universal opinion of the people that if we do that, these programs that the Congress has worked so hard to develop—and these are programs that have reached the people successfully—will not continue to reach the people.

We hear a great deal about unsuccessful programs and we hear a great deal about abuses, but we do not hear much about programs that have continually reached out to help those people whom we do have an obligation to help in this country. These programs that have reached out to the handicapped, these programs that have reached out to poor children in school to provide school lunches, and these programs that have reached out to the educationally disadvantaged to teach remedial reading and remedial

math are programs that have worked, and yet if we in the Congress really abdicate our authority and simply, instead of indicating where these moneys will go, say to the States, "Well, here is  $x$  millions of dollars; you work it out," I think the taxpayers are really being done in, because it seems to me the taxpayers want to know that their money is going for programs that are needed, for programs that are targeting the money, and is not just going to a State legislature which will then vote and decide what to do with the money.

Anyone who thinks that a State legislature is going to eliminate all the administrative problems and is going to get rid of all the redtape that everyone says is troubling the people in dealing with the Federal Government is sadly mistaken. We are simply going to have a new bureaucracy, a new level of redtape, to deal with, and the real thing is that the money—your money, the taxpayers' money—is not going to go where it was supposed to go. And so there is that concern.

I have spoken, incidentally, to businesses, to builders' institutes, and to top executives in private industry on this matter, and these are people who are very much involved in the Private Industry Council, which is a program aimed at placing unemployed people in private industry. These men and women, who are executives themselves of major corporations, have said, "While we support much of what the President has done, don't put the money for these programs into block grants." And yet block grants are one of the very basic premises of the administration's program.

Mr. Speaker, another area that has come in for considerable discussion during my work period is the area of foreign affairs, and here is a place where I found less support on any issue for the administration than anything else. The discussion came in three major areas, and in meetings that I held throughout my district we had the biggest turnouts I have ever seen. The people were really involved, and that is what we want. They spoke on these three issues repeatedly, and they are as follows:

The first issue was the question of the grain embargo; the second was the question of the military equipment, the AWACS, for the Saudis; and the third issue was El Salvador.

Very briefly, the concerns that were voiced on the grain embargo, which as we know, the President lifted this last Friday, centered on this question: How could we justify lifting the grain embargo when the reason we put the grain embargo in was because the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, and how could we justify giving them the grain because they have not invaded Poland?

That just does not seem to make any sense to the public, and it certainly makes no sense to me. If we follow that train of thinking, I wonder what we will give the Soviets next year if they do not invade West Berlin. We can keep that kind of program going on, I guess, for years.

But I think the real question is, What does the Soviet Union think of this? Well, the Soviet Union's immediate response in its local newspapers was that they have just won a great victory, and that the United States was suffering and could not withstand the pressure of the embargo. That is ridiculous. Yet, that is what they think, and this is what those of us who were opposed to lifting the embargo said would be the outcome. And certainly when the Secretary of Commerce made the statement a week ago that there was some sort of an understanding, which nobody else in the administration seems to agree on, that the Soviet Union would not move into Poland because we are going to lift the grain embargo, that would run counter to what everybody who favored the embargo's being lifted was saying, because they were saying the embargo was not having any impact at all and it was actually of no importance, so why not lift it? If it was of no importance, why would the Soviets agree not to do something if we lifted it?

So there is a genuine concern there. But that now has been accomplished, and the embargo is lifted.

The next question was the AWACS, the very sophisticated equipment that is being proposed that we give to Saudi Arabia, and the reason advanced by the administration was that this would be used to help stop the Soviet Union in the Mideast. And we heard earlier today, when the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long) was here on the floor, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs a resolution is being introduced to stop the proposed sale of the AWACS to the Saudis.

It is interesting to note that the day after the statement on the proposed sale to the Saudis was made the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia stated in New York that the Communists were not the real threat to the Saudis but the Israeli Government was. Well, this has been exactly the argument as to why we have refused to sell this kind of equipment to Saudi Arabia.

Others have said, "Well, if we do not sell it to them, they might not give us any oil." Well, I would like to suggest and I think many of the people in my district, from what they have been telling me, would like to suggest, that if this country is going to be governed by blackmail by an Arab country, we really do have a problem that is far worse than anything we anticipated to this point, because if we are right in our beliefs that Israel is a strength for

our country, and that the presence of a democratic Israel, an independent Israel, is important to the United States—which has been our stated foreign policy—then the giving in to blackmail for oil is certainly going to be a very short-range program that, in all likelihood, is going to do us no good at all.

The third question that has come up from my constituents dealing with foreign policy is the question of El Salvador. They asked me repeatedly, "What is the story on El Salvador? Where does the administration truly stand?"

□ 1330

It is interesting to note that a month ago the administration's stand in El Salvador was quite clear because at that time they said that the leftist Communist inspired and supplied guerrillas were the ones who were causing the trouble and the problem, and we had to produce a great deal of military support for the Government, running into the millions and millions of dollars. And this was a clear-cut issue.

Now, just a week ago the Department of State veered a little from the extreme left and said it was also concerned about the extreme right who now seem to be creating a major problem in El Salvador.

Today the FBI has announced that the murder and rape of four American nuns was attributable to the Government, to the national guard, and that now we have a situation where we have the left, the right, and the center hardly representing any American point of view.

If the gentlewoman would like to have me yield on this subject I would be glad to.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I think we ought to be a little more fair and introduce a slightly different perspective. It is true that President Carter sent on the 14th of January \$5 million worth of lethal military aid, the first since 1977, accompanied by some 19 military advisers.

I think many of us felt at the time that there was an emergency, but I think many of us worry whenever military aid is sent to a place that is in trouble.

This was followed by a request from President Duarte for more military aid, which was provided—I believe \$25 million—and more military advisers, rising to a total of 52.

There has always been trouble from the left and from the right. On the left we have the Farabundo Marti Marxist-Leninist group, extreme left, combining with the Democratic Revolutionary Front, and both unwilling to

condemn violence and both committing violence.

In the middle we have Mr. Duarte and Mr. Morales Ehrlich and two generals combining in the junta with the army, which by and large is not the one that is responsible for the extreme cruelties and equal violence of the right. Those are the national guard and the treasury police which are to some extent quite clearly not under the control of President Duarte and the junta, although he has, according to the New York Times, punished, tried, and convicted some 450 of these extreme rightists, you might say, unofficial guards and police.

According to the reports that I read, I am, indeed, happy that the investigation has proceeded as finally to arrive at establishing blame. As I understand it, it is attributed to the national guard which, like the treasury police, is not the Government, is not the army; it is a semiautonomous group. The treasury police are widely believed to be financed by those people who left Duarte, extreme rightists, large landowners—many of them who have taken refuge in another country. I regret to say that many of them are in Miami and that their money is the money that is furnishing the equipment for these extreme right guerrillas—no better than the left and in some cases perhaps even more to be condemned.

But I think it is clear the the Government is trying to strengthen the hands of the one element which has promised elections, which has already set up a council to make a system for the elections which is willing to negotiate with anybody, and which has condemned violence in all its forms, and that is President Duarte and the central government.

I thank my colleague for his patience in his yielding, but that is the way I have been reading the Post, the Baltimore Sun, the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times, and various accounts. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. If the gentlewoman would stay for a minute because she does serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my understanding today has been that our Government, the United States, is asking Duarte to move against the guard on this issue because he has moved against the guard on other issues, and if he has the power to move on other issues, then it would seem very strange, based on the evidence the FBI says that they have produced for him, that at this point he has been reluctant to move on the case dealing with the four nuns.

Perhaps the gentlewoman would like to comment on that.

Mrs. FENWICK. The only thing I can say is that maybe he learned about it when we did. As I understand

it, the FBI announced that yesterday, and I have seen no statement on his part that he is not going to move. Perhaps he is moving at this very instant. I certainly hope so.

Mr. PEYSER. I would certainly hope so, too. We can wait and see what happens there.

Incidentally, the one thing that the people, I believe, are very much in support of, as I am, is providing economic aid for that Government and to do what we can in the economic sense to get that country back on its feet. But I find—and I do not know about the gentlewoman's constituents—that there is not a great enthusiasm for our loading military supplies and people in that country.

I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. FENWICK. I do concur in my colleague's judgment on that point. I was happy to see that it has been announced by the administration that the military advisers are going to be replaced by civilian volunteers. I think that is a very good move.

I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), and it is very interesting.

I listened to three Communists, representatives of the Farabundo Marti Front, who were here in Washington. And what did they most object to? Economic aid. I said, "Why? Why do you object to economic aid?"

Because it is going to implement the land reform for the first time in the history of that country, or at least in many, many years. All the large properties have been taken over, and they have been handed to cooperatives belonging to the peasants and farmers who used to work on them. Now they are going to try to move to the smaller farms. Everything above 1,250 acres has been taken over, and that money is going to implement land reforms, which is the main reason that the left gives just to justify its insurrection.

This was a more revealing thing to me.

I agree with the gentleman from New York. My constituents, like his, are not against economic aid and certainly not if it is going to do some land reform. But the Communists are.

Mr. PEYSER. Very good. I hope that the administration will continue moving in that area, because that is the right track I believe to be on.

Finally, I want to touch on one other subject that did not come up really, and that is what I felt was worthwhile reporting that did not come up in the meetings that I had with my constituents. That subject was the proposed tax cuts, the individual tax cuts. I must admit I had on my agenda each night when I was speaking before a group, or each luncheon, or breakfast, the Kemp-Roth tax proposal of the administration, thinking

that this was something that was really going to be on the people's minds. As I say, the interesting thing is it never came up unless I introduced it, which to me is a clear message that the people are far more concerned with trying to reduce the deficit in this country than they are in getting back \$300 or \$200, which would be the average refund, and having the opportunity of feeding inflation at a very rapid rate by having that money back in their hands to spend.

As I say, the issue never came up unless I brought it up. To me it shows the very native intelligence of the people saying, Look, instead of giving us a couple hundred dollars, why do we not utilize that money that we are already putting out to reduce the deficit, which it certainly would do because that money represents many, many billions of dollars.

In the first year perhaps we should give a token kind of a tax reduction for 1 year, and then let us wait and see what happens. But to make this commitment is something, it is obvious, the public is not crying out for. They are looking for the judgment of Congress, who will be studying and looking at this proposal as to what to do.

There was an interesting editorial, lead editorial, in the New York Times today, and that editorial stated that the proposed tax cut was too little to accomplish what the administration would be hoping for and was enough to bring about increased inflation, all of which meant that there was nothing really positive in having such a cut at this time.

Basically, that covers the main areas of the report that I have from people that I have been talking to over the last 10 days. I think it represents a great deal of the concern of people in the country, a great deal of concern for senior citizens who see themselves again being moved down a peg at a time when they are obviously the greatest victims of inflation that we are having today.

I think a request of the people of the United States to Members of this Congress is to look carefully, to study the programs, not to be a rubber stamp, and then to use their best judgment in acting on what they believe are the best interests of the United States.

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, during the district work period, I held several town meetings in my district and talked with numerous groups and individual constituents about their reservations with the administration budget proposals.

Many were worried about the effect of budget cuts on our cities, towns, and rail systems. A businessman from Portland told me what would happen to his manufacturing firm if Conrail stopped service to his town: He said he would have to move his business out of

Connecticut, incurring great expense, or else go out of business.

