

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 28, 1981

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. His Eminence, Archbishop Vatché Hovsepian, primate of the Armenian Church of North America, Western Diocese, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our loving Father, through the mouth of the prophet Hosea, You proclaimed:

For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice.—Hosea 6: 6.

Again, through Your only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, You said: Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied.—Matthew 5: 6.

Thereby, Your voice resounded for all people in all ages and places that mercy and justice are Your standards.

Today, O Lord, as we commemorate the martyrdom of our people, we ask Your mercy to remember with Your loving kindness, the souls of over 1½ million of our Armenian people, who were martyred in the holocaust of 1915, and all victims of oppression, who have suffered and died at the ruthless hands of consciousness and godless aggression. O Lord, teach us all, that it is only as we live according to Your love for us, and our love for one another, that suffering and injustice will pass from this world.

We humbly thank you, O Lord, for shielding Ronald Reagan, our President, under Your provident care. We ask Your everlasting blessings upon the President of the United States, the honorable Members of this Congress, the members of the Supreme Court, and all the servants of this Nation. Protect them and all of us, from the visible and invisible enemies. Bestow Your divine wisdom upon them and upon all those unto whose judgment the destiny of the United States and the world have been trusted.

We ask this, O Lord, to the praise and glory of Your holy name, and in the name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. 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.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 7, answered "present" 4, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—321

- Addabbo, Albosta, Alexander, Anderson, Andrews, Annunzio, Applegate, Archer, Ashbrook, Aspin, Atkinson, AuCoin, Badham, Bafalis, Bailey (PA), Barnard, Barnes, Beard, Bedell, Bellenson, Benedict, Benjamin, Bennett, Bereuter, Bethune, Bevill, Biaggi, Bingham, Boggs, Boland, Bolling, Bonior, Bonker, Bouquard, Bowen, Brinkley, Brodhead, Brooks, Broomfield, Brown (CA), Brown (CO), Brown (OH), Broyhill, Burgener, Butler, Byron, Campbell, Carney, Chappell, Clinger, Coelho, Coleman, Collins (TX), Conable, Conte, Corcoran, Coughlin, Courter, Coyne, William, Craig, Crane, Daniel, Crane, Phillip, D'Amours, Daniel, Dan, Daniel, R. W., Danielson, Dannemeyer, Daschle, Davis, de la Garza, Deckard, Derrick, Dickinson, Dicks, Dingell, Dixon, Donnelly, Dorgan, Dougherty, Downey, Dreier, Duncan, Dunn, Dwyer, Dymally, Dyson, Early, Eckart, Edwards (AL), Emerson, English, Erdahl, Erlenborn, Ertel, Evans (DE), Evans (IA), Fary, Fenwick, Ferraro, Fields, Findley, Fish, Fithian, Florio, Foley, Fountain, Fowler, Frank, Frenzel, Frost, Fuqua, Gaydos, Gejdenson, Gephardt, Gibbons, Gilman, Gingrich, Ginn, Gonzalez, Gore, Gradison, Gramm, Gray, Green, Gregg, Guarini, Gunderson, Hall (OH), Hall, Sam, Hamilton, Hammerschmidt, Hance, Hansen (ID), Hawkins, Heckler, Hefner, Heftel, Hendon, Hertel, Hiler, Holland, Hollenbeck, Holt, Hopkins, Horton, Howard, Hubbard, Huckaby, Hughes, Hunter, Hyde, Ireland, Jeffords, Jeffries, Jenkins, Jones (OK), Jones (TN), Kazen, Kemp, Kildee, Kindness, Kogovsek, Kramer, Lagomarsino, Lantos, Latta, Leath, LeBoutillier, Lee, Lehman, Lent, Levitas, Lewis, Livingston, Loeffler, Long (LA), Long (MD), Lott, Lowry, Lujan, Madigan, Markey, Marks, Marlenee, Marriott, Martin (NC), Martin (NY), Matsui, Mavroules, Mazzoli, McCollum, McCurdy, McDade, McDonald, McEwen, McGrath, McHugh, Mica, Michel, Mikulski, Miller (CA), Miller (OH), Mineta, Minish, Molinari, Mollohan, Montgomery, Moore, Moorhead, Morrison, Mottl, Murphy, Murtha, Natcher, Neal, Nelligan, Nichols, Nowak, O'Brien, Oberstar, Obey, Panetta, Patman, Patterson, Paul, Pease, Pepper, Perkins, Petri, Edgar, Edwards (OK), Forsythe, Johnston, Lundine, Akaka, Anthony, Bailey (MO), Blanchard, Bliley, Boner, Breaux, Burton, John, Burton, Phillip, Carman, Chappie, Cheney, Chisholm, Clausen, Clay, Coats, Collins (IL), Conyers, Cotter, Coyne, James, Crockett, Daub, Dellums, DeNardis, Derwinski, Dornan, Edwards (CA), Emery, Goodling, Harkin, Jacobs, Ottinger, Udall, Evans (GA), Evans (IN), Fascell, Fazio, Fiedler, Flippo, Foglietta, Ford (MI), Ford (TN), Garcia, Glickman, Goldwater, Grisham, Hagedorn, Hall, Ralph, Hansen (UT), Hartnett, Hatcher, Hightower, Hillis, Hutto, Jones (NC), Kastenmeier, LaFalce, Leach, Lederer, Leland, Lowery, Luken, Lungren, Martin (IL), Mattox, McClory, McCloskey, McKinney, Mitchell (MD), Mitchell (NY), Moakley, Moffett, Myers, Napier, Nelson, Oakar, Parris, Pashayan, Pritchard, Quillen, Railsback, Roberts (KS), Rodino, Roe, Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roukema, Sabo, Santini

- Peysor, Pickle, Porter, Price, Pursell, Rahall, Rangel, Ratchford, Regula, Reuss, Rhodes, Richmond, Rinaldo, Ritter, Roberts (SD), Robinson, Roemer, Rogers, Rose, Roth, Rousselot, Roybal, Rudd, Russo, Savage, Sawyer, Scheuer, Schneider, Schulze, Schumer, Seiberling, Sensenbrenner, Shamansky, Shannon, Sharp, Shaw, Shelby, Shumway, Shuster, Simon, Skeen, Smith (NE), Smith (NJ), Smith (OR), Snowe, Solarz, Solomon, Spence, St Germain, Stangeland, Stark, Staton, Stenholm, Stokes, Stratton, Studds, Stump, Swift, Synar, Tauke, Taylor, Thomas, Traxler, Trible, Vander Jagt, Vento, Volkmer, Walgren, Waxman, Weaver, Weber (MN), Weber (OH), Weiss, White, Whitley, Whittaker, Whitten, Williams (MT), Winn, Wirth, Wolf, Wolpe, Wortley, Wright, Wyden, Yates, Yatron, Young (AK), Young (FL), Young (MO), Zablocki, Zeferetti

NAYS—7

- Walker, Goodling, Harkin, Jacobs

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

- Johnston, Lundine, Ottinger, Udall

NOT VOTING—98

- Evans (GA), Evans (IN), Fascell, Fazio, Fiedler, Flippo, Foglietta, Ford (MI), Ford (TN), Garcia, Glickman, Goldwater, Grisham, Hagedorn, Hall, Ralph, Hansen (UT), Hartnett, Hatcher, Hightower, Hillis, Hutto, Jones (NC), Kastenmeier, LaFalce, Leach, Lederer, Leland, Lowery, Luken, Lungren, Martin (IL), Mattox, McClory, McCloskey, McKinney, Mitchell (MD), Mitchell (NY), Moakley, Moffett, Myers, Napier, Nelson, Oakar, Parris, Pashayan, Pritchard, Quillen, Railsback, Roberts (KS), Rodino, Roe, Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roukema, Sabo, Santini

□ 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.

Schroeder	Stanton	Whitehurst
Skelton	Tauzin	Williams (OH)
Smith (AL)	Wampler	Wilson
Smith (IA)	Washington	Wylie
Snyder	Watkins	

□ 1215

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 3 through May 10, 1981, as "Jewish Heritage Week"; and

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Tuesday, April 28, 1981, to receive a message from the President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 117

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

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate recesses today, it recess as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 3 through 9, 1981, as "National Physical Fitness and Sports for All Week."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 85-874, appointed Mr. McCLURE as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Trustees to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, vice Mr. WILLIAMS, resigned.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 91-551, appointed Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. GARN as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Regents to the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, appointed Mr. CHAFEE as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transporta-

tion, under the above cited law, appointed Mr. STEVENS and Mr. HOLLINGS as members of the same Board of Visitors.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 1126(c) of title 46, United States Code, appointed Mrs. HAWKINS as a member, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, under the above cited law, appointed Mr. GORTON and Mr. INOUE as members of the same Board of Visitors.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. STEVENS (chairman) and Mr. ZORINSKY (vice chairman) as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference, to be held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, May 22-26, 1981.

ARCHBISHOP VATCHE HOVSEPIAN

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure and personal privilege for me today to present as our guest chaplain, Archbishop Vatché Hovsepian, who is primate of the western diocese of the Armenian Church of North America.

His Eminence, Archbishop Hovsepian, was born on June 11, 1930 in Beirut, Lebanon. After his early schooling, he entered the Armenian Theological Seminary in Antelias, Lebanon, to study for the priesthood and was ordained as a celibate priest in 1951. After serving as the assistant dean and instructor at the seminary for 2 years, he was sent to England to continue his theological education and studied at the College of the Resurrection near Manchester, England, for 1 year and thereafter continued his religious studies at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland. He completed his formal theological educational training at New Brunswick Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N.J.

In 1956 Archbishop Hovsepian was appointed as pastor of the Holy Cross Armenian Church of Union City, N.J., and served as the head of that church until October of 1967. While pastor of Holy Cross Church, he took the lead in causing the construction of new church buildings, a new Sunday school headquarters was built, and he caused the tripling of the number of children enrolled in the Armenian schools of that community.

In October 1967 His Holiness Vasken I, appointed him as the vicar general of Canada, consecrated him as bishop

and designated him to be the bishop of Canada. As such, he was the first bishop of Canada and he was responsible for the organization of that completely new diocese. His mastery of the English and French languages was a great help to him in his work in Canada and under his leadership several new parishes were organized, a cathedral was purchased for the diocese, and school facilities were organized in several parishes. In the spring of 1971, his eminence was elected primate of the western diocese of the Armenian Church of North America with his headquarters in Los Angeles. In 1976 he was elevated to the rank of archbishop by His Holiness Vasken I. Archbishop Hovsepian's service as primate of the western diocese of North America is exemplified by the rapid growth and vigorous spiritual and cultural life of his community. He is responsible for the building of several new churches and schools, for organizing new parishes, parish retreats and regional conferences and the important establishment of an endowment fund, thus making the western diocese one of the strongest and fastest growing in his church.

Again, I state I am most pleased to have a chance to sponsor Archbishop Hovsepian's appearance as our guest chaplain today, and I know that you, Mr. Speaker, and all of our Members join in wishing him continued blessing in his work.

ARCHBISHOP VATCHE HOVSEPIAN

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to join my distinguished colleague, GEORGE DANIELSON, of California, in welcoming His Eminence Archbishop Vatché Hovsepian, primate of the Armenian Church of North America, western diocese.

On behalf of my constituents from the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, many of whom are of Armenian descent, I want to say I know how happy they are that Archbishop Hovsepian delivered the invocation.

Prior to assuming his present responsibility as primate of the western diocese of the Armenian Church of North America, Archbishop Hovsepian had served as bishop of Canada and as vicar general of Canada. He had also served as pastor of the Holy Cross Armenian Church of Union City, N.J., and over the years has established a distinguished reputation as a theologian, administrator, author, scholar, and teacher. His inspired leadership was instrumental in revitalizing the western diocese, and it is in large part

due to his dedicated efforts that the St. John Armenian Cathedral of Hollywood was established.

It is especially fitting that Archbishop Hovsepian offered the opening prayer in the House of Representatives, for today we are observing the 66th anniversary of the genocide in 1915 by the Turks of more than 1,500,000 Armenians.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Bishop Hovsepian for being with us and for delivering the invocation today. I also want to add that the sad fate of those innocent victims of the Armenian holocaust is very much in mind today as we pay tribute to their blessed memory and martyrdom.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE MARK D. SILJANDER, OF MICHIGAN, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MARK D. SILJANDER, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Members of the Michigan delegation please escort the gentleman to the rostrum?

Mr. SILJANDER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

□ 1230

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 101(a), Public Law 96-374, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on National Development in Postsecondary Education the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BIAGGI of New York; Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri; and the following from private life: Mr. J. Donald Monan, Chestnut Hill, Mass.; Mr. David M. Bartley, Holyoke, Mass.; Mr. Richard A. Fulton, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Aubrey Lucas, Hattiesburg, Miss.; Mr. John Corbally, Urbana, Ill.; and Mr. Martin Abegg, Peoria, Ill.

THE OUTRAGEOUS ATROCITIES IN EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was announced that after 5

days in El Salvador, Father Roy Bourgeois has been abducted. Father Bourgeois has served at Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in my district in Elmsford, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, I hope a clear message will be sent to President Duarte that after the murder of four American nuns, American businessmen, and now this abduction, that we in this Government have had enough and that further American aid will be dependent on how quickly and properly the Government of El Salvador responds to these outrageous atrocities.

I think we have had enough, and I think the American people have had enough of this type of action.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO EXTEND REORGANIZATION ACT

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to renew the authority of the President to reorganize the executive branch. This authority has been granted to Presidents, with some interruptions, since 1932. The most recent extension expired April 6.

My bill would extend the authority for 2 years from the date of enactment. It would also make a number of other changes in the procedures that have been followed in the past.

The most significant change is in the method of approval of the plans by Congress. Previously, Congress could vote only to disapprove a plan, a confusing procedure that required one to vote "no" in favor of a plan, and "yes" against it. My bill would bring the plans to the floor in a straightforward manner for a vote of approval rather than disapproval.

I am also proposing an extension of the time Congress would have to consider a plan before it went into effect. In the past, 60 days after a plan was submitted to Congress it took effect, unless disapproved by either the House or Senate. I am extending that time to 90 days, after which a plan would go into effect unless an approval resolution was defeated by either the House or Senate.

I am also extending from 30 to 60 days the time in which a plan could be amended by the President after its submission.

I think these changes, along with some of a technical nature that are included in my bill, will provide for a more rational procedure and permit Congress to act in a more responsible manner on reorganization plans.

REQUIEM FOR A HEAVYWEIGHT

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

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, the Nation put to rest, while Congress was in recess, a great American, and I think it is fitting that we pay tribute to this fallen giant.