In another town meeting, a school superintendent told me what he thought would happen to education in our district if the budget cuts in impact aid funds were passed. In my district, these funds reimburse communities with military bases for the funds they spend on services for military personnel and their children. The superintendent pointed out that, since local governments collect no taxes from military families, the loss of impact aid funds could force many of these schools to close. We have eight such communities in the Second District alone.

At many Connecticut colleges, parents and students worry that if the budget cuts in student loans are passed, only the wealthy will be able to afford the rising costs of higher education. They argue that a college education provides a vital avenue to success that may no longer be available to middle and lower income Americans. They also point out that providing student loans makes good economic sense, since college-educated citizens contribute more in taxes than any other segment of society.

Wherever I went last week, citizens expressed their concern over the abolition of the Legal Services Corporation and the women's, infants', and children's food supplement program. Many thought it unjust to deprive the least advantaged segment of our society of legal access, and they thought that supplementing a poor, pregnant woman's diet was a good investment to make for a healthy child.

While visiting several campuses, I talked with students concerned about the prospect of increased military aid to El Salvador. In fact, students at the University of Connecticut held a rally this last week to protest the administration stance on military aid to this Latin American country. Other constituents said they were displeased with the administration's call for increased defense spending, saying that though they wanted a strong America, they doubted our Nation could be strengthened by questionable military expenditures.

A senior citizen from East Lyme asked me whether the Reagan administration had forgotten the needs of the elderly. She said she had worked hard all of her life, had saved what she could but now was worried about how she would pay her rent and her fuel bills without some Federal assistance. She was truly concerned that the budget cuts might leave her destitute.

Almost everyone seemed to be concerned about inflation, but only a few said they believed the administration's proposals would do much to bring inflation under control. Most seemed to feel that some budget cutting is neces-

sary, but they questioned the equity of the administration's program. They believed that waste and inefficiency could be eliminated while still retaining many programs which provide vital services. They also wondered why when the administration went after the welfare mothers, the senior citizens, and the working poor, it ignored the loopholes, the cheaters, and the "three-martini" lunch. ●

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity today to discuss the public reaction to President Reagan's budget proposals.

During the Easter recess, I held 1 day of public hearings in Madison, Wis., to explore how programs and individuals in my congressional district would be affected by the spending reductions advocated by the White House. I heard from over 50 witnesses representing various segments of the community, and over 400 people attended the sessions.

Mr. Speaker, I found that the people are becoming aware of how the Reagan budget cuts will impact on their private lives, their jobs, and their neighborhoods, and they are very alarmed. They cannot understand why some of our most important domestic programs are targeted for extinction, while the military establishment, despite heavily documented waste and abuse, is slated to receive huge budgetary increases.

If the administration's budget passes intact, local elected officials see no alternative to slashing important Government services and raising local taxes. Low-income employees see a loss of Federal assistance which will force them below the poverty level. The unemployed see the destruction of training and public jobs programs which currently are their only avenue to productive lives. The elderly, handicapped, and destitute are completely at a loss. There would be no way for them to obtain the basic necessities of life.

We have seen many fancy statistics from the Office of Management and Budget to demonstrate the supposed benefits of the Reagan economic program. But when I go back to Wisconsin, I see the destruction of human potential as the end result of the administration's proposals. We cannot build a sound economy unless we are willing to invest in our most important resource—people.

I would like to share with my colleagues some of the things I learned about the Reagan budget at the hearings.

The city of Madison will lose about \$1 million in direct Federal aid in 1982, and \$3 to \$4 million in 1983. The city's bus system alone will lose \$700,000 in assistance in 1982.

In Dane County, 1,000 low-income families will lose aid through the

women's, infant's, and children's nutrition program. About 1,200 families will be denied fuel assistance during the severe Wisconsin winters. A special program in the county helping over 3,000 low-income individuals become financially independent will be eliminated.

Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction estimated that under the White House proposals for the child nutrition programs, 80 percent of the State's schools would drop their school lunch programs. In 8 out of 10 Wisconsin schools, needy children would be denied nutrition assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a small sampling of the knowledge I gathered from my constituents. However, I would like to quote a statement from Beverly Davis, who represented the Wisconsin Conference of Churches. She made a very important point about the general approach of the Reagan budget.

We are especially concerned about the effect of the cuts in these programs on families, as programs of child care, nutrition supplements for the elderly and children, preventive health care, mental health services, and subsidized housing, are seriously reduced, and efforts to fight child abuse and domestic violence are practically cut off.

As a society we must do everything possible to enable families to stay together and to give them every possible support in raising the next generation into strong, healthy, whole citizens. This is a responsibility we all share, both voluntary and governmental agencies. The federal government is retreating from that responsibility and our whole society will suffer as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the sentiments expressed by Ms. Davis. At this time, I would like to submit to the RECORD two newspaper articles discussing the hearings, along with a few of the statements submitted by witnesses.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Apr. 18, 1981]

**KASTENMEIER FINDS OPPOSITION TO BUDGET CUTS IS UNANIMOUS**  
(By Patricia Simms)

From welfare mothers to the mayor, U.S. Rep. Robert Kastemeier, D-Wis., heard strong opposition late last week to the proposed cuts contained in President Reagan's 1981-83 federal budget.

"How much pain, how much suffering before this President is convinced that he is making a mistake and doing the wrong thing?" asked William Benisch, executive director of the Dane County Community Action Commission.

Benisch, who assembled a panel of clients to testify to the negative impacts of cutting specific programs, said block grants, which are not earmarked for specific programs, would only cause confusion and prevent money from reaching the "grass roots."

"Block grants are not the answer," he said.

Kastemeier held a full day of hearings in Madison on the impact of Reagan's proposed budget cuts on local programs.

Ernestine Moss, a West Side AFDC recipient, testified that she had been discouraged from working because of lack of adequate

reimbursement for transportation costs during last year's bus strike.

Now, she said, budget cuts could force AFDC mothers into a search for work that would be more costly to the taxpayers than the full range of AFDC and related grants. "Who's going to take care of our children when we're out looking for a job 20 hours a week?" she said. "I just ask you—what does it all mean?"

Another recipient, who lives in a West Side low-income housing project, said cutting back on federal nutrition programs would prevent low-income children from growing properly.

"I feel like I'm a criminal, guilty of poverty," Dolores Tomashevka told Kastemeier.

Madison Mayor Joel Skornicka said the proposed budget cuts would mean a loss of about \$1 million in direct federal aid to the city in 1982 and from \$3 million to \$4 million the year after, in addition to another \$1 million a year in increased local costs.

He specifically cited the \$700,000 planned reduction in federal aid to the city's bus system in 1982.

"It seems to me to make no sense to cut back on transit aid at a time when we are importing oil and suffering from a large balance of payments deficit," Skornicka said. "The federal government should be doing everything possible to encourage wider use of means transit."

Skornicka added, "The effects of the federal cutbacks will not be any overall reduction in government spending, but rather a shift from a federal cost to a local cost."

Skornicka said the proposed budget reductions would probably force the city to reduce its general welfare assistance levels or restrict eligibility for the general relief program.

Ron Domini, representing the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, argued that the federal government should be forced to balance its budget merely because state and local governments are required by law to avoid a deficit.

"State and local governments are required by law to balance their budgets, and this often forces major layoffs and service cuts in many states and cities during recessions," he told Kastemeier. "There is no reason for the federal government to follow this bad example."

"During recessions, increased federal spending on social programs like welfare and unemployment compensation is essential to assist people thrown out of work through no fault of their own."

[From the Capital Times]

**HELD BY KASTENMEIER—ADC RECIPIENTS TESTIFY AT HEARING**  
(By Kaye Schultz)

President Ronald Reagan's budget cuts will have the effect of treating the poor like criminals, a mother who receives federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children told U.S. Rep. Robert Kastemeier today.

"I feel like I'm a criminal, guilty of the crime of poverty in this country," Dolores Tomashevka said at a Madison hearing called by Kastemeier.

Tomashevka said cuts in Legal Aid services to the poor, reductions in food stamps and proposals for "workfare" programs "are just the beginning. It's a slow death for the poor."

The Sun Prairie congressman said he organized the hearing to discuss Reagan's pro-

posed \$44 billion in 1982 budget cuts "on a more human level."

He said the "crucial test" of Congress' ability to restore some of the cuts will come at House Budget Committee deliberations beginning April 29. Although the proposed budget cuts will eliminate \$54 billion in tax revenue, Kastemeier said federal spending will still rise \$40 billion in the 1982 budget, and the burden of the cuts will be shifted to local governments.

"There's no net saving. It's just a question of who is spending it," he said.

Mayor Joel Skornicka said the City of Madison stands to lose between \$3 and \$4 million a year in federal funds if Reagan's proposals go through. The largest cuts would come in human services, adding \$900,000 to welfare costs, and a \$1.4 million cut in transit aid by 1983.

Skornicka said the reduction in federal aid will be made up in 1982 by "select cutting of low priority programs, and some property tax increases—after that, things may get more drastic."

Eleanor Fitch, state president of the League of Women Voters, said federal human services programs have succeeded in meeting the War on Poverty objective of reducing the percentage of people below the poverty line from 12 percent in 1965 to 4 percent in 1980. "Under the Reagan budget, that objective will no longer be met," she said.

Fitch suggested alternative budget cuts, including \$275 million in synfuel subsidies and \$76 billion for completion of the interstate highway system, already 94 percent built.

Ernestine Moss, an Aid to Families with Dependent Children recipient who is attending school, said Reagan's cuts would punish single-parent families and force their children to "grow up different."

"We are in training in America; the rich are learning to become richer, and the poor are learning to live with less . . ." she said.

The hearing was scheduled to continue this afternoon at the University of Wisconsin campus, with a focus on cuts to education and public broadcasting.

**TESTIMONY BY MAYOR JOEL SKORNICKA**

I want to thank you, Congressman Kastemeier, for the opportunity to appear before you today. I believe it is both appropriate and necessary to conduct local hearings like this on the President's budget proposals. It is important to bring the budget debate "to the people" so that the full impacts of the suggested program cuts are understood at this end before too many decisions are made at the other end—in Washington.

What is the impact of the proposed cutbacks on the City of Madison and on the citizens of the City of Madison?

As far as we can now determine the impact, it appears that Madison will receive about \$1 million less in direct federal aid in 1982 and \$3-4 million less thereafter. In addition, the cuts could lead to as much as \$1 million a year in increased local costs.

In some cases, the proposed cuts will have a direct, immediate impact on Madison. For example, the President proposed a three-year phaseout of federal support for mass transit operating assistance. This would have meant about \$700,000 less in federal aid for our bus system in 1982 and another \$700,000 in 1983.

Since we cannot expect much in the way of additional operating assistance from the

state government, and since fuel and other costs are rising rapidly, we would have no choice but to raise fares or property taxes or both or to drastically reduce bus service. Fortunately, it appears Congress may delay the phaseout of aid for one year, until FY 1983, but the long term impact will be the same.

It seems to me to make no sense to cut back on transit aid at a time when we are importing oil and suffering from a huge balance of payments deficit. The federal government should be doing everything possible to encourage wider use of mass transit. The effects of the federal cutbacks will not be any overall reduction in government spending, but rather a shift from a federal cost to a local cost.