Joe Louis was the "Champ," the "Brown Bomber," an athlete whose accomplishments are unparalleled. He was the man who, long before the civil rights movement, instilled pride and dignity in the minds and hearts of black Americans. He vindicated us. But he transcended the lines of race and class to become, during World War II, the American hero. In one of history's most poignant moments, this descendant of an enslaved people became the symbol of resistance to the sordid racism of Hitler's Nazi Germany when he defeated Germany's heavyweight boxing champion, Max Schmeling, in 1938. And so he redeemed us.

A simple, humble man, born 66 years ago in the wretched poverty of Alabama, Joe Louis rose to the heights of fame and glory, only to meet again in his last years the trials of economic adversity and debilitating illness. Yet, he retained a sweetness of spirit and an innocent gentleness that might continue to inspire us all in moments of discouragement and despair.

Joe Louis was truly a universal man. What he did, he did often in spite of the obstacles that this country set before him. Yet, he gave to us love, and not bitterness. He gave generously, without selfishness. We are indebted to him, perhaps more than we can ever know. We cannot repay him, except to hold his memory dear.

SMALL ROYALTY HOLDERS AND THE WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to give some relief to small royalty holders from the windfall profit tax. My bill would extend for the life of the tax the 1-year tax credit of the first \$1,000 which would have to be paid on oil production which we enacted in the reconciliation bill at the end of the last Congress. My bill also includes an inflation factor so that that \$1,000 can be increased automatically if inflation continues.

Most of us have received letters indicating the plight of small royalty holders who are not wealthy, who could desperately use the additional money from decontrolled oil prices, and who are turning most of their increased revenue over to the Government under the windfall profit tax. Most of the proposals I have seen to correct this problem, however, deal with a completely different scale.

They call for exemptions from the tax of anywhere from 10 to 1,000 barrels per day of production. For each one barrel exempted, there may be as much as \$5,000 per year in unpaid tax. So, 10 barrels per day equates to \$50,000 per year; and 1,000 barrels means \$5 million per year. With those amounts, we are clearly no longer talking about some retired couple on social security with a small well on their property. Those solutions strike me as shooting rabbits with gold-plated cannon balls.

I believe that my bill, Mr. Speaker, directly addresses the problem which concerns many of us. It will give adequate relief to the small royalty holders. It will not be making the fat cats fatter at the expense of the American public. And it will not make such a large dent in the revenues of the windfall profit tax that we are taking incentive revenue away from those who are making decisions about the finding of new domestic oil sources.

AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED TO FARM BILL TO PROHIBIT SALE OF GRAIN TO SOVIET UNION AT BELOW COST OF PRODUCTION

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

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, by lifting the grain embargo to the Soviet Union, the Reagan administration has in effect allowed a vast subsidy to the Soviet Union, for we sell our grain at below the cost of production and the taxpayer subsidizes that grain and the farmer loses money on it. This loss is a subsidy to the Soviet Union. At the very time that we vote billions of dollars in defense against the Soviet Union, we are subsidizing the Soviet Union by these cheap grain sales.

Mr. Speaker, I will offer an amendment to the farm bill to prohibit the sale of grain to the Soviet Union at below the cost of production.

REAGAN'S DEFENSE SPENDING COULD TURN INTO ECONOMIC NIGHTMARE

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post for Saturday, April 25, contains an outstanding article by Robert G. Kaiser concerning the potential for economic disaster in the huge increase in the defense program requested by President Reagan.

On the basis of interviews with leading economists, Mr. Kaiser points out that if Congress enacts this enormous defense program, as seems likely, and

if the national economy fails to perform as well as the administration predicts, what is supposed to be a balanced budget in 1984 could be a \$100 billion deficit. He also points out that every major economic forecasting firm, as well as the Congressional Budget Office, says that the promised Reagan boom will not materialize.

The article notes that the Reagan administration proposes to increase defense spending in the next 3 years by an amount greater than the entire defense budget of 1978. Further, in constant dollars, this buildup will be three times larger than the Vietnam buildup, which was the strain on our economy that provoked America's current inflation.

Mr. Kaiser's article mentions that the Congressional Budget Office believes that the administration underestimates the rate at which the prices of defense-related products are rising. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that to complete the programs in the Reagan budget could cost \$50 billion more in 1984 than the administration expects. In general, prices for military goods, according to the article, are rising 50 percent faster than the underlying rate of inflation.

Our distinguished colleague, LES ASPIN, has recently brought out a study showing the tremendous economic disadvantage that the United States suffers in competition with Japan and Western Europe because of the fact that the United States spends a far greater proportion of its GNP on military programs than Japan and most of the Western European countries. The Robert Kaiser article quotes economist, Lester C. Thurow of MIT, who points out that one of the reasons for this is that American defense industries draw off the best engineers and skilled labor. Professor Thurow is quoted as saying:

If the skilled personnel and funds that are used for defense here are used for civilian production abroad, it should not come as a great surprise when we are driven out of the civilian markets. What happens to us if we are driven out of semiconductors, microprocessors and computers while we are busy rearming ourselves?

Before the Congress makes the long-range commitment to costly new military programs that is implicit in the Reagan budget, we had better do a cost benefit analysis of these programs. A bankrupt America or one racked by mounting social unrest from civilian budget cuts is not likely to be a very impressive military power.

The full text of the Robert Kaiser article follows:

REAGAN'S DEFENSE SPENDING COULD TURN INTO ECONOMIC NIGHTMARE

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

There is a potential Republican nightmare for 1984 buried in the Reagan administration's "Program for Economic Recovery." It can be found under "D"—for defense.

If Congress enacts the enormous Reagan defense program, as it now seems eager to do, and if the national economy fails to perform as well as the administration predicts it will, that nightmare could become reality. If a tax cut is passed and the promised Reagan boom fails to materialize, what is supposed to be a balanced budget in 1984 could have a \$50 billion to \$100 billion deficit.

Every major economic forecasting firm and the Congressional Budget Office say that the boom won't materialize.

The significance of the administration's proposals can be stated in simple numbers. This year the Pentagon will spend about \$168 billion. By 1984, according to the administration's optimistic calculation, that figure will rise to \$256 billion. By the Congressional Budget Office's reckoning (the CBO is more pessimistic than the administration's Office of Management and Budget about the prospects for reducing inflation), the 1984 figure actually will be \$267 billion, or a 64 percent increase in just three years.

Stated another way, the Reagan administration proposes to increase defense spending in the next three years by an amount greater than the entire defense budget of 1978. In constant dollars, this buildup would be three times larger than the Vietnam war buildup; as a percentage of gross national product the Reagan increase would equal the Vietnam experience. It was that late-1960s strain on the economy, numerous economists say, that provoked America's current economic problems.

Conditions have changed since the late '60s, and there are economists who believe that the economy and the federal budget can absorb the huge defense increases that President Reagan favors (in real terms, an 11.5 percent increase in budget authority this year, a 14.8 percent increase next year). Several administration economists pointed out, that even if the Reagan buildup is fully approved by Congress, defense spending will represent a smaller portion of GNP than it did in the late '60s—about 7 percent compared to 10 percent then. But the proposed increases are unprecedented in size and there is great political momentum now behind them, a combination that makes this potential nightmare at least worth considering.

Few politicians in Washington seem to be considering it just yet. Congress is rushing into the new defense program with enthusiasm and, thus far, very little scrutiny.

Theoretically, nothing would prevent the administration from cutting back on defense spending if it saw the economy falling behind its optimistic predictions. Lawrence Kudlow, chief economist at the Office of Management and Budget, made this point in an interview, saying: "If any overall budgetary adjustments are necessary (in the future), then they'll be made . . . Defense expenditures are always considered as part of the overall budget picture."

But defense spending is not so easy to alter, particularly in the midst of a multiyear buildup like the one now beginning. For example, if the Reagan administration were to decide in January 1983 that excessive defense spending jeopardized any chance at a balanced budget in 1984, it would find that it had already lost control of all but about 16 percent of the procurement outlays scheduled for the 1984 defense budget.

This is because money appropriated for defense programs in one year actually is spent over the next several years. According

to figures compiled by the CBO, \$72 billion will be spent on procurement of weapons and equipment in 1984 under the Reagan budget. But in January 1983, \$61 billion of that amount already would be appropriated (most of it in the '82 and '83 budgets), so it would be locked in and beyond the reach of any sudden effort to cut defense spending. Only about \$11 billion of the '84 outlays would remain to be appropriated after January 1983.

The nonprocurement sections of the budget would be equally hard to reduce suddenly, because they represent money spent to support and maintain forces in being.

Moreover, defense spending is more than just another item in the Reagan budget. The new administration has made a stronger national defense its top spending priority, and has treated funds for the Pentagon as a unique budget category. While the Office of Management and Budget has been slicing away at almost every department in the government, the Reagan White House actually gave the Pentagon more than it asked for in its 1982 budget.

According to sources inside OMB, the usual staff work was dispensed with this winter as the new administration rushed to pump more dollars into defense.

The administration has further committed itself to huge defense outlays by promising to stick to the program it has outlined, even if its price goes up. Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger has testified at least twice that if inflation pushes up costs, he'll return to Congress to ask for more money.

That prospect raises fears among some economists of a repetition of the Vietnam experience. Lyndon B. Johnson refused to raise taxes to pay for his Vietnam buildup, insisting that the Great Society could have both guns and butter. Instead, he set off the inflation that still plagues the United States.

Now President Reagan proposes a much bigger buildup in absolute terms.

Not all economists agree that the defense buildup Reagan proposes is inherently dangerous. Some economists believe the economy now has enough slack to cope with this buildup relatively easily, perhaps at the cost of about an additional one percent added to the inflation rate. That was the consensus among several of the nation's best-known economic forecasters at a Pentagon-sponsored seminar last fall.

But those economists all assumed that a big military buildup would be financed either by a tax increase or by cuts in other forms of government spending. The Reagan budget proposes to balance increased defense spending with a new boom in the domestic economy.

As calculated by Prof. Lester C. Thurow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (an adviser to Democratic politicians who is unabashedly critical of the Reagan program), Reagan proposes to offset a \$196 billion tax cut and a \$181 billion increase in defense spending with \$138 billion in civilian spending cuts. Then new revenue generated by vigorous economic growth hypothetically would balance the Reagan budget by 1984.

Thurow is one of the economists who has argued that the Reagan defense program could create serious new economic difficulties. Another is Wassily Leontief, Nobel Prize-winning economist now at New York University, who said in a recent interview: "If handled improperly, these huge jumps in military spending will mean higher inflation, a worsening balance-of-payments gap,

a drain on productive investment, soaring interest rates, increasing taxes, a debased currency and, in the longer term, more unemployment."

Leontief disputes the administration's optimism.

"Reagan hopes our gross national product will expand so much that we will be able to pay for higher defense spending without raising taxes," he told U.S. News and World Report. "This is not likely to happen. In fact, I personally guarantee that it will not happen."

Administration economists argue otherwise. Kudlow of OMB contends that the administration's budgetary and monetary policies will bring down the inflation rate, thus in effect holding down the real cost of defense spending. He disputed any suggestion that high defense spending might itself aggravate inflation.

"We've done a study on that," Kudlow said. It concluded that when defense spending was high in the 1960s, inflation was low, he said, but when defense spending fell dramatically as a percentage of GNP in the '70s, inflation rates soared.

There are numerous unanswered questions about the potential economic impact of the Reagan defense budget, but few of them have yet been raised in any congressional committee or other official forum.

First of all, the simple budgetary facts have been obscured, largely by rhetoric about the President's "budget-cutting" crusade. In fact, Reagan is not proposing to cut the federal budget. He is proposing to slow the rate at which it will grow. Instead of reducing the budget, the administration wants to transfer billions previously earmarked for social programs into defense.

If the Reagan budget were adopted by Congress, and OMB's optimistic forecasts for the economy came true, this is what would happen to the federal budget and the national economy:

Gross national product would grow 41 percent, from \$2.9 trillion in 1981 to \$4.1 trillion in 1984. Civilian expenditures in the federal budget would grow from \$493.1 billion to \$614.6 billion, a 25 percent increase. And outlays for defense would rise 60 percent from \$162 billion to \$260 billion in 1984—and continue growing to \$343 billion in 1986. (All of these figures are in current dollars, unadjusted for inflation.)

Using the CBO's less optimistic economic assumptions, the 1984 defense budget might be 10 percent higher than Reagan predicts. But the CBO also believes that the administration underestimates the rate at which the prices of defense-related goods are rising. To complete the programs in the Reagan budget could cost \$50 billion more by 1984 than the administration expects, CBO has estimated.

Defense-sector inflation is another area that has received almost no public attention in the discussion so far over Reagan's defense proposals. In fact, prices for military goods are rising 50 percent faster than the underlying rate of inflation.

Some weapons systems have more than doubled in cost just in the last two years. The unit cost of the Army's new, advanced armored personnel carrier, for example, rose 94.8 percent in 1979 and another 65 percent in 1980. A modified version of the C130 air transport equipped with advanced electronics went up in price 75.9 percent in 1979 and another 26 percent last year. The price of an F18 jet fighter, in which the Reagan administration plans to invest heavily, went up 25 percent in 1979 and 44 percent in 1980.

Overall, the costs of the 47 major weapons systems now being purchased by the Pentagon rose more than 20 percent in 1980. According to a CBO calculation, while the underlying rate of inflation in the economy as a whole last year was 9.3 percent, costs of defense purchases went up 14.9 percent. For four years up to 1980, the same index shows, defense-sector inflation was less than a point higher than inflation generally; the sudden jump last year hints at a new explosion in defense costs.

This is another area that has received relatively little public attention, although a number of gloomy (and prolix) official reports have been written on the subject. During the 1970s, when defense spending fell to the lowest levels (as a percentage of GNP) of the postwar era, what has been called the military-industrial complex changed radically. Thousands of small firms that were subcontractors to the giant defense firms in the 1960s—providing 50 to 60 percent of the components of most major weapons systems—went out of business, or out of the defense business.

In many critical areas, there are only one or two firms in the United States that can provide key parts. According to the Pentagon's Defense Science Board, only two companies make the titanium wing skins crucial to advanced aircraft; only three firms make aircraft landing gear; just one manufactures special ball bearings for air frames. Only two shipyards in the country—both of them already working at full capacity—can build many of the ships in the new Navy budget.

As a result of real or potential bottlenecks such as these, the waiting times for the Pentagon to take delivery on major weapons systems after they are ordered have stretched into years. According to the Defense Science Board, the waiting time for an F15 jet fighter is 41 months; for an A10, 49 months. Numerous experts have testified that the U.S. defense industry does not have the capacity to sustain a surge in production to meet the needs, for example, of an unexpected military conflict, and the surge called for in the Reagan budget will be difficult to satisfy.

Bottlenecks in domestic defense industries and a sudden intensification of defense orders contribute to another little-discussed repercussion from a new defense buildup: the stimulation of an increase in imports. Last fall, the major economic forecasters met in a seminar sponsored by the Pentagon to discuss the possible impact of a surge in defense spending. Although they all differed in their predictions, all agreed that increased imports would be one consequence.