Madison will also be seriously affected by proposed cuts in the human services area. Reductions in federal support for AFDC, food stamps and CETA and medical assistance will put additional pressure on Madison's welfare budget. Our expenditure for general assistance is now \$2.7 million a year and the proposed federal cuts could mean \$900,000 in added welfare costs. Since we probably cannot afford all these additional costs, we will have no choice except to reduce assistance levels or restrict eligibility. What's the impact going to be in Madison? Well, we've already acted in the past two years to tighten up eligibility standards to make certain that only those deserving help get it. When the poor, the disabled, the chronically mentally ill, the people suffering from alcoholism or other illnesses, the young runaways, the abused wives and children fall through the federal government's "safety net" and the state government's "safety net," they land right in the laps of local government. And it's a lot harder to turn your back on a person with problems—a "truly needy" person—when they're right there in front of you.

They're no longer a statistic or a social problem—they're real people. And it's these real people at the bottom end of the economic ladder who have already suffered disproportionately because of inflation. When we have made cuts in city government programs recently, we have tried to spare the poor whenever possible. It can be done if you're willing to be selective.

The cuts in the CETA program are perhaps illustrative of the negative, short-sighted effects of some of the administration's proposals. In the Madison-Dane County Consortium, 190 CETA employees will lose their federally-funded jobs—which in many cases would get them on the road to meaningful, private sector employment—and slip back onto the welfare rolls. Instead of providing assistance through one program, the federal (or state or local) government will provide assistance through another. And they'll be less able to move out of the welfare cycle.

Madison will also feel the effects of the federal cuts in other areas. We lose \$210,000 in Section 312 Housing Rehabilitation Funds. In 1983, we will lose \$391,000, and in 1984 and thereafter, Madison will lose over \$1 million a year in federal highway assistance funds.

These funds go for basic street repair and construction, another area where it is very difficult to drastically reduce funding.

Overall, Madison will lose \$3-4 million a year in federal funds once the proposed cuts go through, if they go through. We can absorb some of these losses in aid. We can and will cut some programs and services. But some portion of these cuts, primarily

those affecting transit, streets and welfare, will have to be made up at the local level.

I accept the need to restrict the growth of government spending at all levels. Even before the federal cutbacks hit us, we have been cutting back on spending in the City of Madison. Our budget increases the last two years have averaged 5½ percent, which is about the same as the federal government will achieve if all of the proposed cuts go through. In Madison, we have reduced the number of public employees. In short, we heard the message to reduce government growth—direct from our own property taxpayers—long before the federal government. The difference is: we have been more selective and careful about what programs we cut and which people we try to protect.

The debate on these proposed cuts is a necessary one, and I hope the Congress will examine the administration's budget carefully to make sure these cuts are borne equitably.

#### STATEMENT BY BEVERLY C. DAVISON, WISCONSIN IMPACT AND WISCONSIN CONFERENCE OF CHURCHES

I am speaking on behalf of the Wisconsin Conference of Churches and the IMPACT Legislative Network.

The major Protestant denominations take seriously the many Biblical injunctions to seek justice, to free the oppressed, to care for the widow and child, to feed the hungry, and to call the leaders of the nation to do justice in human affairs. In the words of the book of Proverbs: "Speak up for the people who can not speak for themselves. Protect the rights of all who are helpless. Speak for them and be a righteous judge. Protect the rights of the poor and needy." (Proverbs 31: 8, 9)

Karl Barth, prominent theologian of this century, whose thought is widely respected in both conservative and liberal theological circles, has said: "The poor, the socially and economically weak and threatened will always be the object of the Church's primary and particular concern, and it will always insist on the State's special responsibility for these weaker members of society." Karl Barth in *Against the Stream*.

While religious organizations engage in works of corporate benevolence and encourage their members in acts of personal caring and service, such benevolence can never be sufficient to meet the vast human needs in our nation. The institution of government is the means by which our obligations to social and economic justice are to be fulfilled. We see the present administration retreating from that social obligation, denying justice to millions of Americans, and abdicating any responsibility for the protection of our common environmental life and for the promoting of the general welfare of all of our citizens.

As an expression of our concern for these social programs the Wisconsin Conference of Churches was one of the early supporters of the Public Assistance Coalition in Wisconsin. And this past year we have had a Task Force on Welfare Reform. That task force set forth principles on which any governmental social program should be judged.

First, respect the dignity and integrity of the individual;

Second, contribute to the strengthening of the family;

Third, provide all persons with an adequate minimum income or provide the means to earn that income; and

Fourth, provide useful employment and job training, both in the public and private sectors.

We are convinced after serious study of the proposed budget cuts in human services that these principles are being flagrantly denied. The testimony of this morning will give specific evidence of this. We are especially concerned about the effect of the cuts in these programs on families, as programs of child care, nutrition supplements for the elderly and children, preventive health care, mental health services, and subsidized housing, are seriously reduced, and efforts to fight child abuse and domestic violence are practically cut off. We are also concerned about the disproportionate burden that women and minorities will bear in these cut backs.

As a society we must do everything possible to enable families to stay together and to give them every possible support in raising the next generation into strong, healthy, whole citizens. This is a responsibility we all share; both voluntary and governmental agencies. The Federal Government is retreating from that responsibility and our whole society will suffer as a result.

The member denominations of the Wisconsin Conference of Churches are also concerned about the protection of our environment and the conservation of natural resources. We are stewards of God's great gift of creation and decisions on energy, land use, waste disposal, and water and air use must be made in the light of that stewardship and that sense of corporate responsibility. The resources and the authority of the Federal Government are the vehicle through which we as a society protect those resources for the use of the total society and not just for the benefit of the few. We would speak against the decrease in funding for water resources programs, and the elimination of funds for land purchases and historical preservation. We are appalled at the virtual giving away of mineral rights on public lands. We are very uneasy about the lack of support for research in renewable energy resources in favor of development of nuclear energy.

Finally, we are dismayed that these programs of environmental protection, and programs to meet human need and strengthen the family are being sacrificed on the altar of military spending. We are being told that programs must be cut to balance the budget and to fight inflation, yet the national debt is actually being increased to allow for a 24.8-percent increase in defense spending. We are cutting \$380 million from the solar energy program, yet can spend \$372 million to reactivate an aircraft carrier. We are cutting \$65 million from mental health and drug abuse programs which would serve thousands of our citizens, to spend it on one cargo aircraft. We can eliminate over one billion dollars in child nutrition programs, but then buy 18 fighter planes for NATO.

We are not simply speaking against cuts in some worthwhile social programs to aid the families of our nation. We are protesting the revolution that is taking place in our land, for this budget represents a complete reversal of our priorities and values. We spend for instruments of death rather than bread for life.●

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, having no further request for time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

**STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN FORD  
ON GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVES**

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

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, evidence is mounting that this Government is heading for serious trouble unless we in Congress face up to the problem of executive pay.

Last month the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service heard disturbing testimony from top-level managers of several departments and agencies in the executive branch. They painted a bleak picture of low morale, a rush for early retirement and serious difficulties in recruiting people to fill key executive positions within the Government.

More recently, the Merit Systems Protection Board had completed a special study on the Senior Executive Service, which was created under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 to provide managers with flexibility in assigning and removing senior executives from Government.

Last November the Merit Systems Review Board, whose job is to monitor SES performance and activities, sent questionnaires to 1,500 SES members selected at random. Nearly 1,000 executives have responded. Their comments have to have a chilling effect on anyone who is concerned about the future quality of our governmental institutions.

According to the study:

Eight out of ten felt there were insufficient incentives in SES to retain highly competent executives.

More than 1 in 4 indicated it is unlikely they will be working for the Federal Government 2 years from now if they have their own way. Another 20 percent said there is an even chance they will leave Federal employment within 2 years.

SES positions perhaps are becoming less attractive to potential candidates. Overall, only about 3 in 10 GS-13 to GS-15 employees say they would be willing to join the SES if the job they would like was offered to them.

Among these already in SES, many seem to be having second thoughts about having joined. One in ten surveyed said they would seriously consider leaving the SES to accept a GS-15 position in the same kind of work if the opportunity arose. Another 15 percent said while they are not sure, they would consider it.

The majority surveyed do not believe a real opportunity for monetary reward exists. In spite of the fact that 7 out of 10 SES members indicated that their supervisors rated their performance highly, less than 3 out of 10 felt it likely they would receive a bonus during the next 12 months.

There is a strong suggestion that nonpay benefits alone will not contin-

ue to be sufficient to attract and retain a high quality, committed work force.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is compelling. We are losing our ability to compete with the private sector both in recruiting and retaining the best people. As soon as they are eligible, top-flight executives are retiring and filling the vacancies is growing increasingly more difficult. When a veteran Government executive opts for early retirement, it imposes a double financial burden on the Government; the cost of retirement benefits plus the cost of replacement.

We are not talking about the loss of second-rate people whose departure is of little consequence. We are speaking, if you will, of the best and the brightest.

It is not an alarmist position to say that unless something is done we are going to suffer severe consequences.

How long are we going to wait? Until our inaction has drained away our very best managers? If this happens, and it is inevitable if we continue to do nothing, the cost to the American people in inefficiency, progress and esteem will be many times the costs of taking corrective action before it is too late.

In his 1981 budget proposals on Federal executive, legislative and judicial pay, President Carter recommended an increase of 16.8 percent, in effect lifting the pay cap. At first this position was endorsed by President Reagan, who last February switched positions. At that time, in a letter to me, OMB Director David Stockman explained that the President changed his mind because—

The status of the economy requires that we concentrate our resources on achieving substantial budget reductions.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Civil Service in the House this week, Office of Personnel Management Director Donald Devine sought to have this body believe otherwise. Mr. Devine testified that President Reagan had second thoughts because leaders in both houses of Congress told him they could not get approval of the pay increase.

I believe that with the President's support we could have passed an executive pay bill. And I think it would be helpful if Mr. Devine would get his facts straight regarding the President's position. ●

**COMMENDATION FOR THE WASHINGTON POST CONDEMNATION OF CBS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have had my share of disagreements with the Washington Post;

there have been times when I felt the newspaper was unfair to me, times when I have been disappointed in its work, and times when I have felt the newspaper arrogant and insensitive. Yet there is no denying the high quality and standards of the Post; anyone who compares newspapers will readily put the Post at the top, or close to the top, of the list.

I am tremendously impressed by the responsibility of the Post in its unprecedented act of giving up the Pulitzer Prize awarded for a story that turned out to be false. Any lesser organization would have dismissed the doubters, refused to investigate, and stood by its story. It has to be said that the Post did dismiss the first doubts. It also has to be said that they did not fail to listen to those who continued to raise questions. What is most important, the newspaper took the correct and courageous course of admitting the truth on its own free will and not when forced against the wall. That was not easy to do, but it was right, responsible and correct. I commend the Post for its actions.

The reaction of the Post stands in great contrast to other media. I recall that on May 21, 1968, the CBS network broadcast what has since become known as a great landmark in broadcast journalism, its widely acclaimed "Hunger in America" show. The trouble was that the story was not true. The greater trouble is that CBS not only never corrected its story, but never even acknowledged that some of its most dramatic moments were not true, and that its portrayals of local attitudes were grossly distorted. These are things that CBS never admitted, either because they felt it unimportant, or because they did not want to suffer the penalty of admitting error. In either case their action was irresponsible.

The "Hunger in America" show opened with a memorable, dramatic moment showing a dying infant. The narrator claimed that the infant was dying of starvation in a San Antonio hospital. Before a horrified audience, the baby died, "of hunger," the script said. But a reputable San Antonio reporter, Kemper Diehl, who incidentally has written for the Post, and whose son is making his mark on that same newspaper, investigated and found that the infant had not died of hunger at all. In point of fact, the infant shown on CBS was born prematurely. Its parents were healthy and well nourished. But CBS never admitted the truth of this, never corrected the story, never retracted it, and to this day still shows that program as one of its greatest achievements.

That was not all. When CBS portrayed the attitudes of local officials toward hunger, they showed only film of aging, reactionary politicians who

displayed complete indifference to the problems of the poor. The real community attitude in San Antonio was different. The city government of San Antonio was the first in Texas to start the food stamp program, and that program had been committed to well before CBS came on the scene. The truth was that to get food stamps for our citizens, local agencies had to pay for the State of Texas' share of the administrative expenses. This was not easy for a locality as strapped for cash and resources as San Antonio. The food stamp program proved a great success. It would have been impossible to start and carry out that program if local officials had been anything like as callous and indifferent as those CBS presented on its show. But these facts did not fit with the story that the network wanted to put together, and again CBS never modified its story to reflect what was really happening in San Antonio.

It is not easy to do a responsible job of journalism. Deadlines are short, resources are short, the demands of editors are enormous, the facts not always clear, and always there is the problem of separating personal feelings from objective evaluation. It is never easy to admit that you are wrong. The Post has done so, in the case of its "Jimmy" story. That reflects credit and integrity, and I commend the Post. At the same time I am disappointed that CBS never showed the same kind of integrity or concern for the truth in its "Hunger in America" report. "Hunger in America" was a story that needed to be told, but it needed to be told truthfully.

□ 1345

#### AMERICA'S GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMY—SOME STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1981, I gave a talk at Marquette University, Milwaukee, on "America's Government and Economy—Some Structural Problems." The text of my remarks follows:

Those here who love fishing know well that the secret of success is proper structure—a waterlogged stump, a pile of rocks, a steep drop-off. If the structure is appropriate, you catch fish.

As in fishing, so in life. Particularly in politics and economics, good structure makes for happiness.

Until very recently, our political and economic structure was a source of strength. Our constitutional system of checks and balances, of divided sovereignty and separated powers, worked. So did our economic system of free enterprise tempered by concern for human welfare and by a govern-

mental undertaking to assure sufficient demand to buy what could be produced.

Now we are in the doldrums. In Government, for more than a decade, President and Congress have not pleased the American people. Back in 1966, 41 to 42 percent of the American people said they had a great deal of confidence in the Congress and the President; by 1979, only 17 to 18 percent felt such confidence (survey of Louis Harris and Associates). And participation in elections has been dropping off over the same period.

In economics, nearly fully employment without inflation has given way to a disastrous bout of escalating prices, increasing joblessness, and impossibly high interest rates.

A leading reason for these miseries, I shall argue, is deteriorated structure. If the passing of the years rearranges the rock piles on your favorite fishing lake, it may cease to be a good fishing lake. And if the ravages of time and man have caused malfunctions in our political and economic structure, this may contribute to our present discontents.

I propose to ask how the structure deteriorated, and what can be done to restore it. Let us look first at our governmental problems, then at our economy.

The big fissure in our political structure lies in the relationship between President and Congress. The Constitution, with its checks and balances, built tension into this relationship. But for most of our history, Governmental seemed to work because of the existence of an institution not even mentioned in the Constitution—the political party. The party came to act as a bridge between executive and legislature. When stalemate loomed, the party could always be relied upon to come to the rescue.

But in the last decades, the influence of the parties, and particularly the Democratic Party, has greatly declined. Parties that once recruited their stalwarts from the political spoils system found themselves increasingly out in the cold as a result of civil science. Parties that maintained constituent loyalty by the provision of welfare in the form of favors at City Hall and baskets of Christmas found themselves rendered redundant by governmental welfare programs. Parties that used to reinvigorate themselves every four years by presenting leaders capable of choosing presidents, frequently in a smoke-filled room, found themselves bypassed by the open primary and by the post-McGovern super-democratization of it.

Along with the decline of party came the rise of the freelance governmental official. Jimmy Carter is the leading example of an outsider who gloried in his outsideness to master the nominating machinery. Congress is increasingly filled with freelancers rather than party people, political entrepreneurs whose use of television and computerized mailings and unlimited special interest campaign contributions makes them impervious to any party and its discipline.

So party discipline, the cement which used to hold the structure together, has all but disappeared.

We have just celebrated, in 1976, the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Just ahead of us, in 1987, is the bicentennial of our Constitution. This gives us an opportunity, perhaps an obligation, to ask whether constitutional changes are need to repair the rickety condition of our governmental structure.

Whenever constitutional change is proposed, one hears pleas for the parliamentary system, in which legislative-executive cooperation is assured because legislature

and executive are in effect one. Under the parliamentary system, the parliament picks the prime minister and the cabinet from its own members. Legislature and executive can each topple the other and call an election. The head of government (prime minister) and the head of state (king or president) are different people.

I do not view a full adoption of the parliamentary system as a realistic option for the United States. Our presidential system, for all its flaws, has worked. It is very difficult to imagine two-thirds of the Congress and three-fourths of the state legislatures junking the American presidential system.

But short of a complete change in our constitutional system, there are amendments to the Constitution of a considerably milder nature which might contribute to curing the structural defects which beset us. Over the last years, I and others have put forward for discussion several proposed amendments designed to remedy some of the defects. Let us have a look at them.

Back in 1974, I proposed a constitutional amendment authorizing the Congress at any time to adopt, by a three-fifths vote, a resolution of no-confidence in the President, which would cause the immediate removal of the President and mandate a prompt new Presidential and congressional election. The requirement of simultaneous congressional and Presidential elections was meant to deter impetuous action by Congress to remove a president.

1974, it will be remembered, was that historic moment when Congress was struggling with the question of whether Richard Nixon was impeachable by reason of that vague constitutional phrase—"high crimes and misdemeanors." It was an extremely debatable question, which fortunately never had to be resolved because of Mr. Nixon's resignation. That may have been a good thing at the time, but it has left us with a major unsettled constitutional issue. Establishing a new procedure for a vote of no-confidence would make it possible for Congress to act before the country reaches the brink of crisis, before a stalemate occurs. Congress would know its powers clearly, and could act expeditiously. I suspect that had such a constitutional amendment been in effect during the Watergate period, it would have occasioned the removal of Mr. Nixon earlier, and with less trauma, than occurred as a result of agonizing impeachment proceedings.

A second proposed constitutional amendment, one I introduced in 1979, was intended to create a bridge between the executive and legislative branches by allowing the President to select some of his top cabinet and other officers from the Congress. This would be accomplished by repealing the prescription contained in Article I, Section 6, against Members of Congress serving as so-called "officers" of the United States. Such a change would conform with the practice of practically every other major democracy—West Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Canada, France, Italy, the Low Countries, the Scandinavian countries—all of which regularly create government from the ranks of leading legislators.

U.S. Senators and Congressmen thus selected by the President should have no more difficulty wearing two hats than do their counterparts abroad. Congressional voting procedures could be simplified, clustered, or indeed made eligible for remote electronic voting by someone who was not on the floor. Congressional staffs could handle the legislator's constituency ombudsman function. And the drain on the time of

a senator or congressman appointed to an executive branch leadership post could be lessened by allowing him to put his committee assignment into deep freeze, with his seniority on the committee retained.

Thus allowing legislators to serve in executive branch jobs would have a number of advantages. It would permit the President wider choice for his cabinet than he enjoys now. It would make service in the Congress more attractive, since it would permit members to hold posts of executive responsibility without the necessity of interrupting their congressional careers and giving up their congressional committee seniority. Most important, it would place a new emphasis on communication and cooperation between the branches of Government—a new link between the president and the Congress.

My third amendment, introduced back in 1975, and much less important than the others, would attempt to separate the political functions of the President from the more ceremonial functions he performs. This would be accomplished by providing for the direct election of both a chief executive and a chief of state. Such an arrangement is a functional division one observes widely in the constitutional monarchies—such as Great Britain, Japan, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries—as well as in a number of nonmonarchical democracies—such as France, West Germany, Italy and Israel. In these cases, the King or the President is quite distinct from the Prime Minister, and tends to the more ceremonial tasks, such as accepting diplomatic credentials and entertaining foreign dignitaries.

Having a second person assume these tasks would go a long way toward relieving the President from chores that have become enormously time-consuming. Ronald Reagan has the right idea that a lot of the President's chores can indeed be delegated. But it would be unfortunate if he delegated the more important functions, while leaving the ribbon-cutting and dinner-hosting to himself.

A fourth possible amendment to improve the functioning of government would be one that enabled Congress to place some reasonable limits on what candidates for President and Congress can spend on their campaigns. The reason this requires a Constitutional amendment, rather than being amendable to legislation, is that the Supreme Court ruled, in the 1976 case of *Buckley v. Valeo*, that Congress could place spending limits only on candidates who elected to accept public financing of their campaigns. The court held that any further proscription would violate the constitutional guarantee of free speech. In the meantime, Congress has been unwilling to pass legislation providing for the public financing of congressional elections, and, therefore, no limits on spending apply at all to candidates for the House or Senate.

In the 1980 election, the record for spending in a House race seems to have been set by Republican Robert Dornan of Los Angeles, who spent \$2 million in a successful, though close, race against Carey Peck, the son of actor Gregory Peck, who spent \$0.5 million. In the Senate, Democrat Alan Cranston felt obliged to spend almost \$3 million to beat back a bid by Paul Gann, the coauthor of California's proposition 13.

Placing reasonable limits on campaign spending seems no more a violation of freedom of speech than to forbid movie patrons to yell "fire" in a crowded theater. The capacity of seat-buying to ruin a democracy is

surely one that the Court ought to weigh in a freedom-of-speech decision. Perhaps the Supreme Court should be given a chance to reverse itself—this certainly is simpler than the amendment process.

Another constitutional amendment—one regularly advocated by Lyndon Johnson, among others—would extend the present 2-year congressional term to 4 years. Its proponents believe that Congressmen would exhibit greater courage in standing up to special interests if their electoral exposure is only once every 4 years.

Admittedly, such an amendment would have made life easier during my 14 terms in Congress. On balance, nevertheless, I am not persuaded. The Founding Fathers had a purpose in subjecting members of "the popular branch of the legislature" to the public will every 2 years. Moreover, I would have some fear that were Congressmen given a free ride for 4 years, their off-years might see not so much a heightened interest in legislation as a marked increase in absenteeism and overseas travel.

Its merits or demerits to one side, the 4-year term is not likely to be enacted. Senators perceive the amendment's obvious effects would be to allow Congressmen the leisure in their off-years to run for their Senate seats. Objectivity under such circumstances is a lot to ask.

Can useful improvements in our governmental structure be achieved short of formal constitutional amendments? The answer, surely, is "Yes."

For one thing, we can attempt to strengthen the parties—particularly mine, the Democratic Party—by internal organization. The Republican Party today illustrates a considerable degree of Presidential-congressional cooperation. Not so the Democrats, whose national structure all but ignores the Congress.