Thurow of MIT argues that a defense buildup could prove more profitable to West Germany and Japan than to the United States, partly because of the new sales it will mean for firms in that country, partly because American defense industries draw off the best engineers and skilled labor.

"Would you rather work on designing a new missile with a laser guidance system, or on designing a new toaster?" Thurow has written. "To ask the question is to answer it. Military research and development is more exciting . . . The military is willing to pay almost any premium to have a better product. The civilian economy is not. As a result, the very best brains move into defense."

"If the skilled personnel and funds that are used for defense here are used for civilian production abroad," Thurow added, "it should not come as a great surprise when we are driven out of civilian markets. What happens to us if we are driven out of semi-

conductors, microprocessors and computers while we are busy rearming ourselves?"

None of these questions about the potential impact of the Reagan defense program have been raised very loudly in Congress. Critics can be found, particularly on the liberal end of the political spectrum, but few of them volunteer their views before they are solicited.

"You're going to spend more, get less, and ultimately put yourself in a far more dangerous position," according to Rep. Thomas J. Downey (D-N.Y.). Downey, a member of the House Budget Committee, then was asked if he would try to delete any of the defense program from the budget resolution. No, he said. "It's no use."

DEBATE AND DECISION ON BUDGET MUST BE BASED ON FACT

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

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this week's debate and decision on the budget must be based on fact. And the fact is that the President's budget contains the makings of the highest series of budget deficits in peacetime history.

The spending and revenue estimates in the House Budget Committee's recommendations are based on a cautious forecast of the economy's performance. These projections were made after we listened to the country's most distinguished economists.

The President would have us gamble on his administration's guesses and hopes that the growth rate of the economy will be 80 percent higher than most economists predict. The administration wants us to gamble that inflation and interest rates will decline twice as fast as we can reasonably expect.

I wonder how many of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle would be up here denouncing these rosy economic forecasts if they had been proposed by a Democratic President.

And I wonder how many of my colleagues in the minority would support such huge deficits if they were not camouflaged by phony economic assumptions.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ORGANIZED CRIME ACT OF 1981

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Organized Crime Act of 1981. This legislation comes as a result of extensive hearings held last year by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations chaired by my distinguished colleague from Georgia, SAM NUNN.

This legislation will greatly expand the Federal Government's ability to

fight a network of organized violence which the FBI estimates generates an underground economy of \$120 to \$160 billion each year. When compared to the \$50 billion gross annual income of Exxon, the extent of organized crime in America is staggering. In Florida alone, organized criminal activity has risen over a third in the past 12 months as the infusion of narcotics has turned Florida into a battleground. Law enforcement authorities in Dade County alone reported over 40 gangland executions in a recent 10-month period. The time for action is now.

Today, over 20 percent of FBI investigative units are involved in attacking mob violence. Organized crime knows no ethnic boundaries and encompasses the entire spectrum from the Hell's Angels to the massive and infamous La Cosa Nostra. Despite this diversity, all of organized crime has a single common denominator: violence.

Testimony before PSI painted a terrifying picture of organized violence in this country. Horror stories of bombings in Kansas City and Rochester, the brutal murders of innocent bystanders in Chicago, and an eerie recounting of a Mafia initiation ceremony in New York seem more from the pages of trashy novels than the pages of Senate hearings. Yet the assassination of a Federal judge in Texas and the gangland executions of south Florida are graphic reminders that mob violence is all too real. According to Senator PERCY:

Shakedowns and threats remain the standard mob business tool, with bombings, arson, and murder the necessary back-up. To insure its success, the mob bankrolls political corruption so that eyes are diverted and backs conveniently turned, leaving the victims helpless and utterly alone.

We can afford to turn our backs no longer. The growth of this cancer known as organized crime must be arrested before it eats away the foundation of law and order on which our Nation rests. We can wait no longer.

The Organized Crime Act of 1981 seeks to engage all the resources of the Federal Government in the war against mob violence. First, it would allow the Federal and local governments to work hand in hand in the investigation and prosecution of organized crime, including the area of professional contract murders. Second, it will make it a Federal offense to harm or threaten law enforcement officials, witnesses and potential witnesses, informants, and their families. It will also expand the court's authority to protect the confidentiality—and the lives—of informants. Third, it will allow Federal judges to dramatically increase the penalty for crimes committed through the use of violence. Finally, this legislation would provide flexibility in denying bail to those who could be proved to be a threat to the

community. All too often, major drug smugglers look upon bail as "simply the cost of doing business." Violence, narcotics, and organized crime are inseparable. This legislation would help insure that the highest echelons of the organized crime/drug cartel are brought to trial.

Mr. Speaker, organized crime becomes stronger each day. We can wait no longer. I urge the Congress to move quickly in enacting this urgent legislation.

NEWEST MEMBER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—MARK SILJANDER OF FOURTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

(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, today we welcome the newest Member of the House of Representatives, MARK SILJANDER of the Fourth District of Michigan.

The gentleman from Michigan comes to this House on the wave of an impressive landslide victory. He is the 190th Republican Member. Believe me when I say I am happy to have his vote added to that of his 189 colleagues on this side of the aisle. His timing could not have been better.

The gentleman, I am sure, knows full well the challenges that lie ahead for him. But in my conversations with him, I have come to believe that he will meet those challenges expertly. Mr. SILJANDER brings to the House his experience as a State representative in Michigan, he is no stranger to the legislative process.

We are very happy to have him among us and pledge our cooperation and assistance in the weeks and months ahead.

When we leave the floor today, we intend to give the gentleman from Michigan a crash course in matters pertaining to the Federal budget. He will have a test on the subject matter within a very few days. I can assure you he will be well prepared, and I am confident he will pass with flying colors.

VETERANS' CENTERS SHOULD NOT BE CLOSED

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

Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess I visited the Veterans' Administration Office in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

This office is staffed by only four people. But it serves 11 counties and conducts over 1,800 interviews each month.

If OMB guidelines are followed, the Wilkes-Barre Center will be closed. In addition, a service officer located at the VA hospital in Wilkes-Barre may lose his job.

In my opinion, these actions would be penny wise and pound foolish. The Wilkes-Barre Center provides invaluable service to hundreds of thousands of veterans in northeastern Pennsylvania. And the service officer assigned to Wilkes-Barre has provided over 30 years of dedicated assistance. This man is also a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that these OMB guidelines are just that—guidelines and not a directive. I urge the OMB to withdraw these guidelines immediately so that veterans throughout the Nation can continue to receive the service they so richly deserve.

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

Mr. NELLIGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, being on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I think I can assure the gentleman today that we think there is a hold on cutting back on these regional offices on personnel and also on the Outreach facilities, and I think the gentleman's position on this facility that there should not be a reduction in personnel at this time, we have gotten that commitment from the OMB, and this pertains to all of the regional offices and some of the hospital-bed personnel around the country. So there is a hold on cutting back on VA personnel at this time in the VA administration personnel.

Mr. NELLIGAN. I thank the chairman for that good news.

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY PLAN SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 weeks I have been traveling throughout my district in Idaho listening to people's concerns and thoughts. From senior citizens to union members, farmers to loggers, and miners to businessmen—I came away with the same message.

My farmers are hurting. My home-builders are sitting idle. My loggers are not cutting. Small businesses are going under. Economic stagnation has dug its claws into the State of Idaho.

The people of Idaho asked me to return with a message for you, Mr. Speaker. They wanted me to tell you and the other Members of the House that they are waiting on the implementation of President Reagan's economic recovery program. They want this House to work with the Senate

and the President to reduce our inflation, to reduce our taxes, and to restore the American dream of hope and prosperity.

The people back home realize some hurt will be felt with reductions to Government programs. They are willing to accept the hurt today in order to have a better tomorrow. Those miners, farmers, loggers, union members, and businessmen will do their part to make America great again—strong again. It is time we do ours.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more time. The need is now. The choice is clear. An economic idea has been planted. It is now time to harvest. Let us put President Reagan's economic recovery plan into action now.

□ 1245

A VOTE FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the support I found at home last week for President Reagan's economic program was overwhelming, from Democrats and Republicans alike.

The President has my support and I would like to share just one example of why the President's program is so vital to the economic survival of this Nation.

The local board of realtors in Pomona, Calif., delivered a letter with thousands of signatures for me to bring back to President Reagan. The point of the letter was simply this: Too many Americans can no longer afford to buy a home. With the median cost of a house at \$64,000, at today's interest rates the average family of four would require nearly \$38,000 in income to qualify for purchase. With such statistics, nearly 68 million Americans are shut out of the housing market.

If business as usual is allowed to continue, by 1984 that family would need an income of \$60,000 to afford a new home.

Vote "no" for business as usual, vote "no" for inflation and high-interest rates, vote "yes" for the Reagan bipartisan budget resolution.

CONSTITUENTS OF REPRESENTATIVE HILER SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PACKAGE

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

Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I mailed a questionnaire out to the people of the Third Congressional District of the State of Indiana. One of the questions dealt with the Presi-

dent's program for economic recovery; whether the people support the President's approach to solving our Nation's economic problems.

At the beginning of last week the responses began to arrive.

Well, those responses support President Reagan by a wide margin of 7 to 1—84 percent of the people in my district support the President's economic policies.

Like many of my colleagues, I was elected on a promise to support the proposals that are now the essential parts of President Reagan's economic package.

I urge all Members of the House to listen to their constituents—the people want the whole package. They want the tax cuts across the board. They want the spending cuts, which will reduce the Federal role in the economy. They want the opportunity to be able to keep their hard-earned dollars without being penalized by taxation.

On November 4 the people voted for Ronald Reagan; I think it is about time the Congress voted for Ronald Reagan.

I hope when President Reagan comes before Congress tonight in this Chamber, the Members will give him the warm reception he deserves, reflecting the overwhelming popular support for his economic proposals.

CONGRESSMAN BADHAM IN TOTAL SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY PLAN

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

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, tonight our President will address a joint session of Congress in an effort to drum up support for his economic plan for this Nation.

Unfortunately, there is a three-letter word being used among many of my colleagues that will have the net effect of tearing the administration's plan into little pieces. That word is the conjunction, "but."

On a daily basis I hear such utterances as: "I support the President's economic recovery plan, but * * *," or, "I support the administration in its efforts to cut the cost and size of Government, but * * *."

There are just too many "buts" being used today in conjunction with the President's program. If we are serious about getting this country back on track, and have taken note of the mandate of November 4, then we ought to stop this nitpicking and support our President.

I believe the administration's philosophy was made clear when our former colleague, Dave Stockman, remarked:

I don't believe that there is any entitlement, any basic right to . . . services; and the idea that's been established over the last ten years that almost any service that someone might need in life ought to be provided, financed by the government as a matter of basic right, is wrong. We (the Administration) challenge that. We reject that notion.

I plan to support the President's economic recovery plan—no ifs, ands or buts.

KANSAS CITY ROYALS URGE PRESIDENT TO COME OUT SWINGING

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks I have put over 1,900 miles on my car, traveling the length and breadth of the Second District of Kansas to hear the people's views.

In my travels, I repeatedly heard one thing—support the President's program of budget cuts and tax rate reduction.

Today I was proud to present to President Reagan a baseball bat, symbol of the people's message to "go to bat for the President's program." I fully intend to be a pinchhitter for our President in the budget battle that faces us.

The bat that I will be presenting personally to the White House later this week has a special significance for us Kansans. It has been signed by the team members of our own Kansas City Royals. The Royals have asked me to urge the President to come out swinging in his fight against inflation and an unbalanced budget.

I am happy to oblige.

CONGRESS SHOULD RESIST EFFORTS TO DISMANTLE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PACKAGE

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's economic recovery program and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to act now to reduce Federal spending and taxes. Only if the President and Congress can work together will we reduce inflation which continues to sap the economic strength of our country. Twenty years ago, America enjoyed the premier economy of the world. Now, the signs of decay are everywhere.

Young people cannot buy a home; parents cannot educate their children; people on fixed incomes can no longer make ends meet. Inflation is devastating and it is our No. 1 problem.

Within 30 days of taking office, President Reagan proposed a sweep-

ing, four-part program for economic recovery for the United States. The program is squarely based upon the campaign promises of the President and thus reflects the overwhelming mandate on which he was elected. During my own campaign for Congress I espoused the key elements of this plan: Spending cuts; tax rate cuts; regulatory relief; and a stable monetary policy.

I am committed to President Reagan's economic program—a program which offers vision for the future and hope at long last for fulfillment of our economic goals. I urge my colleagues to resist any efforts to dismantle the President's budget package.

ADMINISTRATION'S FOOD STAMP LEGISLATION

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce the administration's food stamp legislation. As ranking minority member of the House Agriculture Committee's Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition Subcommittee, I am committed to the goal of reducing the level of spending for food stamps while retaining a program adequate to serve the needs of those Americans truly dependent on nutrition assistance.

Latest Government statistics show that nearly 23 million Americans—1 out of every 10 of our citizens—receive food stamp benefits. In fiscal year 1981, outlays could reach as high as \$11.45 billion—some \$1.75 billion above the 1981 cap.

Clearly this program is out of control. The voters have told us as much by sending us a clear message that they want the food stamp program streamlined and restored to its traditional role as a food program for needy Americans—not an income maintenance program.

The administration has put forth a plan to reduce fiscal year 1982 spending by \$1.8 billion. I believe the suggestions are worthy of support by all Members of this body who believe, as I do, that Federal spending must be reduced through careful reconsideration of our budget process.

Let me take a few moments to outline the major provisions of this legislation and the intended savings:

First. Set income eligibility limit at 130 percent of the poverty level. The administration estimates that less than 400,000 households would be excluded from the food stamp program by instituting this procedure. No family with an annual income below \$11,000 would be dropped from food stamps. Under current law, a family of four with an income of nearly

\$14,000—over \$1,100 per month—could receive food stamp benefits in fiscal year 1982. By raising the income eligibility to 130 percent of the poverty level we could reduce outlays by \$270 million.

Second. Offset food stamp allotments for school lunch benefits. This procedure of eliminating one benefit per day per school age child during the school year would save about \$522 million in fiscal year 1982, according to administration estimates. Under current law, food stamp allotments are calculated on the assumption that all family members eat all meals at home. However, many students eat free school lunches. As a result, Federal nutrition subsidies are duplicated for about 2.5 million households. By instituting a school lunch offset, the average monthly food stamp allotment for a household would be reduced by \$11 per student per month in fiscal year 1982. As a comparison, the average monthly free lunch subsidy in 1982 for each student will be about \$23.

Third. The administration seeks a \$460 million savings by instituting a recommendation by the previous administration to repeal liberalized deductions scheduled for fiscal year 1982. The last administration, and the current one, see the need to bring the food stamp deduction procedures into line with other Government programs.