Accordingly, I have proposed the establishment of a Democratic Advisory Council to try to revitalize the party. Under the proposal, the Democratic National Committee would constitute such a council, with heavy representation from Congress, from state and local government, and from policy-concerned leaders.

The tasks of the council would be ones which are not being performed well by the present party institutions: to prepare party positions, to devise a better method of selecting Presidential candidates, and to revitalize the party generally. Setting up a Democratic Advisory Council could help revive the party of Jefferson and FDR. A revived, strong party could in turn provide a needed bridge between Congress and the President should the nation at some future time turn again to the Democrats.

A second non-constitutional reform we might consider making is in the nominating process for President.

As it stands now, the system of 30 or more state primaries tests stamina, financial resources, and political strategizing more than it tests the skills a successful President will need to possess, such as knowledge of issues, experience in the ways of Washington, skill at making important decisions, and fashioning coalitions to support them. The premium is on shaking the most hands, raising the most dollars, buying the most TV time, and saying things fuzzy enough to exercise the broadest appeal. This system elevates to the nomination people who may or may not know the leaders around the country whom they will have to deal with if they are elected President; who may or may not know a great deal about the complicated national

and international issues they will have to face; and who may or may not know much or care much about the role that negotiation and compromise play in the American political system. Jimmy Carter stands as the classic example of someone who did much better in the primaries than he did in the Presidency. A troubled nation like ours cannot afford many more Presidents who require such extensive on-the-job training.

The existing situation could be improved if party legislative leaders, as well as those elected in primaries, were included in the national conventions; and if the primaries themselves were fewer in number and shorter in duration.

For instance, the national party could adopt a rule providing that at least a third of the convention delegates not be pledged to any candidate. These unpledged delegates would be Congressmen or other party leaders who would have to work with the new President. This would permit a majority of delegates to be selected by primary, but it would make it unlikely that a candidate would have gained enough to assure a first-ballot convention nomination, as is so possible today. As a result, it would be necessary for a successful candidate to pull together a broad party consensus at the convention.

In addition to more unpledged delegates, the time of our primaries ought also to be changed: they are at present too many, too long, and too arduous. Almost the only people who can compete successfully any more are those who are independently wealthy, and have no other job to preoccupy their time. Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan were, not surprisingly, unemployed millionaires when they undertook to run for President. So were George Bush and John Connally. Those from the Congress who made a serious effort were required to forsake many of their official duties. Such a stringent requirement of time, money, and patience effectively deters from running a lot of people who would make good Presidents. Legislating a shorter period of campaigning, or consolidating some of the state primaries into regional ones, might make running for President a more manageable and attractive enterprise, and might widen the range and quality of men and women who want to compete.

Senator Packwood of Oregon has introduced legislation which would provide for a system of five regional primaries, in the Northeast, South, Midwest, Plains, and the West. Under Senator Packwood's scheme, states would participate voluntarily, and the order of the primaries would be determined by the Federal Elections Commission by lottery. The first one would be held on the second Tuesday of March, and in each successive month another would be held. The regional primary would prevent small states like New Hampshire and Iowa from exerting a disproportionate influence on the electoral process, and eliminate the draw-out efforts that are required today of Presidential candidates conducting their primary campaigns. An alternative, proposed by Senator Baker of Tennessee, would use the four time zones rather than the regions.

A third "easy" reform we might make would be to back up a bit on some of the measures by which Congress has redressed what it regarded as its just grievances against the President. In fact, we have gone too far, and a prudent pause may be in order.

Rambunctious military activities by Presidents Johnson and Nixon led Congress to

enact the War Powers Act, letting Congress in the nick of time into the war-making process. But Congress should think twice before it again impinges on executive control of our foreign policy, as it did on the Greek-Cyprus issue and on the question of Soviet emigration.

Again, Congress was right to dethrone the tyrannical seniority system in the 1970's. But getting rid of imperious committee chairmen is no excuse for the excessive proliferation of subcommittees the Congress has permitted. Swollen staffs, frequently working at cross purposes, are the result. The number of subcommittees should be sharply curtailed.

Still another example: Mr. Nixon's impounding of congressional appropriations led to the Budget Control and Impoundment Act. That was a well-justified congressional intrusion, but the same cannot be said for congressional second-guessing of administrative decisions, and its one-House vetoes of executive action.

By exercising a little self-control, Congress can help relieve executive-legislative tension without a constitutional amendment.

Let us now turn to our economic structure. Here, too, the old-time religion seems not to be working.

The world of John Maynard Keynes in which we have been living for the last half century held that assuring adequate demand by consumers, investors, and government would make the economy operate at close to full employment, and without unacceptable inflation. The means of insuring this adequate demand included supporting labor unions, the progressive income tax, and the subsidization of food, housing, and medical care. The welfare state encouraged keeping up demand, while letting supply take care of itself.

But in the last 15 years the traditional demand economics has brought upon us an unparalleled bout of stagnation and inflation.

We have fallen into the trap of macroeconomic policy: if we fight unemployment by easing fiscal and monetary policy, we end up adding to inflation; if we fight inflation by tight fiscal and monetary policy, we end up increasing unemployment.

Why do we find ourselves in this tantalizing position, where nothing seems to work? I believe, again, that our economic structure has grown so creaky that normal economic signals have lost their effect. Let me give you some examples of creaky structure.

It used to be that management had a built-in resistance to outsized wage increases because it would be unable to sell its goods if it agreed to such increases. Today, in the major sectors of our industry and trade, it is easier to pass on wage increases than to fight them and risk a strike.

It used to be that physicians were restrained from overcharging by the unwillingness of patients to pay. Today, Medicare pays the bills for the elderly, so there is little incentive to bargain.

It used to be that outrageous restaurant prices scared away the diners. Today the deduction of entertainment expenses removes what used to be a bargaining factor.

It used to be that lenders would extract from their borrowers only a reasonable rate of interest. Today the interest rate is tax deductible, and the wealthier the borrower the less he is bothered by high interest rates.

I could go on to list the rigidities and wrong-headed incentives which now clutter

our economy. Railroads and trucks and banks are still discouraged by regulatory agencies from sloughing off inefficient operations. The losers in American industry—obsolete shipyards, improvident automakers, undercapitalized steel mills—are increasingly kept alive by governmental subsidy. Protectionists—and not just in this country—demand and get tariffs and quotas and marketing agreements that assure inflationary price rises for everyone.

We bewail the lack of capital to build much-needed new plant and equipment. Yet we continue tax incentives which induce people to put their money, not into productivity-increasing equipment, but into vacation homes, new energy-wasting suburban shopping centers, or into consumer purchases on credit by the affluent.

We are just now as a nation starting to get rid of some of these rigidities and disincentives. Even the most sensible and moderate monetary and fiscal policies, designed to combat both recession and inflation, cannot work until we do.

To work, our new economic policy must contain not only a monetary and fiscal component, but a structural reform component. Structural decay must be fought on both the supply and the demand sides.

To get our structural reform moving on the supply side, the focus must be on both capital and labor. More capital savings and investment must be sought by both tax incentives and lower interest rates. Fixed capital in plant and equipment must be supplemented by research and development, both public and private, and by the building up of infrastructure, both public (bridges, ports, streets) and private (utilities, railroads). More clearly focused education and job training is needed.

On the price side, the campaign against inflation must be conducted on a wide variety of fronts—energy, food, regulatory. Some sort of an incomes policy to keep wages and prices in line, involving cooperation between labor, business, and government, is also necessary.

Just as checks and balances alone cannot make politics work, monetary and fiscal policy alone cannot make economics work. In economics as in politics, structure is crucial. ●

#### THE NATIONAL CONSUMER CO-OPERATIVE BANK ONE STEP CLOSER TO FULFILLMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Sr GERMAIN) is recognized for 15 minutes. ● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, a series of pronouncements coming out of the Office of Management and Budget cast a cloud over the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, but I am happy to report that there have been some encouraging developments in recent days.

First, the Comptroller General, who is given a mandatory review function under the Budget and Impoundment Control Act, ruled on April 13 that the administration had exceeded its authority in impounding funds previously appropriated for the purchase of stock in the bank. Following the language of the act creating the bank, the GAO found that such purchases of

stock by the Treasury are mandatory if the funds have been appropriated.

After the GAO opinion, the \$60 million previously appropriated for stock purchases was released to the bank last week—a giant step toward assuring that the institution will be able to meet its purposes of providing loans to consumer cooperatives across the Nation.

While the transfer of the funds by Treasury to the bank is indeed good news, there is still need to free up funds which have been appropriated for fiscal year 1981 for the self-help development fund and technical assistance program. The GAO did not question the administration's power to impound these funds, but it is important that the Congress see that this part of the program continues. The self-help fund provides loans primarily for newly developing cooperatives whose membership must be predominantly low-income. This is a particularly cost-efficient means of developing economic activity in inner-city and depressed rural areas and should not be curtailed. The funds in dispute for fiscal year 1981 are \$29 million—a sum not calculated to upset the budget calculations.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the transfer of the \$60 million to the bank will help clear the air and allow this institution to proceed with its primary functions as a lending institution. It was the intent of Congress that the bank move as rapidly as possible with efforts to raise funds in the private market. This can be done only if the bank is allowed to operate as its charter specifies and free from unnecessary interference and unsupported attacks on its performance.

Before the budget exercises began, the bank's management had approached Wall Street investors and received very favorable responses. This reflects well on the management of the bank and on the market's judgment of the institution's viability.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this administration will eventually support efforts to meet the original commitment to the bank for its full capital—all of which will be repaid with interest to the Treasury. Frankly, I think it is time to let the bank get on with its business. It needs stability, not threats.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I was happy to receive a response from OMB Director Dave Stockman on April 3, assuring me that OMB was using only legislative approaches and had not attempted to interfere with the management of the bank.

I realize there are some who cannot accept the cooperative structure as part of our economy despite the fact that such institutions have been around as long as we have been a Nation. Some oppose all types of coop-

eratives—baby-sitting cooperatives, farm co-ops, senior citizen cooperatives,—the whole range of self-help entities.

This is regrettable because I am convinced that cooperatives can be important tools for consumers, a chance to create mechanisms that can help people shape decisions of choice and price in the marketplace. Our economy is strong and this Nation is strong because we do allow freedom of choice, and there is no reason why anyone should try to dictate what types of businesses are created, whether they be stock companies, partnerships, family enterprises, or cooperatives. Some of the budget-cutting efforts are designed to limit and dictate choices in the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that there is bipartisan support for cooperatives. I am also hopeful that there are those within the administration who do support self-help programs and will not allow the administration to impose an "anti co-op" label on itself.

As a former high White House staffer in the Ford administration stated:

Cooperative action is as American as the Boston Tea Party, the winning of the West and rural electrification. . . . As one who grew up around co-ops, I can attest to their ability to aid the development of communities ignored by commercial banks, to keep prices competitive and to give consumer-members more bargaining power in the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, again it is encouraging that part of the immediate struggle to assure continuation of the program has ended happily with the stock purchases by Treasury. While I know this administration holds to its original positions on the bank, it is an excellent sign that the fiscal year 1981 funds, already duly appropriated, have been allowed to be transferred to the bank in keeping with the mandatory nature of the statute governing the stock purchases. While we may continue to debate the merits of the bank and other funding, we must commend the recognition of the law and congressional intent in regard to these funds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the RECORD a copy of my letter of April 16 to Secretary of the Treasury Donald Regan concerning the opinion of the Comptroller General and the release of title I moneys:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE  
AND URBAN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1981.

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

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I trust immediate steps will be taken to release funds for the National Consumer Cooperative Bank in keeping with the opinion of the Comptroller General of April 18, 1981.

As you know, this opinion stated, among other things, that:

" . . . the Federal funds available to finance the Bank come from the Bank's sale

of class A stock to the Treasury. Sections 3014(a) and (c) of title 12 use the term "shall" in reference to the Bank's issuance of stock to the Treasury. We believe that use of the term "shall" coupled with the general statutory scheme here involved connotes a mandate to engage in the action described. Consequently, the Secretary of the Treasury has no discretion to refuse to purchase class A stock issued by the Bank within the limits of appropriations made for this purpose.

"This conclusion is evident from the legislative history of Consumer Cooperative Bank Act. Senate Report 95-795 states on page 17 that there are to be three classes of stock in the Bank, including 'class A nonvoting, cumulative preferred stock for required purchase by the Secretary \* \* \*.' (Emphasis added.) On page 18 of that report, it states that "with respect to government investment, the bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase class A stock \* \* \*." (Italics added.)

"If the Congress had wanted the Secretary to have discretion in the purchase of stock, it clearly could have done so . . ."

I am sure you will take all the steps necessary to release these funds.

Sincerely,

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,  
Chairman. ●

#### 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. PETRI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. HECKLER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SHAW, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FIEDLER, for 5 minutes, April 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PEYSER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SOLARZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. AU COIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MIKULSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, April 28.

Mr. SOLARZ, for 60 minutes, May 1.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETRI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. NELLIGAN.

Mr. LEBOUTILLIER.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. HOLLENBECK.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. MICHEL in seven instances.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. RUDD.

Mr. DOUGHERTY in two instances.

Mr. ERDAHL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. GARCIA.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. TRAXLER.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. BEDELL.

Mr. ECKART.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. LEVITAS.

Ms. MIKULSKI in two instances.

Mr. HANCE.

Mr. DYSON in two instances.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. DAN DANIEL.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. SIMON in three instances.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. CONYERS in two instances.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 734. An act to encourage exports by facilitating the formation and operation of export trading companies, export trade associations, and the expansion of export trade services generally; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Resolution 128, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1981, at 12 noon in memory of the late TENNYSON GUYER of Ohio.

**CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1980, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE**

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT  
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1981.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In compliance with Section 4(a) of Public Law 85-804, the calendar year 1980 report on "Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense" is enclosed.

Table I shows that 127 contractual actions amounting to \$4,854,882 were approved and

that 21 actions amounting to \$12,530,976 were disapproved. Included in the number of actions approved are 66 actions for which a potential Government liability cannot be estimated.

Table II lists the actions which have an actual or potential cost to the Government of \$50,000 or more. Table II also contains a list of those actions for which a potential Government liability cannot be estimated.

Sincerely,  
D. O. COOKE,  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

TABLE I.—SUMMARY REPORT OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

[January to December 1980]

Department and type of Action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount
Department of Defense—total.....	127	\$12,308,647	\$4,854,882	21	\$12,530,976
Amendments without consideration.....	4	6,178,836	1,898,525	8	10,432,185
Correction of mistakes.....	5	6,874	6,858	10	593,172
Formalization of informal commitments.....	51	663,458	549,499	2	1,505,619
Contingent liabilities.....	66				
Other.....	1	5,459,479	2,400,000	1	N/A
Army—total.....	42	535,356	538,733	8	1,634,767
Amendments without consideration.....	1	400,000	400,000	1	37,919
Correction of mistakes.....	4			6	259,649
Formalization of informal commitments.....	37	135,356	138,733	1	1,337,199
Contingent liabilities.....					
Other.....					
Navy—total.....	65	5,800,009	1,547,108	1	29,604
Amendments without consideration.....	1	5,291,399	1,149,293	1	29,604
Correction of mistakes.....					
Formalization of informal commitments.....	13	508,610	397,815		
Contingent liabilities.....	51				
Other.....					
Air Force—total.....	20	5,973,282	2,769,041	10	927,262
Amendments without consideration.....	2	487,437	349,232	4	425,319
Correction of mistakes.....	1	6,874	6,858	4	333,523
Formalization of informal commitments.....	1	19,492	12,951	1	168,420
Contingent liabilities.....	15				
Other (residual powers).....	1	5,459,479	2,400,000	1	N/A
DLA—total.....				2	9,939,343
Amendments without consideration.....				2	9,939,343
Correction of mistakes.....					
Formalization of informal commitments.....					
Contingent liabilities.....					
Other.....					

<sup>1</sup> Contract modification.

TABLE II.—LIST OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS WITH ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL COST OF \$50,000 OR MORE TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

[January to December 1980]

Type of action, service, and name of contractor	Actual or estimated potential cost	Description of product or service	Justification
AMENDMENTS WITHOUT CONSIDERATION			
Army: Waltham Precision Instruments, Inc., Waltham, Mass.	\$40,000	Aircraft clocks.....	Waltham Precision Instruments is a small business which primarily manufactures mechanical clocks for aircraft and is currently the only active U.S. producer using U.S.-produced parts. The company has been established as a mobilization base producer of critical precision parts. A memorandum of understanding was concluded between the United States and Switzerland whereby DOD requirements in excess of an estimated quantity necessary to sustain Waltham were open for competition and awarded to Swiss firms. OSD determined that the minimum sustaining rate for Waltham was 300 clocks per month, but later found that 500 clocks per month was a more realistic figure. As a result of operating difficulties which led to losses in the last 3 years, attributable to errors in pricing, imprudent business ventures, and an inadequate accounting system, Waltham filed for bankruptcy in December 1978. As a result, an advance payment of \$150,000 was authorized. The Army recognized, however, that more extensive relief to make the company viable was necessary under Pub. Law 85-804. Waltham, working with DOD and the Army, effected changes in top management, improved the accounting system, and reduced overhead and G. & A. rates. The sustaining rate was increased to a profitable level of 700 units per month. Based on the information submitted, the Board found that the continued viability of Waltham as a source of mechanical aircraft clocks is essential to the national defense, and granted monetary relief not to exceed \$400,000, notwithstanding the recommendation of ARRCOM and DCAA for a lesser amount (\$314,500).

TABLE II.—LIST OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS WITH ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL COST OF \$50,000 OR MORE TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85—804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—Continued

[January to December 1980]

Type of action, service, and name of contractor	Actual or estimated potential cost	Description of product or service	Justification
Navy: Applied Devices Corp. (ADC)	1,149,293	Multiband, surface-to-air-missile (SAM) radar system training devices.	The Naval Training Equipment Center (NTEC) awarded a fixed-price incentive contract to Applied Devices Corp. (ADC) at a ceiling price of \$3,123,728 for surface-to-air-missile radar system training devices. ADC requested extraordinary relief because they had run out of time and money without completing the contract. An estimate of an additional \$2 million was made by ADC. NTEC recommended that relief be granted because of a mutual mistake as to a material fact as described in the DAR and sought approval from the Naval Supply Systems Command to increase the ceiling by \$4,142,106 to \$7,250,707. The clearance was approved and ADC notified. A Navy review team investigated the facts leading to the new ceiling and did not conclude that a mutual mistake of material fact occurred, but that ADC could not complete the contract without additional funds because ADC's financial condition was so severe that a work stoppage was imminent. The Navy Contract Adjustment Board authorized an amendment without consideration to raise the contract ceiling price by \$1,976,351 in order to satisfy ADC's incurred costs and to insure performance under the contract. ADC claimed this was a breach of contract since the contracting officer had legally raised the ceiling to \$7,250,707. The Office of the General Counsel advised that the Navy would not be able to repudiate the contracting officer's agreement because he had authority to make the agreement and obtained the necessary clearance from higher authority. In addition, ADC relied on the contracting officer's representation that agreement had been reached. The Board rescinded its decision authorizing \$1,976,351 and directed NTEC to settle ADC claims for breach of contract by increasing the ceiling price to \$7,250,707. Based on technical and financial reviews of ADC's overall business base, the Board found that the eventual cost of the contract would reach an estimated \$8.4 million and authorized an immediate award of the difference, or \$1,149,193, thereby facilitating the national defense.
Air Force: Cartwright Engineering, Inc.	348,008	AN/DSQ-24A (Digidop scoring sensors)	Cartwright Engineering, Inc., received 3 sole source contracts for the manufacture, test, and delivery of AN/DSQ-24A Digidops scoring sensors which are an integral part of the missile scoring system for all Air Force aerial target drones. Cartwright based its request for relief on performance problems by its subcontractors. Cartwright subcontracted for a hybrid circuit with the MTS Corp. on a sole-source basis. When MTS failed to meet delivery schedules and quality standards, Cartwright selected Environmental Communications, Inc. (ECI), as the new source for 100 units of the hybrid circuits, at the same price as MTS. ECI also failed to meet performance criteria and Cartwright terminated the contract. However, Cartwright renegotiated the contract with ECI for the needed unit at a considerably higher price. Cartwright sought relief of \$486,213 based on ECI price increases which were caused by unanticipated technical and production difficulties. In the interim, Cartwright stopped performance under the 3 contracts, alleging that further performance would increase its losses to \$531,743. The Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC) sustained that Cartwright's continued operation and performance under these contracts was essential to the national defense. The AN/DSQ-24A scoring sensor is an essential element of the missile scoring system and Cartwright is the only manufacturer and holder of proprietary rights to the AN/DSQ-24A. Development of a new source would cost an estimated \$2 to \$3.5 million and take at least 2 years. Based on the above recommendations by the Air Force and AFLC, the Board considered the scoring sensors and Cartwright, as the sole producer, to be essential to the national defense and that granting extraordinary contractual relief to Cartwright would facilitate the national defense. The Board authorized the amendment of the existing contracts to provide for an increase in the unit price of the sensors of \$1,665.11, and that Cartwright be paid a lump sum of \$348,008 for 209 units already delivered, with future payments of remaining units upon delivery.
<b>FORMALIZATION OF INFORMAL COMMITMENTS</b>			
Navy: Todd Shipyards Corp.	310,850	Floating drydock (YFD-9)	The Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) contracted with Todd Shipyards Corp. (TODD) to lease 3 drydocks to them, including the YFD-9, with options for renewal. In 1976, TODD notified the Navy that it did not intend to exercise the option for the YFD-9 and requested that it be removed from their premises. Because of the vessel's poor condition and other cost factors, it remained at TODD for 3½ years before it was sold and removed. NAVSEA and TODD agreed that berthing charges for the YFD-9 would be offset by the leasing charges of the remaining drydocks. It was later discovered that the statutory authority for the lease, 10 U.S.C. 2667, did not authorize such offsets; therefore, NAVSEA requested that the Board formalize what had become an informal commitment. The Board decided that NAVSEA be authorized to formalize the commitments in an amount not to exceed \$310,850, the schedule of charges agreed to in the offsetting arrangement.
<b>RESIDUAL POWERS</b>			
Air Force: E-Systems	2,400,000	Aircraft maintenance	E-Systems and its wholly owned subsidiary and subcontractor, Air Asia Co., Ltd., of Taiwan, were under contract to the Air Force to provide defense-related aircraft maintenance in Taiwan. The Air Force informed E-Systems of its decision to discontinue the maintenance because of the termination of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Republic of Taiwan. E-Systems sought relief under 2 theories: first, E-Systems contended that the Air Force's decision to discontinue the contract would cause them to suffer a loss of a significant portion of Air Asia's business base. This would result in a reduction in their work force and associated employee separation and retirement costs approximating \$5.5 million. Second, E-Systems maintained that a mutual mistake as to a material fact was made during contract negotiations when E-Systems and the Air Force both assumed complete amortization of certain past service costs because of Air Asia's eligibility for aircraft maintenance contracts in the Far East. E-Systems contended that approximately \$4.7 million of past service costs would have been negotiated into the contract if the parties had recognized the possibility that contractors in Taiwan would not be acceptable to the Air Force. The Board ruled that relief could not be granted under either theory since the Government, in its contractual capacity, could not be responsible for decisions related to diplomatic relations. Furthermore, an erroneous expectation of a continuing contractual relationship does not provide a basis for the mutual mistake theory. Pursuant to the Board's residual powers, it determined that E-Systems request warranted relief because it would be unfair for E-Systems to bear risks of unforeseeable changes in foreign policy. The Board determined that granting relief under such unique circumstances will facilitate the national defense by demonstrating that the Government will deal fairly with defense contractors. E-Systems and the Air Force could not take into account the change in foreign policy and negotiate what the increase in price might have been. Accordingly, there was no way to determine that amount, and the Board awarded relief of \$2.4 million, the amount it felt was equitable.