Fourth. Further savings, in the neighborhood of \$310 million would be realized by maintaining other deductions at fiscal year 1981 levels and by improving management procedures in order to reduce the error rate in food stamp issuance.

Fifth. And, finally, by calculating food stamp benefits on past income rather than estimated income in the future, we can save a significant amount in future years.

Mr. Speaker, it is readily apparent that the administration is committed to improving the administration of the food stamp program through tighter cost controls and management procedures. The spending reductions being sought in this legislation have been carefully determined. They are designed to bring the food stamp program back to its original purpose.

Without these cost-saving measures I fear a growing public anger against the entire program and its worthy goal of providing nutrition assistance to the truly needy. We must, therefore, approve these reasonable improvements which will not take food out of the mouths of those in need, but which will bring fiscal restraint to one of the fastest-growing and unrestrained Federal spending programs in our Nation's history.

IT IS TIME FOR A CHANGE

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

Mr. WEBER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to reaffirm my support for President Reagan's program for economic recovery and for the vision he has for America. I say this not just for myself but for the citizens of the Ninth District of Ohio whom I have the privilege to represent. Like all of us, I have just returned from our district work period. What the people back home told me is very simple—it is time for a change.

Today we have a President who has offered us a new beginning, a solid program which requires "our best efforts and our willingness to believe in ourselves and our capacity to perform great deeds." President Reagan has won the support of the American people. A recent poll conducted in my district shows support for President Reagan's programs running 8 to 1. Time, however, is running out. We may not get another chance. As a constituent who recently wrote me stated: "America can't afford to drop the ball on this one."

THE MOMENT OF TRUTH

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, today the House Rules Committee began consideration of the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1982. Tonight the President will address a joint session of Congress in this Chamber on the importance of our decision on that budget resolution to the success of his program for economic recovery. This Thursday we will begin debate on that budget resolution in the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching a moment of truth in this House, a critical test of whether we are serious about cutting back on Government spending, giving the American people a real tax break and putting this country back on the road to economic prosperity.

If there is one truth which was impressed I think on the Members during our district work period, it is that last fall's election results were no fluke. They were a genuine mandate from the American people for the kind of economic recovery program the President has proposed.

I would appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here today as we approach this moment of truth to support the Latta-Gramm substitute which will implement the will and the mandate of the American people and to reject the O'Neill-Jones resolution which ignores that mandate by in-

creasing spending and taxes while reducing defense spending.

THE PEOPLE SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have returned from Easter recess in my hometown of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., with one clear message ringing in my mind: The people support the President.

I made many speeches and the response of the audience was always the same; overwhelming support of the President's proposed budget.

I spoke to senior citizens in the condominiums, to working men and women in an electronics plant; I spoke to Cuban Americans, The Broward County League of Cities representing every city in my district; I spoke to chambers of commerce, to building contractors; I spoke to Jewish groups, and to church groups.

At a meeting of senior citizens, one man stood up to speak against the President. When I asked him if he wanted more of what we have had for the last 4 years, he emphatically responded, "No."

Because the Fort Lauderdale area is a retirement community, and the home of retirees from all corners of the country, I consider our community to be a representative cross-section.

Our community is overwhelmingly in favor of President Reagan's budget.

I am proud to support the President's budget.

LET'S GET WITH IT

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, later this week as we begin consideration of the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1982, we will be confronted with a clear choice. We can choose to continue down the same road of tax and spend and tax and spend that we have been on for the last 30 years and adopt the Budget Committee's recommendation; or we choose to adopt the President's "program for economic recovery" as embodied in the Gramm-Latta alternative.

What will the difference be if we choose the committee's budget instead of the President's? The difference is quite clear. The Federal Government will spend an extra \$25.3 billion, and the American people will be forced to pay an additional \$38.6 billion of their hard-earned money in taxes under Mr. JONES' committee plan.

This, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the American people said they were sick and tired of on November 4. The

American people voted for lower spending, lower taxes, and responsible fiscal policy.

The choice is ours. We can support the committee's recommended budget of more spending, more taxes, more inflation, and continued economic stagnation. Or we can support the President's program of lower Government spending, lower taxes, lower inflation, lower interest rates, lower unemployment, and long-term economic growth.

Which road will we choose? I for one intend to vote for the President's program. A program to get Government off the backs and out of the pockets of the American people. A program to restore real growth and prosperity to the American economy. A program of renewed opportunity for all Americans. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, we are charged with representing the people. Let us get on with it.

□ 1300

AMERICANS ARE WILLING TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR OWN MONEY

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

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, before leaving Washington for the recent district work period, we read and heard a great deal about public opinion with regard to the President's program for economic recovery, and I have to admit that I was more than a little confused to hear that there was increasing support for fiscal retrenchment, but skepticism about the need for a tax cut.

You can imagine my relief after spending about 12 days in southwestern Ohio and learning that the people of my district, and I suspect many others, are willing to shoulder the responsibility of keeping a little more of their money each year if we are willing to let them.

Most of the people I talked with seemed to think that inflation was hitting them twice: at the cash register and in their tax bills. And most of them seemed to think that taxes would continue to increase, I am told at a rate of about 16 percent a year, if we do not do something.

I know my constituents are being told that tax cuts would be inflationary—that it is inflationary for people to spend their money when their Government could be spending it—but you should see what these people would do with their money if they could count on a tax cut being phased in over a 3-year period, and they could plan ahead.

Why, they would reduce their debt, or save it. Some of them would salt some money away in the hope of

making a down payment on a home. Some would invest their money. Is that so bad?

But they know that a one-shot tax cut would increase consumption and be inflationary.

We have got to help restore confidence in our economy and in the Congress. What better way than to tell the American people that we are going to let them have the tools they need to rebuild our economy. And that they can depend on it.

GOING TO BAT FOR PRESIDENT REAGAN

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud and honored today to be asked to put on a pin to indicate that I am going to be at bat for President Reagan, for the American people and for the President's economic recovery program.

I think that we have a vital opportunity to turn this country around, to cut spending, to cut taxes, to have an opportunity to fight inflation and to create permanent jobs in the private sector.

With this pin, I am indicating my support for the President's economic recovery program. I hope every Member of the House in a bipartisan effort will join us in voting to change the way things have been going.

JOINT RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

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

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in September 1975 I introduced H.R. 9460 which authorized the people of the Virgin Islands to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of drafting a constitution providing a republican form of government and a Bill of Rights. This bill received tremendous support in the House, with 102 bipartisan cosponsors; it was passed on a unanimous vote by the Interior Committee; and it passed on a unanimous vote of the entire House on October 6, 1975. The bill became Public Law 94-584 on October 21, 1975.

Today, I am pleased to introduce this joint resolution supporting the proposed constitution for the U.S. Virgin Islands. Joining me as cosponsors are Hon. ANTONIO WON PAT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs; Hon. ROBERT LAGOMARSINO, ranking minority member; and Hon. PHILLIP BURTON, previous chairman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs and longtime friend of the ter-

ritory. The constitution reflects the efforts of the delegates elected to the Fourth Constitutional Convention, who have worked diligently to create a document which provides the greatest opportunity for self-government while recognizing our position as part of these United States.

The people of the Virgin Islands have not taken the opportunity to demonstrate their political maturity lightly. This is evidenced by the fact that this is the fourth constitution drafted. The delegates, ever aware of their responsibility, have presented a document reflecting major concerns of the people.

Approval of this joint resolution, as submitted, would be consistent with established congressional policy to provide ever-increasing self-government for the territory and to allow the people of the Virgin Islands to exercise their basic right to self-determination. Upon approval, the constitution will be returned to the people of the Virgin Islands for them to complete this process by exercising their judgment in referendum.

THE DEMORALIZED NEEDED

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have spent a great deal of my time during the course of the last 2 weeks talking to my constituent groups. Dozens and dozens of organizations and individuals have come to my office, or I have seen them in their own areas, talking about the programs which they have depended upon for survival. They come to me demoralized and they leave depressed because I would tell them what they have been reading about the Reagan proposals is, in fact, true; that there will, indeed, be between \$40 billion and \$50 billion of those programs, child nutrition, education, aid for senior citizens, transportation, and health, and you name it, that are going to be cut back. They cannot understand it. They look at a President who seems to be a nice guy and they say, "How can he be doing this to us?"

I tell them, indeed, he is doing it to them. The saving grace, Mr. Speaker, is that after a year and a half or two perhaps the pendulum will swing back. I do not believe that the American people will stand for the kind of radical retreat which is being sounded by the Reagan administration.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO GIVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, with all of the interest we are hearing around the Nation on the economy, I believe that it is time for the Congress to give the American people a balanced budget.

On April 20, the Commerce Department announced the economic growth figures for the first quarter of this calendar year. Those figures that reflect an annual growth rate of 6.5 percent—the highest growth rate in nearly 3 years.

On the following day, the cost price index for March reflected an annual rate of inflation of 7.5 percent—the lowest in many years.

These data are a clear signal that the economy is not staggering poised to plummet. Instead, it is making a strong recovery from the energy price increases inflicted during the past year and a half.

The economy, in my view, does not need inflationary stimulation imposed by a tax cut. It needs a balanced budget which will get the Government out of financial markets and ease high interest rates to allow productivity growth to create jobs, increase revenues, and make a tax cut possible next year.

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN MASSACRE

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

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 24, 1981, marked the 66th anniversary of the beginning of the first genocide of the 20th century, the first holocaust. I refer to the infamous Armenian genocide which began shortly after midnight on the morning of April 24, 1915.

At that time agents of the Ottoman Turkish Government commenced that genocide by the sudden rounding up of the leaders of the Armenian community in Turkey as the first step of a planned, vicious, highly organized genocide, which to that time was without precedent in human history.

This is the 11th year in which I have reserved a special order in order to remind the world of the historic facts of the Armenian genocide and to give my colleagues an opportunity to join with me in expressing their remembrance for those events.

This year, because of the Easter recess which resulted in the Congress not being in session on April 24, I am holding this special order on Tuesday, April 28, in order to conform to the congressional schedule. You will remember that today we were honored by the appearance of Archbishop Vatché Hovsepian as our guest chaplain. Archbishop Hovsepian is the pri-

mate of the Western Diocese of the Armenian Church in North America with headquarters in Los Angeles, Calif. He made his trip from California today for the express purpose of appearing before us.

There are those who would ask, "Why remind us again of the facts of the Armenian genocide which took place so long ago; this particularly since the events have been gone over by you so many times in the past?"

There are those who would say, "Why bring this matter up again? What can be accomplished, particularly since the facts are so well known and since it seems that repetition will produce no results?"

Well, to them I reply that we will always remember, that we may never forget, the martyrdom of those who were put to death simply because of their religious beliefs and because of the incredible policy of genocide which was conceived and carried out by the Ottoman Turkish Government against those helpless people.

There is probably no Armenian-American family today which did not have one or more members who lost their lives in that first genocide.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that at that time, 66 years ago, there were only about 3 million Armenians alive in the entire world; about 1 million of them, half of all the Armenians then alive, were put to death by cruel and unusual means, by being buried alive, by being trampled to death by charging cavalry horses, by being beheaded and cut apart, by hanging, by being driven out into the desert, there to die of thirst and starvation, by death in whatever form; 1.5 million people, half of that race the first genocide, the first holocaust of the 20th century.

You will remember that His Eminence Archbishop Hovsepian, who prayed for us today, the primate of the church, was here to be our guest chaplain. I know that his own family was gravely touched. His mother was with us today. His mother was one of the surviving victims of the genocide. Her parents, her brothers, and sisters, perished in the genocide. Somehow she escaped. Somehow she was able to get away through the help of friends into Egypt or some other such place and finally was transported into Lebanon where she found refuge. That is a common story among Armenians. I know, because I represent one of the largest Armenian communities in America.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a family in that group that did not lose someone, a mother, a father, a brother, a sister, children, someone died, sometimes all of them perished. They will never forget and because of the fact that their descendants here in America have never forgotten, and because now these facts

are recorded in history, no one is ever going to forget.

I can only regret one thing. For some incomprehensible reason the present Government of Turkey does not seem to want to make amends. Most of us are old enough to remember the second great genocide of the 20th century, the genocide of the Jews in Hitler's Nazi Germany. While it was terrible beyond description, at least the German Government after the war, those who replaced the evil Hitler, acknowledged the wrong, took whatever steps it could to make amends and have tried to heal this horrible breach in human relations. And the good results are clear for all to see.

On the other hand, the present Turkish Government denies to this day that there ever was such a thing as a genocide. What a ridiculous and untenable position. Our own U.S. Ambassador to Turkey at the time reported to the American people on the details of the genocide and those records are a part of the Archives of the United States today.

□ 1315

They can be found in the Archives of the U.S. Department of State.

The U.S. Ambassador, the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Sr., of New York, a very distinguished member of a most distinguished American family, wrote a book reflecting those facts which he, as our Ambassador, saw, and which he tried to prevent. Yet for some reason the present Turkish Government does not even admit that these horrible facts of history took place.

That is a grave and offensive mistake which adds grievous insult to the prior crime. In the affairs of man, and under the laws of God, there is always room for repentance and repentance can heal the wounds of human relations even so great as these.

I thank God, I thank the framers of our Constitution for the privilege of free speech, that we have been able to put into the records of this Congress, we have been able to put into the records of the United States for all of the world to know that these facts, the Armenian genocide, did take place and that we shall never forget those who were its victims.

History shows that when Hitler commenced his genocide of the Jews some 40 years ago, 45 years ago, some people protested to him that this was something the world would not tolerate, and history shows that Hitler replied, "Well, who today remembers the Armenians?" That was his justification for going ahead with his genocide, and that is a good reason for us to remember that we must not forget, because it is through forgetting that we permit these things to happen again.

I am most pleased to note that these efforts of the past 11 years have not been in vain. I am happy to report that on last Friday, April 24, 1981, our President, Ronald Reagan, issued Presidential Proclamation 4838 of April 22, 1981, to commemorate days of remembrance of the victims of the holocaust as required by legislation this Congress passed last year.

While that proclamation is directed to the Jewish holocaust carried out under the regime of Adolph Hitler, I am proud to report that President Reagan did include within the proclamation this language:

Like the genocide of the Armenians before it—and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it and like too many other such persecutions of too many other peoples—the lessons of the holocaust must never be forgotten.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we will never forget, and the world will never forget, the first genocide of the 20th century, the Armenian genocide of 1915.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 66 years ago, on April 24, 1915, the Turks set out to exterminate the whole Armenian Christian population within the Ottoman borders.

Systematically, and with cold callousness, the Turks first killed the writers, teachers, clergymen, and leaders of the Armenian people. Then the able-bodied men were brutally murdered and the young women enslaved. The remaining women, children, and old people were forced to march barefooted, under the blazing Sun, without food or water, toward their ultimate destruction in the remote desert of Der-el-Zor.