Contingent liabilities:

Provisions to indemnify contractors against liabilities because of claims for death, injury, or property damage arising from nuclear radiation, use of high-energy propellants, or other risks not covered by the contractor's insurance program were included in 66 contracts (the potential cost of these liabilities cannot be estimated inasmuch as the liability to the Government, if any, will depend upon the occurrence of an incident as described in the indemnification clause). Items procured are generally those associated with nuclear-powered vessels, nuclear-armed guided missiles, experimental work with nuclear energy, handling of explosives, or performance in hazardous areas.

Name of contractor	Number of contracts		Name of contractor	Number of contracts	
	Navy	Air Force		Navy	Air Force
Aerojet General Co		5	Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Inc.	2	
Automation Industries	1		Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock	1	
Boeing Co.		7	Raytheon Co.	1	
Boeing Aerospace Co		1	Rockwell International Corp	1	
General Dynamics	30		Singer Co	1	
General Electric	7	2	Westinghouse Electric Corp	2	
Hercules Inc.	1				
Honeywell Inc.	1		Total	51	15
Hughes Aircraft Co.	3				

In addition to these, indemnification clauses will be inserted in all transportation contracts entered into by the Military Airlift Command for transportation services to be performed by air carriers which own or control aircraft which have been allocated by the Department of Transportation to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, and pursuant to the order of the House of April 7, 1981, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table on the dates indicated and referred as follows:

[Apr. 13, 1981]

1096. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Legislative Affairs), transmitting various project performance audit reports received from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Asian Development Bank, pursuant to section 301(e)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

[Apr. 14, 1981]

1097. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of April 1, 1981, pursuant to section 1014(e) of Public Law 93-344 (H. Doc. No. 97-44); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1098. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting notice of the State Department's intention to consent to a proposed third-country transfer of certain U.S.-origin military equipment, pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1099. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for implementation of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1100. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-31), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1101. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment and services to Greece (Transmittal No. 81-32), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, together with certification that the sale is consistent with the principles contained in section 620C(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act, pursuant to section 620C(d) of the act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1102. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1103. A letter from the President, American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the annual report of the Academy and Institute for calendar year 1980, pursuant to section 4 of its charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

[Apr. 15, 1981]

1104. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his review of the proposed rescissions, deferrals, and revised deferrals of budget authority contained in the message from the President dated March 10, 1981 (H. Doc. No. 97-28), pursuant to section 1014 (b) and (c) of Public Law 93-344 (H. Doc. No. 97-45);

to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1105. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the commissary shelf-stocking and custodial services function at Norton Air Force Base, Calif., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1106. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-18, "To amend the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 to establish pay limitations on salaries for District of Columbia employees for fiscal year 1981 and clarify provisions relating to adverse actions and grievances of certain employees of the Council of the District of Columbia, and to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to allow for tax deductions for compensation waived by District of Columbia government employees," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1107. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-17, "To order the closing of portions of Van Ness Street, NW, abutting square 2055, between Connecticut Avenue, NW, and Reno Road, NW, (S.O. 79-173) (Ward 3); and to make a clarifying amendment to the Rental Housing Act of 1980," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1108. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report covering calendar year 1980 on the use of authority to designate and rent inadequate quarters, lease family housing and hire quarters at or near Coast Guard installations, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 475(f); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1109. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for improved management of plant genetic resources to minimize crop damage (CED-81-75, Apr. 10, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Agriculture.

1110. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on revising formulas for computing social security benefits (HRD-81-53, Apr. 14, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

[Apr. 16, 1981]

1111. A letter from Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting notice of transfer of funds within the Department of Defense, pursuant to section 734 of Public Law 96-527; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1112. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on improving the Department's management of consultant services, pursuant to section 307 of the Supplemental Appropriations and Recission Act of 1980; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1113. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Logistics), transmitting notice of the Navy's plans to study the conversion from in-house operation to commercial contract of the Defense Metropolitan Area Telephone System in the Norfolk area, pursuant to section 502 of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1114. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the stockpile report for the report ended April to September 1980, pursuant section 11 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1115. A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency for Administration, transmitting notice of proposed changes in an existing record system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1116. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a report on the Board's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1117. A letter from the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting notice of a proposed new record system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1980 on the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program, pursuant to section 5 of the act of July 15, 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 935); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1119. A letter from the Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 106 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 1975e) to raise the limitation on appropriations for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1120. A letter from the U.S. Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notice that increased duties on ethyl alcohol, pursuant to Public Law 96-499, require the United States to enter negotiations under Article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1121. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to restrain food stamp program spending, to increase State agency flexibility, to focus benefits toward the most needy, to extend appropriations authority, to amend the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, and to extend and improve the commodity distribution programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

1122. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of financing of certain marketing and regulatory services provided by agencies of the Department of Agriculture; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Agriculture.

1123. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report evaluating alternative methods of measuring changes in homeownership costs in the consumer price index (PAD-81-12, Apr. 16, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Education and Labor.

1124. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for fiscal years 1980 and 1979, pursuant to section 106 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 97-46); jointly, to the

Committees on Government Operations, and Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1125. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1982 for intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, for the Intelligence Community Staff, for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Armed Services, and the Judiciary.

[Apr. 20, 1981]

1126. A letter from the Executive Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the U.S. Secret Service for "Salaries and expenses" for fiscal year 1981, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679(e)(2) of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1127. A letter from the Acting Associate Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1980 on revenues derived by the Air Force from recovered materials, pursuant to section 612 of Public Law 93-552; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1128. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the second annual report on implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, pursuant to section 308(b) of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1129. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the eighth report of the Director of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, pursuant to section 413(b)(2) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1130. A letter from the Vice President for Government Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting a report covering the month of February 1981 on the average number of passengers per day on board each train operated, and the ontime performance at the final destination of each train operated, by route and by railroad, pursuant to section 308(a)(2) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1131. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report on political contributions made by John J. Louis, Jr., Ambassador-designate to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and by members of his family, pursuant to section 304(b)(2) of Public Law 96-465; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1132. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report on political contributions made by Julia V. Taft, nominee as Ambassador-at-Large and Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, and by members of her family, pursuant to section 304(b)(2) of Public Law 96-465; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1133. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of various international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1134. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment to Japan (Transmittal No. 81-34), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1135. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment and services to Japan (Transmittal No. 81-36), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1136. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-37), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1137. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-38), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1138. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting notice of proposed changes in an existing records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1139. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting notice of two proposed new records systems, and of changes in various existing systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1140. A letter from the Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report on the Commission's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1141. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a report on the Board's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1142. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the U.S. Government Comptroller for American Samoa for fiscal year 1979 on the fiscal condition of the American Samoa Government, pursuant to section 2(d) of Secretarial Order 3009 of September 13, 1977; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1143. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting various audit reports from the U.S. Government Comptrollers for the Virgin Islands, Guam/TTPI/NMI, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1144. A letter from the Director, Federal Judicial Center, transmitting the 1980 annual report of the Center, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 623(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1145. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1979 on administration of ocean dumping, pursuant to section 112 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1146. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

[Apr. 21, 1981]

1147. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise provisions of the Morrill Act of 1890 and the Nelson Amendment of 1907 which make permanent annual appropriations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1148. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1980 on emergency medical services programs, pursuant to section 1208(c)(1) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1149. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 18, 1970; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

[Apr. 22, 1981]

1150. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development, and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the commissary shelf-stocking and custodial services function at Holloman Air Force, N. Mex., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1151. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-19, "To terminate the Environmental Litter Containers Franchise due to ongoing violations of franchise provisions by Pride Environmental Services, Inc.," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

1152. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment and services to Australia (Transmittal No. 81-33) pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1153. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1154. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the second report on the Department of the Interior's methodology for monitoring and reporting on Outer Continental Shelf wells that are shut in or flaring (EMD-81-63, April 17, 1981), pursuant to section 601(b) of Public Law 95-372; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Interior and Insular Affairs.

[Apr. 23, 1981]

1155. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1980 on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, pursuant to section 4(a) of Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1156. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installation, Logistics and Financial Management), transmit-

ting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the total installation support activities at Sacramento Army Depot, Calif., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1157. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the vehicle operations and maintenance function at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1158. A letter from the Acting Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a report that the Agency acquired no real or personal property during the quarter ended March 31, 1981, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1159. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on the economic analysis of due-on-sale clauses, requested by the Conference Report on the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1160. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community and economic development, and related programs, to provide an improved and expedited mortgage foreclosure procedure with respect to multifamily mortgages held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to title II of the National Housing Act or section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1161. A letter from the Mayor of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Emergency Preparedness of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 81-686; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1162. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Student Loan Marketing Association, transmitting the annual report of the Association for calendar year 1980, pursuant to section 439(n) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1163. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for more equitable treatment of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1164. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting notice of the Commission's inability to render a final decision in docket No. 37507, *Rates on Iron Ore, Randville to Escanaba via Iron Mountain*, within the statutory time limit, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10707(b)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1165. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to carry out the purposes of the International Investment Survey Act of 1976; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1166. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a revision to the 1980 human rights report for Albania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1167. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1168. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, United States Railway Association, transmitting a report on the Association's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1169. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, United States Railway Association, transmitting a report on the Association's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1170. A letter from the Chairman, National Park Foundation, transmitting the 1980 annual report of the Foundation, pursuant to section 10 of Public Law 90-209; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1171. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title III of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, to authorize appropriations for such title for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1172. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1173. A letter from the Administrator-designate, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the semiannual report on the effectiveness of the civil aviation security program, covering the period ended December 31, 1980, pursuant to section 315(a) of the Federal Aviation Act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1174. A letter from the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the biennial report on the operation and effect of the International Sugar Agreement, pursuant to section 5 of Public Law 96-236; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