The Honorable Henry Morgenthau, our country's Ambassador to Turkey when the Armenian massacres took place, was a personal witness to this unprecedented effort to destroy an entire people. At the time he declared:

Whatever crimes the most perverted instincts of the human mind can devise, and whatever refinements of persecutions and injustice the most debased imagination can conceive, became the daily misfortunes of this devoted people. I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

When the carnage was over, more than 1.5 million innocent men, women, and children had been brutally murdered. This past Sunday, April 26, a memorial service was held in Lafayette Park across from the White House in remembrance of these brave martyrs who died in the Armenian genocide. Bishop Mesrob Ashjian, of the Eastern Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America, officiated at the service, and I am pleased to include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the inspirational remarks he made at

the memorial service. His remarks follow:

I would like to express my deep and sincere thanks to all of you who associated yourselves this morning in prayers, thoughts and words, with this requiem liturgy and public commemoration. By doing so, you have venerated the Armenian martyrs' sacred memory; and have enhanced our hopes for our future. Because unique in comparison to other holocaust memorials, this liturgy and requiem service not only commemorates the first genocide of the 20th century, but also the heightened awareness and loyalty of the Armenian people who have survived and prospered for 66 years since the aftermath.

We are here today to remember and to dedicate ourselves. We are here to remember the Genocide of 1915. The Genocide . . . the Holocaust . . . I know that these words impose silence; but at the same time demand speech, demand expression! I fully realize that we still have not learned how to talk about the horror of the Genocide. We all know the purpose behind it very well; and the reasons for the perpetration of that most horrendous crime against humanity. However, we should be reminded from time to time of the Genocide's purpose:

Here are the words of Talaat, Turkish Minister of the Interior, in a cable dated September 15, 1915:

"It has recently been communicated that the government, following the order of the Committee, has decided to exterminate all the Armenians living in Turkey . . . It is necessary to put an end to their existence without regard to women, children and invalids, however tragic the means of extermination."

But even so, Armenians live! Armenians survive! Armenia lives! And a people who refused to die, lives on! Out of the ashes of a three year long holocaust, the free and independent Armenia was born. The Armenians built scores of monuments in memory of the martyrs, but the most vital memorial is not in Montebello, in Montevideo, in Marseilles, but in Armenia. Armenia herself is the living, thriving memorial for all our martyrs; and the beacon for the rosy future.

But here we are: The other half of Armenia in the Diaspora. We are scattered all over the world. In sixty countries, sharing sixty different fates. Yet we reject that fate; we reject the Diaspora as our tomb. We cling tenaciously to our claims, fully realizing that we constitute the very essence of the Armenian entity. We vow to rediscover our common language, to recreate our common religion and to reclaim our common culture, awaiting the day when all our lands will be ours once more, because we firmly believe, that a particular culture flourishes best on its land!

Now we are told that a people has no right to claim a particular land as its own. No law exists that binds a people to a specific land. It is solely our consciousness of an Armenian selfhood that gives us the right to claim our ancestral lands. Locations and places do not retain the memory of passing events; but rather, it is the spirit that remembers these things. Since history lives on only in the mind, then it is the mind that finally creates the place, the land, the nation.

The first Roman soldier who viewed the bodies of 960 warriors who committed mass suicide in Masada to avoid being taken as slaves, had apparently understood this concept, when he exclaimed, "The rock and men have become one." It is our belief that the land of Armenia, from Vartan to Tavit

Beg, from Antranig to the heroes of Sardarabad, have become one with its people. This land of rocks, and all its men, have indeed become one. We are moved to look to our land as belonging to us; we are moved to claim her always.

But here, we find ourselves in the Diaspora; and in our lives bear the consequences of the Armenian massacres. The injustice committed against our nation remains unpunished. We have responsibilities that we can not shun. We must see to it that never again such a crime be committed against any nation. But we Armenians are not separate from other peoples. We Armenians are also part of God's creation. We share the one and the same human destiny. Therefore, it is our responsibility to look around us and to be sympathetic to the plight of any other nation to the suffering of any other people.

Massacres? Our own time is full of stories of atrocities: Uganda, Biafra, the Khmer Rouge, Equatorial Guyana, East Timor, El Salvador, Lebanon, the boat-people in the China Sea. And here we observe our own people who appear so uninformed, so indifferent; as though there were two humanities. We, with the memory of our lives, of our suffering; and they with theirs. We watch television, and, between commercials we see the sad images of human horror and suffering; and say, "too bad." Should we not be observing all this with different eyes, perhaps with fuller hearts? These people are not strangers to us after all. The vivid reality is not in our peaceful homes, but over there, where men are still being tortured and massacred.

It is about time to understand that there are not two humanities, but one, and that we are part of it. Last April, the then Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific affairs, Richard Holbrooke, was congratulating himself for the fact that there isn't a single nation facing extinction, except . . . Cambodia. The columnist of the New York Times who was quoting him commented, "None of us would want to face the question: where were you when Cambodia died?"

We Armenians have the right to ask, "Where were you when Armenia was dying?" But this fact does not give us the right to play the role of Pontius Pilate, to wash our hands of the matter, and to say, "Who cares, anyway. Who cared for us that we should be compelled to care for others? Let them die."

We, as Christians, have the responsibility of fighting justice and oppression whenever and wherever it occurs. As Christians we have the moral responsibility to be committed to action to insure justice, peace and freedom for all people. The Genocide of our own people makes it imperative for us to commit ourselves to the infusion of the values of love and compassion into the powers and principalities of all governments. If we were allowed to paraphrase the late Jean Paul Sartre's famous words addressed to a gathering of intellectuals, we would say, "The task of the Christian is not to decide where there are battles but to join them wherever and whenever the people wage them. Commitment is an act, not a word."

Commitment is an act, not a word. And we, the Armenians, especially living in our Diaspora situation, should be ready for this: to commit ourselves and to act; to keep the spirit of the Armenian alive, to learn our language, to be in communication with the saints of our church, the heroes of our

nation. Be faithful to the tradition, to the history, to the very blood. And never to forget! But to remember always; so that never again a holocaust similar to the Armenian massacres would ever happen. Remember and look around us; help people who fight for human rights, for human dignity.

Avedis Aharonian, the renowned Armenian poet says, "If this much blood can be forgiven by our children, let the whole world rightfully insult us all . . ." There comes a time for forgiving, for who can live and not forget? Now and then, however, we should always remember and proclaim:

In the presence of eyes
Which witnessed the slaughter,
Which saw the oppression
The heart could not bear,
and as witness the heart
that once taught compassion
until the days came to pass
that crushed human feeling,
I have taken an oath:
To remember it all
To remember, not once to forget.

Mr. Speaker, a just solution for the Armenian grievance must be achieved, for to ignore the injustice done to them will only encourage others in such lawless and inhuman crimes. It is the hope of Armenians everywhere that the United Nations will take decisive action to provide a peaceful redress for their legitimate grievance.

As Members of Congress, let each of us examine our conscience and let us do our utmost to alleviate the memory of this unjustified crime against the Armenian people, the scars of which are carried in the hearts and minds of every surviving Armenian.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, with pervasive remorse and a burning desire to be heard, Armenians in the United States and throughout the world commemorate on April 24 the wholesale slaughter of 1.5 million of their people by the forces of the Ottoman Empire in 1915. It is essential that a candid world note the occurrence of this odious tragedy, and remember with opprobrium the atrocious conduct of the malefactors in question. Persecuted mainly for their Christian fervor and implacable resistance to religious oppression, the Armenians of the Empire were subject to mass butchering until 1922, resulting in horrific total losses of over 2.5 million souls.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues afford these persecuted millions the honor and prayers they deserve, and appeal to the conscience of the Turkish nation to take note of this repugnant and grossly inhumane chapter in their 20th-century history.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 66 years ago this month the world witnessed the first planned genocide of the 20th century.

The tragic and brutal events that began on April 24, 1915, in historic Armenia and other parts of the Ottoman Empire decimated the Armenian people. More than 2 million Armenian

men, women, and children either lost their lives or were deported by an Ottoman Turkish Government bent on destroying the Armenian nation and any trace of the Armenian civilization. By the middle of 1916, the Armenian population of Turkey had quite literally ceased to exist, their ancestral lands had been taken, and a few thousand survivors had been scattered over the face of the Earth.

The Armenian tragedy would have been an unspeakable horror even if it had been the only act of genocide to disgrace the world's history in this century. As we know only too well, however, the Armenian genocide, and the silence with which it was greeted by other nations, only served as a precursor of similar events in Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, Uganda, and Cambodia. One of the best ways to prevent future acts such as these is to make sure that the record which describes them is accurate and well publicized. It is therefore indeed unfortunate that in spite of the weight of evidence which has been compiled concerning the Armenian genocide, no Turkish Government since 1915 has acknowledged the role of its predecessors in those events. Without such an acknowledgement, in my judgment, no real progress on the resolution of the issues which divide Armenians and Turks will even be possible.

The commemoration of Armenian Martyrs Day provides an opportunity to reflect on some of the consequences of unchecked racial or religious hatred. It also, however, provides an opportunity to reflect on the special qualities of the Armenian people. Through tenacity, persistence, dedication, and hard work, the Armenian people have rebuilt their race. No group can surpass the record of the Armenians for triumph in the face of adversity. Eloquent testaments of the Armenian heritage can be seen in every community in this Nation and others, in which Armenians have settled. It is a heritage of which Armenians have every right to be proud.●

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing the 66th anniversary of the genocide carried out against over 2 million Armenians by the Turks. Each year we should pause and reflect on the tragic and brutal events that began on April 24, 1915. On this day, the intellectual and spiritual leaders of the Armenian community were arrested and later sent into exile that most were destined not to survive.

With the removal of these leaders, a massive program for uprooting and deporting nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey began. Over the next year more than 1 million Armenians lost their lives either at the hands of the Turks and Kurds, or through famine in exile. In addition, reports indicated that several hundred

thousand Armenian women and children were sold into slavery. Only a small fraction of the Armenian population survived by emigrating to other countries. As a result, the first planned genocide of the 20th century nearly exterminated the Armenian population in Turkey.

On April 24 of each year we are provided with an opportunity to deplore man's inhumanity to man and to reflect on the strength of the Armenian people who, despite all odds, have maintained their identity. The Armenian people have demonstrated throughout history their fortitude, stamina, and tenacity in maintaining their culture, church, and language. I believe that the existence of this spirit is the foundation that will lead to the ultimate restoration of a free Armenian nation.

In recalling the severe injustices suffered by the Armenian people, we remind ourselves that crimes of this nature must never be repeated and pledge to remain vigilant in opposing all such atrocities.●

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in commemorating the Armenian genocide. Sixty-six years ago, a million and a half Armenian men, women, and children were senselessly massacred.

I deplore the brutal killings that took place and extend my heartfelt sense of remorse to the survivors. Today, we pause for a moment to contemplate the inhumanity of this tragedy, and to rededicate ourselves to a future free of needless deaths. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that through continued recognition of the genocide of 1915 we can affirm that those who perished did not die in vain.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) for arranging this special order.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join with my colleagues in drawing special recognition to the 66th anniversary of the first deliberate genocide in the 20th century—the savage slaughter of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Turkish Empire in 1915. By recalling this tragic event, we affirm anew our resolve to prevent such brutalities from occurring in the future. We should also recognize the commitment of the Armenian people throughout the world to the cause of justice and human rights and the terrible price they have paid in pursuit of these principles.

This instance remains one of the most shocking and deplorable acts ever perpetrated by one people against another. However, this historic event not only threatened the Armenian people with extinction which was the goal of the tyrants of the Ottoman Government; but also produced an unfortunate precedent, that of world inaction.

Traditionally, Armenian Americans and their kin throughout the world have observed April 24 as a day of mourning. It was on the night of that day 65 years ago that 200 intellectuals, community leaders, and prominent citizens of the Armenian community were herded into the desert and executed. This event marked the beginning of the Ottoman Empire's systematic plan to exterminate the whole Armenian Christian population within its borders.

Over the next 3 years, 1915 to 1918, some 2 million Armenians were massacred. The entire population was uprooted from their ancestral homeland in what is now the eastern region of Turkey. The able-bodied men were murdered, and the remaining women, children, and elderly were forced to leave their belongings and march to the remote deserts of Der-el-Zor. Along the way, these helpless people were subjected to torture, rape, and slaughter by roving bands of Ottoman soldiers. Any survivors of these brutalities died from exhaustion, starvation, and disease.

Beyond the brutal deportations and heinous murders, the Ottoman Government attempted to obliterate all traces of the 3,000-year-old Armenian civilization. Libraries, churches, and schools were destroyed. Books, paintings, and irreplaceable historical treasures were burned. Every possible attempt was made to wipe out any trace of the Armenian people who are perhaps the oldest of the civilized races in western Asia and were the first nation in the world to accept Christianity as its state religion.

Nevertheless, despite the odious crimes of the Ottoman Government, the Armenian people survived. In 1918, through the efforts of President Woodrow Wilson, the boundaries for a free and independent Armenia were established. The little republic was formally recognized by the United States. However, weakened and demoralized by the genocide, the Republic of Armenia fell 2 years later—this time to the Soviet Union. Today, the historic Armenian area, in what is now Turkey, is totally devoid of Armenian people, while the Soviet Union holds the Armenian people captive in the area known as Soviet Armenia.

Today, there are tens of thousands of Americans of Armenian descent living in the United States, upholding the principles of liberty and justice we all cherish so dearly. But the scars of the crimes committed against their ancestors still remain.

The Armenian people have demonstrated, throughout history, their fortitude, stamina, and tenacity in maintaining their church, culture, and language. The existence today of the Armenian spirit is the foundation that

will lead to the ultimate restoration of a free Armenian nation.

In remembering the severe injustices suffered by the Armenian people, we remind ourselves that crimes of this kind must not be repeated, and pledge to remain vigilant in opposing all such atrocities.●

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, April 24 was the 66th anniversary of one of the most horrendous crimes against humanity. Every year on this day we recognize the beginning of the Ottoman Turkish Government's annihilation of 1.5 million Armenians between 1915 and 1918. It was the first genocide of the 20th century, and set the precedent for the destruction of European Jewry and other ethnic minorities by Adolph Hitler.

Even as we are preoccupied with the affairs of the present, it is important that we reflect upon the events of the past, for such tragedies can only be prevented in the future if they are remembered.

In early 1915 the Ottoman Turkish Government perpetrated the senseless killing of over 1,500,000 Armenian people. They began by rounding up, arresting, and then exterminating 200 leaders of the Armenian community. In the years that followed, more than half of the entire Armenian population suffered the same fate. All who remained, including women, children, and the elderly, were deported to the remote deserts of Der-el-Zor. They were forced to travel in the wilderness without any provisions, eventually dying, one by one, from starvation, exposure, disease, or from sheer physical exhaustion. Hundreds of thousands of innocent people were heartlessly murdered, simply because of their ethnic heritage.

Virtually every Armenian lives with the memory of the loved ones that were slaughtered. The scars of that evil will forever be within the minds of the survivors, who are residing in areas throughout the world. Over 500,000 Armenian people live here in the United States of America. They have transcended the past, and have become leaders of their communities. It is these people that we honor today, and it is to their relatives and friends that we pay tribute.

It was the world community's ignorance of the Armenian genocide in the early part of this century, and our inability to learn from past experience, that forced us to become witnesses to a series of crimes throughout the century—Hitler's Germany, Amin's Uganda, Pol Pot's Cambodia, and more.

The 66th anniversary of the Armenian genocide of 1915 affords us the opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to justice and human rights—to renew our commitment to prevent such brutalities from occurring in the future. But to speak of such a firm

commitment is meaningless unless we are sincerely determined not to ignore the tragic events that still occur with such regularity in so many countries of the world. Only when our pursuit of justice and human rights is evident in our deeds, and not merely in our words, will we and the survivors of genocide—whether they be Armenians, Jews, Ugandans, or Cambodians—be satisfied that their friends, relatives, and fellow men did not die in vain.●

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most chilling and coldblooded sentences ever uttered in this century was said by Adolf Hitler as he prepared his campaign of genocide against European Jewry. Asked if world opinion would not be against him, he replied, "Who still talks nowadays about the extermination of the Armenians?"

Hitler was unfortunately correct in his assessment of Western civilization's inability—or unwillingness—to remember the first genocide of this century. April 24 marks the 66th anniversary of the planned and systematic massacre of Armenians of the Ottoman Turkish Empire.

This is how the Encyclopedia Britannica describes that terrible moment in world history:

The greatest single disaster in the history of the Armenians came with the outbreak of World War I. In 1915 the Young Turk government, regarding the Turkish Armenians, despite pledges of loyalty, as a dangerous foreign element with friends among the enemies who had launched the Dardanelles campaign and with cousins in the Russian army on their eastern front, resolved to deport the whole Armenian population of about 1,750,000 to Syria and Mesopotamia.

The chances of survival in these ill-prepared desert regions were slight: it was a death sentence, a "final solution" that Adolf Hitler was to emulate consciously in Germany.

This summary does not, of course, even hint at the documented atrocities committed against innocent human beings during this extermination. "Starving Armenians" became a phrase that was on everyone's lips for a few years. But, as Hitler later pointed out, people forget. The attempt to eliminate the entire Armenian population of Turkey was forgotten. Hitler was betting on the same kind of historic amnesia, brought about by ignorance and laziness, when he went about his own campaign of calculated slaughter of innocent civilians against the Jews and the Poles and others.

Today the ideological fanaticism that led to the slaughter of the Armenians and the Jews still exists in the world. Ask the Cambodians; and the boat people; ask the survivors of the Soviet gulag.

We owe it not only to the memory of the Armenians but to our children and to their children to make certain we never forget that such things have happened, and that such things can happen again unless we are vigilant.●

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, Mr. DANIELSON, who has been so kind as to help commemorate this event. I would like to share with my colleagues my remarks which were made at a concert in Fresno, commemorating Armenian Martyrs Day, on Friday, April 24:

It is certainly not a pleasant task to be called upon to recall the Armenian Massacre. As we remember that dark day on April 24, 1915, when the first intellectuals, community leaders, and prominent citizens of the Armenian community were brutally executed; which marked the beginning of one of the world's first and most devastating genocides—when some 2 million Armenians were driven from their homeland and massacred by the ruthless Turkish Ottoman regime. We all know the tragic details of the slaughter of over half the Armenian people—the oldest of the world's civilized people in Western Asia and the first nation in the world to accept Christianity as its religion. Yet strange as it sounds, there is something to celebrate out of this horrendous deed of some sixty-six years ago.

The simple fact that the Armenian spirit still lives and provides such a strong foundation for its people is amazing, and truly worthy of celebration and commendation from the other free peoples of the world. A lesser people would long since have given up all hope and their National identity would have been lost. However, despite their terrible deprivation, suffering, persecution, and injustice, the Armenian people have endured, and retained their historical identity, Christian faith, their courage, their culture, and their honorable traditions. This occasion, Armenian Martyrs Day, which we are commemorating today, provides us the opportunity to mourn the loss of those before us, and to deplore man's inhumanity to man, and it provides us the opportunity to praise the strength and courage of the Armenian people who have surmounted the most grave difficulties to preserve their identity.

As most of you probably know, I am Portuguese. My ancestors like many of yours, came to the United States many years ago to begin a new life. Yet my parents and grandparents, like yours and those of many other ethnic groups who settled here, realized the importance of instilling in us a sense of our cultural, historical, and religious identity to preserve the heritage of their native land. My Congressional District is made up almost entirely of dozens of ethnic groups whose roots are spread all over the world. In light of this fact, I am particularly appreciative of the fine example which the Armenian community has set for other ethnic groups—being a full participant in the community—and at the same time retaining for their children and grandchildren those things which are unique to their culture. For this I applaud them.

This year marks the Centennial Celebration of the first Armenian settlers in Fresno, California. I think this would be a good time to recognize the great contribution of the Armenian Community to Fresno and the surrounding communities. Armenians have always been honest, industrious, cooperative, good neighbors and citizens in this community. Armenians are prominent business, civic, professional, and educational leaders; artists, entertainers, and farmers. A list of the leaders of virtually any field will include many, many individuals of Arme-

nian heritage. The Armenian settlers in Central California were among the first to till the soil, irrigate the land, and are in large part responsible for the development of this fertile region.

In closing, let me say that the successes of the survivors and descendants of the Armenian holocaust, and the culture and heritage of the "Armenian Spirit" which still lives, stands as a living memorial to all of those who lost their lives some sixty-six years ago.●

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, genocide forgotten is genocide condoned. That we speak today in reverent and respectful memory of the suffering of the Armenian people is important. It is important to show that no deed so horrible as the Turkish genocide of Armenians in 1915 shall ever fade from the collective memory of civilized men and women. If we forget, we have ourselves completed the tyrant's task.

I feel strongly that to remember the Armenians, the first victims of 20th-century genocide, is also to remember the millions who suffered in the holocaust of a generation later. The most lasting shrine to any of the victims of genocide is to remember all of the victims of genocide, and to tell the world what happened, so that it may never happen again, to any people.

If we are looking for a date to give to the start of the modern age, the age of genocide, the age of hatred, then the night of April 24, 1915, seems fitting. The sheer enormity of what happened to the Armenian people, starting on that night, should not make those tragic events less immediate to us; 1915 was not a long time ago, life was much as it was today. But from 1915 on, genocide has snaked its way through human history. It did not stop at Auschwitz, nor in Kampuchea. The world is still far from cleansed from the obscene horror that claimed 1½ million Armenians, 6 million Jews, or 3 million Cambodians. Words by themselves may be weak shields against tyranny, but today we must show by our words that what happened in Armenia must never be forgotten, as much as the holocaust must never be forgotten.

No genocide could kill the spirit of the Armenian people. Proud, independent, and creative, 6 million Armenians are now scattered throughout the world, nearly 500,000 of them in the United States. Their spiritual homeland—Armenia—is not marked on the map, for it remains divided between Turkey and the Soviet Union. Yet Armenia still lives in the hearts and the souls of Armenia and stands for us all as both a beacon and a warning. It stands for all those who believe in the dignity and worth of human life, in the richness and diversity of human culture, for freedom and hope and ideas that do not die as people die. It stands for the ultimate futility of the tyrants and their creed of death and hatred. Long and terrible though

the list of the slain may be, genocide could no more destroy the Armenian people than it could the Jewish people.

To those Armenians who survived and their families, we today say that their sufferings are remembered, as are all those who did not survive. To the rest of us, let us remind ourselves that we, too, must remember.●

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, Armenians throughout the world observed a solemn and tragic moment in their history on April 24—the 66th anniversary of the Armenian Holocaust of 1915-17. Agents of the Ottoman Turkish Empire commenced the systematic massacre of more than 1,500,000 Armenian people on that regrettable day.

In the early morning hours 200 leaders of the Armenian community in Constantinople were taken from their homes, arrested, and put to death. During the next 2 years, hundreds of thousands of Armenians were either killed or deported in an attempt by the Ottoman Turks to find a lasting solution to the "Armenian Question."

There are few Armenian families that did not lose at least one of their loved ones during this genocidal campaign. This memorial day still captures the unimaginable horror permeating the minds of those who only wanted freedom and identity but lost both at the whim of the Ottomans. The concept of genocide is not fathomable to most Americans, but to the Armenian people living in this country and around the world, it is a horror never to be forgotten.

The United States has historically attempted to work out a solution to the Armenian Question only to see these attempts foiled by a want to forget. But the Armenian Question still exists and the Ottoman genocide remains as a reminder to the free world that genocide is not the answer.

Attempts are still made to deny the Armenian people their human rights to exist culturally and politically. America must provide the moral leadership to defend the Armenian people's right to self-determination by persuading a cooperative settlement to the issues. As champion of the free world, the United States must vigorously urge justice under international law.

Lasting solutions can only come from peaceful deliberations, not by shedding blood.

Forgetting that this type of mass killing baptized the 20th century may not have directly been responsible for what happened to our Jewish brethren who were genocidal victims of World War II, but the statement by Adolf Hitler as to "Who remembered the Armenians," in both cases does cause concern. We cannot live on as if nothing happened.

I urge my colleagues to join me in commemoration of this solemn occasion with a new understanding of the lessons of history to assure a permanent end of the denial of self-determination. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, the blood of the Armenian martyrs has not been shed in vain.●

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. DANIELSON) for giving me this opportunity to comment on an event in history that is indelibly imprinted in the memories of the Armenian people, both in this Nation and the world.

Each year on April 24 the Armenian people observe Armenian Martyrs Day in recognition of the dignity and rights of every human being.

In particular they and all people remember the genocide of 1½ million people between 1915 and 1918 that began with the arrest and murder of Armenian community leaders and members of the national parliament. It forced uprooting of families and set into motion an exodus from an ancestral homeland.

History has recorded most vividly that the Ottoman Turkish Empire had planned the elimination of the Armenian people, and the implementation of that plan and others which followed are those which all people must forever guard against. Indeed, this Armenian Martyrs Day, and all that follow, must and will serve as a reminder to all governments that man's inhumanity to man must cease forever.●

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today to commemorate the Armenian genocides of 1915, but also to celebrate the continued strength and vitality of the Armenian people.

Nearly 2 million Armenians were martyred by the ruthless Ottoman Turks during and following World War I in the first ever attempt to exterminate a people of the human race. The world's first genocide almost succeeded, for it left less than one-quarter of the entire Armenian population living. Hundreds of individuals at a time were systematically and brutally murdered, merely for being Armenians. Those who escaped death were forced to flee their homeland and separated from family and friends. The Armenians became few and scattered, yet never giving up hope that their persecutors would be punished for their atrocious crime.

Today the Armenian people remain scattered around the globe, still hoping that someday justice might be delivered for their great suffering. Today the Members of this great House ask that the Armenians receive justice, and their grievances be brought before the General Assembly of the United Nations for resolution

and redress. We also ask that the Presidential Commission on the Holocaust recognize the historical precedent set by the Armenian genocide and study the Armenian genocide as a powerful reminder of the horror and terrible evil of such a crime unpunished.

It is heartwarming to see such a strong show of support for a people so victimized. I believe our efforts today reflect the respect and friendship we all have for Armenian Americans and Armenians abroad. There is no other people so deserving of justice and no other people so denied. I am proud to be associated with the continuing determination the Armenian people have shown to right one of the world's greatest wrongs. We must all unite against the evil of genocide and assure its banishment from the annals of the future.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks with respect to the subject matter of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

BENJAMIN BOGOMOLNY: THE EIGHTH YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF A SOVIET REFUSENIK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, the month of April marks the eighth year since Benjamin Bogomolny was first refused a visa by the Soviet Union. He is one of the longest term Soviet refuseniks on record in Russia.

In 1966, the Bogomolny family received affidavits to emigrate to Israel. His mother, father, and four sisters were given permission and forced to leave the Soviet Union, while Mr. Bogomolny was drafted in the army. Completing his service in the army, Benjamin Bogomolny applied in November 1972, for permission to emigrate. His application was denied in April 1973, on the grounds that he may have learned state secrets while in the army and that he constituted a threat to national security.

Benjamin Bogomolny has been under constant harassment since he first sought a visa. His telephone has been disconnected, his apartment ransacked, Hebrew books stolen, and his life threatened during this period. The Soviet police have made no attempt to investigate his complaints.

An example of this treatment was reported in the May 1975 Jerusalem Post. It was stated that he was a victim of a minipogrom as the KGB stepped up its campaign to crush the Jewish activists in the Soviet Union. The paper wrote that he was manhandled by two drunks. Returning home later, he found the same two drunks, now fully sober, and 12 other men wielding clubs and shovels and breaking things in his apartment. Benjamin Bogomolny, whom the men threatened to hang, escaped through a back window and immediately complained to the police. On visiting the police precinct the following day, he discovered that there was no record of his complaint. The police denied any knowledge of the incident. In addition, the Jerusalem Post reported that a student who rents a room from Mr. Bogomolny was warned by the police that he should not sublet a room from a man who wished to emigrate.

The treatment of Mr. Bogomolny is appalling. There is no reason why he has been restricted from leaving the Soviet Union these last 8 years. The actions of the Soviet Union are in direct violation of the Helsinki accords. I urge the Soviet Union to allow Mr. Bogomolny and his wife, Tatina, permission to join his parents and four sisters who have been anxiously waiting 11 long years to see each other.●

BEYOND REAGANOMICS

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 22, 1981, I gave a talk at Loyola University, Los Angeles, on "Beyond Reaganomics." The text of my remarks follows:

The administration's economic program consists of supertight money; a fiscal 1982 expenditure cut of around \$50 billion, in which military increases are offset by cuts in the social budget; and a \$148 billion a year income tax reduction when fully effective in 1984, heavily weighted toward personal income tax cuts for the affluent.

Is the program equitable? Will it work? Is there an alternative?

Neither the proposed budget cuts nor the proposed tax cuts are equitable.

No doubt, cuts in budgetary expenditures are needed. They are needed because the mandate of the November, 1980 election is quite clear: cut expenditures, reduce the present federal take of some 23 percent of gross national product.

Budget cuts are desirable, too, because of the need to get the deficit under control. Only a budget deficit which is under control can eliminate the Treasury's need to borrow heavily to meet the deficit. With a lowered deficit, the Nation's savings could get through to the needed ultimate investment in plant and equipment.