1175. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improving independent evaluation systems in the multilateral development banks (ID-81-30, Apr. 21, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1176. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the sixth annual report on the Department's activities under the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, covering fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 20 of the act; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

[April 27, 1981]

1177. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), transmitting an airport master plan and facility marketing study for the former Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo., pursuant to section 610(b) of Public Law 94-431; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1178. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve

Affairs and Logistics), transmitting the final environmental impact statement on the disposition and use of Federal surplus property at Hamilton Air Force Base, Novato, Calif., pursuant to section 610(b) of Public Law 94-431; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1179. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 511(d) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement for all persons to perform an initial period of active duty of not less than 12 weeks and to extend to 270 days the period within which persons enlisted under this section shall commence an initial period of active duty for training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1180. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4349(a) of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the companies of the corps of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy may be commanded by commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1181. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development and Logistics), transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the commissary shelf-stocking function at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1182. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the second report on applications for delays of notice and customer challenges under provisions of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3421(a); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1183. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-21, "To permit commercial advertising on the side and rear exterior of Metrobuses," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1184. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-22, "To amend the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act of 1980, and for other purposes," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1185. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-23, "To order the closing of a public alley abutting lots 115 and 91 in Square 207 bounded by R Street, N.W., S Street, N.W., Johnson Avenue, N.W., and 15th Street, N.W. (S.O. 77-164) (Ward 2)," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1186. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-24, "To order the closing of a portion of Nannie Helen Burroughs Avenue, N.E., and a portion of a public alley abutting lots 10, 11, 25, 26, 91, 96, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 in Square 5127, bounded by Hunt Place and 46th Street, N.E. (S.O. 78-372) (Ward 7)," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1187. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting District of Columbia Act 4-25, "To order the closing of a portion of a north-south public

alley abutting lots 267, 805, and 806 in Square 5359, bounded by Hilltop Terrace, S.E., and 46th Street, S.E. (S.O. 79-388) (Ward 7)," pursuant to section 602(c) of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1188. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting notice of a meeting relating to the international energy program to be held on April 27 and 28 in London; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1189. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting reports covering the month of January 1981 on changes in market shares for refined petroleum products and retail gasoline, pursuant to section 4(c)(2)(A) of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1190. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting notice of the State Department's intention to consent to a request by the Government of Denmark for permission to transfer temporarily by lease certain U.S.-origin military equipment to General Dynamics Corp., pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1191. A letter from the Executive Officer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the Agency's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1192. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report on the Board's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1193. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting his annual report of funds drawn by him, the application and disbursement of the sums, and balances remaining in his hands as of January 2, 1981, pursuant to section 7 of the act of October 1, 1980 (26 Stat. 646); to the Committee on House Administration.

1194. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting his annual report for calendar year 1980 on applications for court orders made to Federal and State judges to permit the interception of wire or oral communications, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1195. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1196. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, to provide that funds to be expended under the act must first be approved through an appropriations act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1197. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 9 of the National Climate Program Act to extend the authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1982 and 1983, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

1198. A letter from the Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize funds to the Republic of the Philippines to assure the effective care and treatment of patients in the Veterans Memorial Medical Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1199. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate and improve Federal grants to States for home energy and emergency assistance to low-income households, to eliminate unnecessary restrictions on those programs and increase flexibility in a State's exercise of its responsibility for program administration, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1200. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on alternative field structures for conducting examinations of financial institutions (GGD-81-21, Apr. 24, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1201. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the role of the Federal payment in financing the budget of the District of Columbia (GGD-81-67, Apr. 23, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and the District of Columbia.

1202. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the U.S. Customs Service's procedures for classifying merchandise under the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (GGD-81-46, Apr. 23, 1981); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

1203. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Agreement on the International Carriage of Perishable Foodstuffs and on the Special Equipment To Be Used for Such Carriage (ATP), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted Apr. 16, 1981]

[Pursuant to the order of the House on Apr. 7, 1981, the following report was filed on Apr. 16, 1981]

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma: Committee on the Budget, House Concurrent Resolution 115. Concurrent resolution revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1981 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984 (Rept. No. 97-23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted Apr. 27, 1981]

Mr. FUQUA: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 2643. A bill to provide for the improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, and for other purposes

(Rept. No. 97-24, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3243. A bill to establish a grant program for the acquisition of medical equipment and supplies for the treatment of aircraft accident burn victims; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 3244. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act of 1974 to prohibit the transportation of radioactive materials in densely populated areas; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. CARMAN:

H.R. 3245. A bill to provide mandatory social security coverage for Members of Congress and for the President and Vice President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 3246. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 to remove the price controls on certain natural gas produced after April 1981; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 to remove the fuel use prohibitions applicable to existing powerplants and major fuel-burning installations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt newly discovered oil from the windfall profit tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that intangible drilling and development costs will not be treated as an item of tax preference for purposes of the minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the rate used in computing percentage depletion for oil and natural gas will continue to be 22 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORRADA:

H.R. 3251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to the territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Delaware:

H.R. 3252. A bill to establish the Coastal Barrier Resources System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUNDERSON:

H.R. 3253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment for purposes of the unemployment tax of certain services performed by students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 3254. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code relating to the mailing free of postage of bills by nonprofit health clinics receiving Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude life insurance proceeds from the gross estate for purposes of the Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide individuals a limited exclusion from gross income for interest on deposits in certain savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 3259. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize funds to the Republic of the Philippines to assure the effective care and treatment of patients in the Veterans Memorial Medical Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3260. A bill to establish a mechanism with the Department of Health and Human Services to maximize the availability of new compassionate drug treatments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STANTON of Ohio (by request):

H.R. 3261. A bill to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community and economic development, and related programs, to provide an improved and expedited mortgage foreclosure procedure with respect to multifamily mortgages held by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to title II of the National Housing Act or section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the awarding of reasonable court costs and certain fees to prevailing parties in civil tax actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALGREN (for himself and Mrs. HECKLER):

H.R. 3263. A bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 and the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out the earthquake hazards reduction programs and the fire prevention and control program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to provide that certain regulations issued by the Secretary of Transportation relating to highway routing of radioactive materials shall not be effective; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FITHIAN:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the designation and adoption of the American marigold as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution designating May 6, 1981, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed sale to Saudi Arabia of AIM-9L air-to-air missiles, the FAST auxiliary fuel and equipment pods for the F-15 fighter, and the five airborne warning and control aircraft (AWACS) ordered by Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed sale to Saudi Arabia of five airborne warning and control aircraft (AWACS) and conformal fuel tanks and air-to-air missiles for 62 F-15 fighter aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the age of retirement under the social security program should remain at 65, and that the Congress will not enact legislation to raise such age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COELHO:

H. Res. 129. Resolution to request the Secretary of the Interior to restore the name "Bureau of Reclamation" to the bureau of the Department of the Interior charged with administering the Federal reclamation program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, and pursuant to the order of the House of April 7, 1981, memorials were presented and referred, on the dates indicated, as follows:

[Apr. 20, 1981]

39. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to resumption of multiple use of public lands found unsuitable for designation as wilderness by the Bureau of Land Management; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

40. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to disabled military retirees, disability compensation, and earned retirement pay; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

[Apr. 27, 1981]

41. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to undesirable plant species, including noxious plants, on lands administered by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

42. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to alcohol abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

43. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to budget cuts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

44. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to immigrant assistance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

45. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to right to life amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

46. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to

reinstatement of funding for the sea grant college program and the ocean thermal energy conversion program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

47. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, relative to Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

48. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania, relative to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

49. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to section 936 of the Federal Internal Revenue Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

50. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to local control; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

51. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to enactment of economic legislation proposed by the President of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'AMOURS:

H.R. 3264. A bill for the relief of Michael Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 3265. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ida Zafra Villanueva; 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. 44: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 70: Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 182: Mr. STANGELAND and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 269: Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. MARRIOTT, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 374: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. BONER of Tennessee.

H.R. 375: Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 378: Mr. DWYER.

H.R. 484: Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 501: Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FARY, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOTTL, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROBERTS of Kansas, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STANTON of Ohio, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.R. 560: Mr. LeBOUTILLIER and Mr. HOWARD.

H.R. 644: Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

H.R. 907: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 911: Mr. MOORHEAD and Mrs. BOGGS.

H.R. 1005: Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.R. 1100: Mr. LENT and Mr. DYSON.

H.R. 1554: Mr. MCKINNEY and Mr. BINGHAM.

H.R. 1576: Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr.

RICHMOND, Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1711: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1765: Ms. FIEDLER.

H.R. 1851: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DANIELSON, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GRAY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2352: Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2389: Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GOLDWATER, JR., Mr. LeBOULLIER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2414: Mr. STOKES, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CORRADA.

H.R. 2445: Mr. ATKINSON.

H.R. 2506: Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MOPFETT, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 2640: Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 2859: Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. FROST, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 2888: Mr. BONER of Tennessee.

H.R. 2921: Mr. BUTLER and Mr. CHENEY.

H.R. 3006: Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 3070: Mr. McDADE, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 3184: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.J. Res. 128: Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GEJDNENSON, Mr. GINN, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 131: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. McDADE, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. GOLD-

WATER, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.J. Res. 203: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FISH, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. LaFALCE, and Mr. ST GERMAIN.

H. Res. 125: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, and Mr. COELHO.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor and board of aldermen, Crosby, Miss., relative to community health centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

57. Also, petition of the Portuguese-American Federation, Inc., Bristol, R.I., relative to appointment of Joseph E. Fernandes as Ambassador to Portugal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. Also, petition of the trustees, Temple Isaiah, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to budget cuts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

59. Also, petition of the board of trustees, State of Hawaii, Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to the Native American Hawaiian Study Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

60. Also, petition of the city council, Cambridge, Mass., relative to the Atlanta murders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

61. Also, petition of the executive board South Middlesex Bar Association, Framingham, Mass., relative to the Legal Services Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. Also, petition of the National Capital Union Presbytery, Washington, D.C., relative to a day of mourning for Atlanta; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

63. Also, petition of the Hawaii Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Maui, Hawaii, relative to taxes on agricultural lands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

64. Also, petition of the city council, Cambridge, Mass., relative to nuclear weapons; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 115

Page 7, line 4, strike out "\$219,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$215,800,000,000".

Page 7, line 5, strike out "\$189,750,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$185,950,000,000".

Page 7, line 13, strike out "\$6,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,689,000,000".

Page 7, line 14, strike out "\$6,850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,239,000,000".

Page 7, line 16, strike out "\$8,050,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,550,000,000".

Page 7, line 17, strike out "\$12,350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$11,850,000,000".

Page 7, line 25, strike out "\$21,350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$21,550,000,000".

Page 8, line 1, strike out "\$21,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$21,300,000,000".

Page 8, line 7, strike out "\$28,150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,321,000,000".

Page 8, line 8, strike out "\$29,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$29,571,000,000".

Page 8, line 10, strike out "\$84,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,850,000,000".

Page 8, line 11, strike out "\$74,450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,650,000,000".

Page 8, line 13, strike out "\$278,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$280,393,000,000".

Page 8, line 14, strike out "\$247,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$248,643,000,000".

Page 8, line 19, strike out "\$4,350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,697,000,000".

Page 8, line 20, strike out "\$4,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,897,000,000".