So the question is not whether there should be budgetary retrenchment. The question, rather, is on whom the burden should fall. And here, even a cursory look at

the Reagan budget shows that a disproportionate part of the cuts falls upon those in the dawn of life, the children; those in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those in the shadows of life, the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and the poor.

Health programs are ruthlessly cut. Medicaid is slashed \$1.2 billion, which means not only less medical care for the needy but a greater burden thrust upon state and local governments whose principal fiscal reliance is on regressive taxes like the real estate tax on the homeowner. The \$78 million pneumonia immunization program for the elderly is completely abandoned. The 91 Vietnam Veterans Outreach Centers, providing psychological, drug, and alcoholic help for Vietnam veterans, are to be abandoned. Nutrition programs, such as food stamps and school lunches, are severely curtailed.

Likewise hard hit are programs to make jobs. The CETA program, which was scheduled to provide jobs for 500,000 men and women, mostly young, by next October 1, is to be entirely phased out. Useful programs such as security guards for senior citizens, and volunteer helpers for private charities such as Goodwill Industries, will be seen no more. Likewise sharply curtailed are programs of economic and neighborhood development and providing infrastructure for America's industries and cities—roads, bridges, ports, railroads, utilities.

Primary and secondary school education aids are to be cut 22 percent.

Neighborhoods, the crowning glory of the Reagan program, are to be abandoned. Completely repealed would be the section 312 home rehabilitation program, under which moderate-income families have been getting reasonable interest loans with which to upgrade their homes. The Cooperative Bank, which provides capital for neighborhood efforts in food, pharmaceuticals, health, and housing, is to be terminated. Maintenance funds to repair the leaky roofs of public housing are curtailed, and public housing tenants have their rent raised from 25 percent of their income to 30 percent. The Legal Services Corporation, which has provided help for so many of the storm-tossed who cannot afford a private lawyer, is to be ended. Mass transit is drastically curtailed.

All these cuts could have saved some \$50 billion, and I have no quarrel with the idea of a \$50 billion deficit-narrowing measure. But it would have been entirely possible to save that same \$50 billion without short-changing really needy people, and without eviscerating programs which foster economic development. For example, billions could have been saved by cutting down the federal tax deduction subsidy for interest paid on vacation homes, sometimes the third and fourth such home; and on interest paid, largely by the top one-fifth of income receivers, on loans to carry consumer purchases. In addition to putting needed funds into the budget-balancing column, such measures would at least partially remove an incentive which now induces people to over-consume, and thus have fewer savings to make available for productivity-enhancing, inflation-fighting industrial plant and equipment.

Huge savings could also have been achieved by doing something about tax-exempt industrial revenue bonds for unnecessary shopping centers (and in some cases porno bookstores); uneconomic power projects like Clinch River in Tennessee, or Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation water projects, bonanzas to the oil industry such as the depletion allowance,

which make no sense in a world where oil brings \$40 a barrel.

But, equity aside, will the program work? Will it produce the victory over unemployment and inflation and budget deficits which Reaganomics proclaims it will?

Faith over and beyond the call of duty is required to make one believe that it will. The theory is that the super-tight money will fight inflation, and the super-heavy tax cut will stimulate growth. Much more likely, the tight money and high interest rates will retard growth, increase unemployment, and bring about bankruptcies. And the tax cut will simply stimulate higher interest rates.

If patterns in the current inflationary period are projected, only about 5 percent of the total reduction will be saved by the beneficiaries of the reduction, with the other 95 percent, as a present, spent. Indeed, since much of it will be spent by the wealthy, it is likely to be spent on expensive imported consumer goods ranging from Mercedes's to claret, thus worsening our trade balance and the international dollar, and, in the next round, inflation. Moreover, even the little bit theoretically "saved" from current consumption may in today's inflation be spent by speculating in corporate takeovers or in commodities, such as Bunker Hunt and his billion-dollar silver manipulations.

The Administration projects the 1984 workout of its policies as producing a balanced budget, and inflation, unemployment, and interest rates all hovering around the 6 percent level. The Administration disdains econometric studies, and derived its euphoric results, largely by hoping, or guessing, that everyone would conclude from the Reagan program that hard times were over, businessmen should reduce their prices, labor lower its wages, and banks make available their money for lower interest rates.

A number of economic forecasters who still hold the view that logical prediction is possible—among them the Congressional Budget Office, Data Resources, The Wharton School, and Chase Econometrics—come up with vastly gloomier 1984 scenarios. But these economic think-tanks, in programming their computers, all assumed that the Reagan program in all its brute severity would not actually be carried out. Hence, they softened the assumptions. The Federal Reserve would actually not keep money as tight as the Administration is ordaining. Congress would not, by its spending and taxing measures, allow the kind of budget deficits that Reagan arithmetic postulates.

So all of these projections fail to take Reaganomics at its word, however forbidding the word might be. So I asked the Joint Economic Committee staff to put into the computer the Reagan program, without "improving" a line of it.

And out came the result: unemployment no better than today; inflation down to 8 percent but "underlying" inflation—the general trend of wage rates—still at its present 9 percent-plus level; and a budget deficit of \$111 billion, the greatest in history, rather than a budget in balance. What would be happening, the computers were telling us, was that the reductions in social spending would be more than outweighed by the increases in military spending and the reductions in income tax revenue. The added deficits, coupled with a very stringent monetary policy, would bring about high interest rates and slow growth. These in turn would further increase the deficit.

In short, the Republicans, far from learning by the mistakes of the Democrats, seem

doomed to repeat them. In 1967 the Democratic administration combined guns and butter—guns for a major war in Vietnam, butter for a whole gamut of new social programs; and the result was years of stagflation. Now, fourteen years later, along come the Republicans and want to repeat the same mistake—guns for the greatest peacetime increase in military spending in history, and butter in the form of outsized tax reductions for the affluent, with a resulting renewed bout of stagflation and budgetary deficits.

A particularly unfortunate element in Reaganomics is what it will do to income distribution.

It is too much perhaps to hope for the moment that America can achieve a fairer income distribution, a diminution of the gap between rich and poor, and a closer approximation to the situation which prevails in countries like Germany and Japan.

But income distribution in the United States has been getting worse for the last 15 years, and now is certainly no time to accelerate the worsening. During 1965-1978, the share in the national income earned by the lowest quintile of American families, the poor, remained about even, but only because of the tremendous increase in transfer payments such as health, welfare, education, food and housing benefits. As to the second and third quintiles—those making \$10,000-20,000 a year and \$20,000-30,000 a year today, respectively—they definitely lost. Their share of the national income declined from 28 percent to 26 percent. The fourth quintile, those in the \$30,000-40,000 bracket, just about kept even. And the top quintile, not surprisingly, absorbed what the lower-middle income second and third quintiles were losing; it raised its share of the national income from 42 percent to 44 percent—a total of many billions of dollars.

Under Reaganomics, the people in the lowest 60 percent are going to lose more. The poor will have their transfer payments shorn. The second and third quintiles don't have those transfer payments to lose, but they will get piddling income tax cut benefits—the reductions from Kemp-Roth will be swallowed by the increases in the payroll tax and in inflationary bracket creep. Being borrowers rather than lenders, they will be hurt by a perpetual high interest rate regime. And the tax loopholes that gladden the hearts of the upper income brackets—itemized deductions, oil and real estate shelters, investment credits—are simply not available to them.

The top ten percent of American families will profit mightily from Reaganomics, with the lowest 60 percent taking it on the chin. This does not sound like a good way to keep up the demand necessary to take off the market what the economy can produce, and thus avoid a recession. Nor does it seem a good way to make for social peace, either in the central city or in the lower middle-class suburbs.

The view that Reaganomics is not likely to work is not held just by Congressional Democrats. Reaganomics is also viewed with some private skepticism by a good many Congressional Republicans, ranging from those on the moderate wing who see super-tight money as a real barrier to the necessary growth, to those on the conservative wing, like the three conservative Republican Senators who outraged the White house by voting against the budget on the Senate Budget Committee just before the April recess, who fear, with considerable reason, a huge Reagan budget deficit down the road.

And many a market letter from many a respectable Wall Street firm nowadays is pointing out that the markets are not exactly prophesying success for Reaganomics, as indicated by the fact that long-term interest rates, auguries of inflation, have been steadily rising since the inaugural.

The President in his State of the Economy address on February 18 asked anybody with a better alternative to step forward and present it. Very recently, the Democrats, led by Chairman Jones of the House Budget Committee and Chairman Rostenkowski of the House Ways and Means Committee, have done just that. Mr. Jones proposes a slightly gentler hand on social program budget cuts than Mr. Reagan—some what on the order of 10 percent rather than 25 percent cuts for economic development, mass transit, food stamps, school lunches, legal aid, and so on. By cracking down on military "waste", and by mandating a somewhat smaller tax cut, Mr. Jones is also able to reduce the 1982 Reagan budget deficit of \$40 billion to \$25 billion. Mr. Rostenkowski would cut 1982 taxes by only \$40 billion, rather than by Mr. Reagan's \$52 billion, and would shift the benefits very modestly from those at the top of the income scale to those in the middle.

The Democratic alternative represents, as does the Democratic Party nowadays, a pale and somewhat more human imitation of the Republican program—a little tougher on fatcats, a little easier on thincats, and a bit more responsible about the deficit. In short, an improvement, if hardly a call to the barricades.

While the two great parties of the middle square off on the minutia of macroeconomics, nothing much is being done about the structural problems of our economy. Yet it is in improving our economic structure that the game will be won or lost. For even the most admirable monetary and fiscal policies are insufficient to bring both steady jobs and stable prices at the same time.

The structural aspects of cost-push inflation, productivity, energy and national defense must be addressed:

1. Against inflation, our only "policy" is super-tight money. By itself, as Thatcher's England is proving, it cannot lay a glove on inflation without creating unacceptable stagflation, recession, and unemployment. Yet the Administration's free-market mythology immobilizes it from addressing the wage-price spiral in steel, in automobiles, in coal, and in a score of other major sectors.

There are overseas examples of what to do about cost-push inflation that we seem intent on ignoring. In Austria, the government has for years successfully worked a social contract in which labor and management agree on a compact which puts a productivity-related ceiling on the spiral. In Holland, the government has had a comprehensive system of wage and price controls in place for the last couple of years, and inflation is today less than 7 percent.

2. In productivity, we have only a fragmentary policy, though accelerated productivity increases are one of the best inflation-fighters going. Republicans and Democrats are generally agreed on the need for liberalized depreciation for business investments, and on the simplification and reform of regulatory excesses.

But labor-management-government cooperation for productivity improvement is still frowned on, despite the splendid results of cooperation in the two postwar miracle-workers, Germany and Japan. In both these countries labor has been weaned away from

inefficient work-rules, and management from concentration on short-term and financial fetishism. Why not in America?

Nor does the Reagan budget do anything noticeable for productivity. Infrastructure programs—rebuilding America's ruined streets and bridges and sewer systems and waterworks and railroads and utilities and mass transit—is badly short-changed. So is manpower training, and industrial research and development, both public and private.

3. The Administration is considering killing the Department of Energy, but there is precious little of an energy policy to kill. To stand up to OPEC—and in the process make ourself the hero of the non-oil-producing world—we need to build up a strategic petroleum reserve. We need to conserve gasoline, but instead of discussing an increase in the present 4-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax, with a built-in rebate for workers who need it to get to work and other essential uses, we talk of abandoning the present national gasoline-saving 55-miles-per-hour speed limit. We lavish billions of windfall profits on our oil industry, but from solar research we are about to remove the little that it hath.

4. Finally, there are the economic and geographical implications of our shift of emphasis toward the military. With our drastically increased military spending, we may be in fact weakening our security by weakening our economy. Military hyper-spending hits the most inflationary spots in the economy, where skilled manpower and materials are scarcest. Military production, unlike the production of civilian goods, creates no purchasable commodity to satisfy the money demand of the workers and entrepreneurs who make the military goods.

We had better find a way out of the arms race with the Kremlin which we are now accelerating. The political and economic unrest in Poland brought us very close to the brink: the Soviet Union must have come very near intervening, and heaven knows what sort of reaction that might have produced from the White House, the Pentagon, the State Department, and the Congress.

But as our recent Joint Economic Committee study showed, throughout Eastern Europe—in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Romania, in East Germany—economic stagnation is producing situations which may well duplicate on a large scale the Polish tinderbox. Russia is curtailing her oil supplies to Eastern Europe, and her COMECON economic aid.

Trouble surely lies ahead, unless we privately and publicly urge the Kremlin to begin with us now, not just talks on nuclear weapons, but meaningful talks on an across-the-board reduction in the level of all our armaments. Only by such a return to sanity can both sides of the Cold War address the problems of the less-developed countries, including those of Eastern Europe, before they explode in our face.

There is a lot more involved in world peace than economics, but economics might be a foot in the door.

Will someone willing to tackle the real problems of the age please come forward.●

ANTI-JUNKETING ACT OF 1981

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

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today along with our colleague, Congressman

GARY LEE, that would curb unnecessary travel to foreign countries by Members of the House of Representatives. My bill would eliminate travel by Members who are retiring or who have been defeated in their primary elections. This is a loophole by which Members of the House who are not returning to Government service globe-trot at taxpayers' expense.

In addition, my bill contains a sunshine provision that would require any foreign travel by Members or staff to be authorized by a public rollcall vote of the full committee after formal consideration of a travel proposal. The travel proposal would have to include the legislative objectives of the proposed travel and the projected cost of that travel.

If we were given an opportunity to consider the benefits of travel relative to cost and purpose, we might find that some foreign travel is not a cost effective exercise of our oversight responsibilities. I realize that there are legitimate reasons for some congressional travel, and this legislation would not affect legitimate foreign travel by Members of Congress. It would create an atmosphere of responsible decisionmaking, however, and discourage unnecessary travel. Furthermore, it would provide a source for further savings in committee budgets.

Junkets discredit the U.S. Congress and shake the already tenuous confidence of the American people in their Government representatives. I urge my colleagues to support continuing reform of our system of travel authorization.●

THE 1981 DANTE AWARD GOES TO DAVID CONDON

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

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that David Condon, sports columnist for the Chicago Tribune, will receive the Tenth Annual Dante Award of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans on May 8, 1981, at a luncheon in his honor at the Como Inn of Chicago. Mr. Condon writes in the Tribune's "In the Wake of the News" column, which is the Nation's oldest continuous sports column.

Since 1944 when he began his career with the Chicago Tribune, David Condon has shown his devotion to the city of Chicago and its people and has upheld the highest standards of integrity in his presentations to Tribune readers. He has made significant and innovative contributions to journalism in our country, and he richly deserves the Dante Award, because it was Dante Alighieri, in his "Divine Comedy," who said, "Men should never be timid about the truth."

The Dante Award was established by the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, an umbrella organization comprised of more than 40 civil organizations in the Chicago area, to extend recognition annually to an individual in the mass media communication field who has made positive contributions to the profession of journalism.

David Condon was born in Las Vegas, shoveled coal in the family coal business, and was once a cemetery caretaker. He graduated from the University of Notre Dame, and during his attendance there he was the editor of the Notre Dame Scholastic. He has also seen service with the Las Vegas, N. Mex., Daily Optic, the South Bend, Ind., Tribune, and the 8th Service Command, U.S. Army.

Mr. Condon's "Wake of the News" columns are wide ranging and he writes on subjects as diverse as Yankee Don Larsen's perfect game in the 1956 World Series, Casey Stengel, Philip K. Wrigley, owner of the Chicago Cubs; activities in the stables at a race track, a boxing champion's training camp, President Eisenhower's caddy, the death of Samuel Cardinal Stritch, or a retarded children's home.

He won the American Bowling Congress Award for the year's best feature story in 1955 for the only bowling column he wrote during that year, is the author of "the Go-Go White Sox," a 1960 publication by Bobbs-Merrill, and was represented in Prentice-Hall's annual anthology of the Nation's best sports stories for 4 consecutive years. He also covered the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, the late Samuel Cardinal Stritch's visit through New Mexico's Indian country, vice conditions in a central Illinois city, and has done an intimate personality profile of Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, longtime president of Notre Dame University.

David Condon's accomplishments are many, but special attention should be given to the awards he has received for his assistance of inmate sports programs at the Cook County Jail, the Illinois State Penitentiary at Pontiac, and the Federal prison at Terre Haute. In 1972, he became the second sports writer in history to be honored by the National Confederation of Eagles for his outstanding contributions and work with retarded children.

The Tenth Annual Dante Award luncheon to honor David Condon will be held at the Como Inn and many political dignitaries, civic leaders, and leaders of the communications industry will be in attendance.

Jerome N. Zurla is the chairman of the luncheon, Bill and Mary Frances Veeck will jointly serve as master of ceremonies, and the invocation will be offered by the Rev. Lawrence Cozzi, C.S. Chairman Zurla and JCCIA Presi-

dent James L. Coli will present the Dante Award to Mr. Condon.

The John Fischetti Scholarship was established by the JCCIA to further the study of Italian American students in communications and is named after the Pulitzer Prize-winning political cartoonist. This year's award goes to Mr. Miles Messina, 3253 North Oconto Avenue, in Chicago, located in the 11th District which I am honored to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my warmest congratulations to David Condon on this honor, and for the strong and constructive impact he has made on our community. His career, his character, and his splendid record of achievement prove that he is, indeed, a "friend of truth." ●

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—SUBPENA FOR TESTIMONY IN THE MATTER OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA VERSUS LAURENCE JOHN LAYTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1981.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the provisions of Rule L of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I am hereby notifying you of my receipt today of a subpoena duces tecum in the matter of the *United States of America v. Laurence John Layton*. Mr. Layton has been charged with a four count indictment of Murder, Conspiracy to Murder, Aiding and Abetting in the Murder of Congressman Leo Ryan and Conspiracy and Attempted Murder of Richard Dwyer in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Criminal No. CR-80-416-RFP).

The subpoena commands my appearance in the courtroom of the Honorable Robert F. Peckham, Chief United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, on July 9, 1981 at 9:30 a.m., with classified section III(F) of the report issued by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Jonestown, Guyana tragedy. (See "The Assassination of Representative Leo J. Ryan in the Jonestown, Guyana Tragedy" Report of a Staff Investigative Group to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, May 15, 1979, House Document No. 96-233, 96th Congress, 1st Session). The subject matter of this subpoena relates to the Committee on Foreign Affairs' investigation into the Jonestown, Guyana tragedy, conducted pursuant to the provisions of clause 1(h)(10) and clause 2 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and of House Resolution 981 of the 95th Congress.

I have requested legal representation in this matter from the Clerk's general counsel since the custody of the documents in question falls under the jurisdiction of the Clerk's office.

I am examining the subpoena and, pursuant to my responsibility under Rule L, will

notify you of my determination as to whether the subpoena is a proper exercise of the court's jurisdiction, is material and relevant and is consistent with my privileges and rights as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Chairman.

[U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California—No. CR-80-416-RFP]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. LAURENCE JOHN LAYTON, TO CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Subpoena to Produce

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, at 450 Golden Gate Avenue in the Courtroom of the Hon. Robert F. Peckham, 19th Floor, in the city of San Francisco, on the 9th day of July, 1981 at 9:30 o'clock A.M. to testify in the above case and bring with you Classified section of report entitled "The Assassination of Representative Leo J. Ryan and the Jonestown, Guyana Tragedy." Report of the Staff Investigative Group to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Dated: May 15, 1979, § III(F), which section is entitled "Conspiracy to Kill Rep. Leo Ryan?"

This subpoena is issued upon application of the defendant.

April 7, 1981.

James F. Hewitt, Federal Public Defender, Attorney for defendant Layton, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: (415) 556-7712.

WILLIAM L. WHITTAKER,
U.S. Magistrate² or Clerk.
By CORINNE A. ORTEGA,
Deputy Clerk.

[In the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California—CR-80-416-RFP]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, v. LAURENCE JOHN LAYTON, DEFENDANT

ORDER

On Motion of the defendant under the provisions of Rule 17 (b) and (c), and good cause appearing therefor.

It is hereby ordered that subpoenas duces tecum be issued to the named witnesses for the production of the described books, papers, documents or other objects in the possession or subject to the custody and control of the witness, and that the fees and costs of said subpoena and witness be paid in the same manner in which similar costs and fees are paid in case of a witness subpoenaed in behalf of the government.

It is further ordered that the custodian of the subpoenaed materials may, in lieu of personal appearance prior to trial, deposit said materials with the Clerk of this Court no later than April 20, 1981, for examination and copying by both parties and this Court.

Party to whom subpoena directed:

¹ Insert "United States," or "defendant" as the case may be.

² A subpoena shall be issued by a Magistrate in a proceeding before him, but need not be under the seal of the court. (Rule 17(a), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.)

Clement J. Zablocki, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Date of Trial: July 9, 1981.

Materials subject to subpoena:

Classified section of report entitled, "The Assassination of Representative Leo J. Ryan and the Jonestown, Guyana Tragedy." Report of the Staff Investigative Group to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, dated: May 15, 1979, § III(F), which section is entitled "Conspiracy to Kill Rep. Leo Ryan?"

Dated: April 6, 1981.

ROBERT F. PECKHAM,
Chief U.S. District Judge.

[In the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California—CR-80-0416-RFP]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, v. LAURENCE JOHN LAYTON, DEFENDANT

ORDER

This court has today ordered that subpoenas duces tecum be served on the Secretary of State, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives, and the Custodian of Records of the Federal Communications Commission. Those subpoenas order that the materials requested be turned over to the Clerk of this court no later than April 20, 1981.

In the event that any of the persons so served wish to file motions to quash, such motions shall be filed no later than April 20, 1981. Any opposition to such motions made shall be due no later than April 27, 1981. Hearing on any such motions to quash will be held on May 5, 1981, at 10:00 a.m., at the United States Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California.

In order to expedite the disposition of any issues raised by these subpoenas, this court will conduct a conference, via telephone, with counsel for the parties to this action, and with counsel for the persons served with these subpoenas. That conference shall commence at 11:00 a.m., Pacific time, on April 13, 1981. At that conference, the court will wish to discuss the anticipated extent of compliance with the subpoenas, the anticipated extent of and grounds for any motions to quash, and any possibilities of informal agreements which would resolve any disputes over the subpoenaed material.

The court orders that counsel for the defendant provide the court, prior to the scheduled time for this conference, the names and telephone numbers of the counsel who will be representing the recipients of the subpoenas at this conference. The court will initiate the telephone conference call. The court asks that the counsel for the recipients of the subpoenas be available at these telephone numbers at the time set for this conference.

Counsel for the defendant is further ordered to have a copy of this Order served on each of those receiving a subpoena duces tecum. The copy of this Order shall accompany and be served at the same time as the subpoenas.

So ordered.

Dated: April 6, 1981.

ROBERT F. PECKHAM,
Chief U.S. District Judge.

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. WALKER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CORCORAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DONNELLY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEBOUTILLIER in two instances.

Mr. WEBER of Minnesota in two instances.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. GREEN in two instances.

Mr. JEFFRIES.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. PURSELL in two instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

Mr. CORCORAN.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. EVANS, of Delaware.

Mr. GOODLING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DONNELLY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. STOKES in four instances.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. FAUNTROY in three instances.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. MILLER of California in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. CONYERS in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. NOWAK.

Mr. HUBBARD.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 3 through 9, 1981, as "National

Physical Fitness and Sports for All Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 3 through May 10, 1981, as "Jewish Heritage Week."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, April 27, 1981, the Chair declares that the House will recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 8:40 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 116 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presiding.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. James T. Molloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY); the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG); the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER); the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL); the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT); the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP); the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES); and the gentleman from California (Mr. CLAUSEN).

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of the Senate, pursuant to the order previously entered into, the Chair appoints the following Senators on the

part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER); the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS); the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND); the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE); the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER); the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN); the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD); the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD); the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON); the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE); the Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL); the Senator from Ohio (Mr. METZENBAUM); and the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN).

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 1 minute p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

A PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 97-48)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Congress, honored guests and fellow citizens.

I have no words to express my appreciation for that greeting.

[Applause.]

I have come to speak to you tonight about our economic recovery program and why I believe it is essential that the Congress approve this package which I believe will lift the crushing burden of inflation off of our citizens

and restore the vitality to our economy, and our industrial machine.

First, however, and due to events of the past few weeks, will you permit me to digress for a moment from the all important subject of why we must bring Government spending under control and reduce tax rates. I would like to say a few words directly to all of you and to those who are watching and listening tonight. Because this is the only way I know to express to all of you on behalf of Nancy and myself our appreciation for your messages, your flowers, and most of all, your prayers, not only for me, but for those others who fell beside me.

The warmth of your words, the expression of friendship and, yes, love, meant more to us than you can ever know. You have given us a memory that we will treasure forever. And you have provided an answer to those few voices that were raised saying that what happened was evidence that ours is a sick society.

The society we heard from is made up of millions of compassionate Americans and their children from college age to kindergarten.

As a matter of fact, as evidence of that I have a letter with me. The letter came from Peter Sweeney. He is in the second grade in the Riverside School in Rockville Center. And he said, "I hope you get well quick or you might have to make a speech in your pajamas."

He added a postscript. "P.S. If you have to make a speech in your pajamas, I warned you."

Well, sick societies do not produce men like the two who recently returned from outer space. Sick societies do not produce young men like Secret Service Agent Tim McCarthy—who placed his body between mine and the man with the gun simply because he felt that is what his duty called for him to do. Sick societies do not produce dedicated police officers like Tom Delahanty—or able and devoted public servants like Jim Brady.

[Applause.]

Sick societies do not make people like us so proud to be Americans and so very proud of our fellow citizens.

Now, let us talk about getting spending and inflation under control and cutting your tax rates.

Mr. Speaker and Senator BAKER, I want to thank you for your cooperation in helping to arrange this joint session of the Congress. I won't be speaking to you very long tonight, but I asked for this meeting because the urgency of our joint mission has not changed.

Thanks to some very fine people, my health is much improved. I would like to be able to say that with regard to the health of the economy. It has been half a year since the election that charged all of us in this Government with the task of restoring our

economy. Where have we come in these 6 months? Inflation as measured by the Consumer Price Index has continued at a double-digit rate. Mortgage interest rates have averaged almost 15 percent for these 6 months, preventing families across America from buying homes. There are still almost 8 million unemployed. The average worker's hourly earnings after adjusting for inflation are lower today than they were 6 months ago, and there have been over 6,000 business failures.

Six months is long enough. The American people now want us to act, and not in half measures. They demand, and they have earned, a full and comprehensive effort to clean up our economic mess.

Because of the extent of our economy's sickness, we know that the cure will not come quickly, and that even with our package, progress will come in inches and feet, not in miles. But to fail to act will delay even longer, and more painfully, the cure which must come.

And that cure begins with the Federal budget. And the budgetary actions taken by the Congress over the next few days will determine how we respond to the message of last November 4.

That message was very simple. Our Government is too big and it spends too much.

For the last few months you and I have enjoyed a relationship based on extraordinary cooperation. Because of this cooperation we have come a long distance in less than 3 months. I want to thank the leadership of the Congress for helping in setting a fair timetable for consideration of our recommendations, and committee chairmen on both sides of the aisle have called prompt and thorough hearings.

We have also communicated in a spirit of candor, openness, and mutual respect. Tonight, as our decision day nears, and as the House of Representatives weighs its alternatives, I wish to address you in that same spirit.

The Senate Budget Committee, under the leadership of PETE DOMENICI, has just today voted out a budget resolution supported by Democrats and Republicans alike that is in all major respects consistent with the program that we have proposed.

Now we look forward to favorable action on the Senate floor. But an equally crucial test involves the House of Representatives.

The House will soon be choosing between two different versions or measures to deal with the economy. One is the measure offered by the House Budget Committee. The other is a bipartisan measure, a substitute introduced by Congressmen PHIL GRAMM of Texas and DEL LATTA of Ohio.

On behalf of the Administration, let me say that we embrace and fully support that bipartisan substitute.

It will achieve all the essential aims of controlling Government spending, reducing the tax burden, building a national defense second to none, and stimulating economic growth and creating millions of new jobs.

At the same time, however, I must state our opposition to the measure offered by the House Budget Committee.

It may appear that we have two alternatives. In reality, however, there are no more alternatives left. The committee measure quite simply falls far too short of the essential actions that we must take. For example, in the next 3 years:

The Committee measure projects spending \$141 billion more than does the bipartisan substitute.

It regrettably cuts over \$14 billion in essential defense funding—funding required to restore America's national security.

It adheres to the failed policy of trying to balance the budget on the taxpayers' back. It would increase tax payments by over a third—adding up to a staggering quarter of a trillion dollars. Federal taxes would increase 12 percent each year. Taxpayers would be paying a larger share of their income to Government in 1984 than they do at present.

In short, that measure reflects an echo of the past rather than a benchmark for the future. High taxes and excess spending growth created our present economic mess; more of the same will not cure the hardship, anxiety, and discouragement it has imposed on the American people.

Let us cut through the fog for a moment. The answer to a Government that is too big is to stop feeding its growth. Government spending has been growing faster than the economy itself. The massive national debt which we accumulated is the result of the Government's high spending diet. Well, it is time to change the diet and to change it in the right way.

I know the tax portion of our package is of concern to some of you. Let me make a few points that I feel have been overlooked. First of all, it should be looked at as an integral part of the entire package, not something separate and apart from the budget reductions, the regulatory relief, and the monetary restraints.

Probably the most common misconception is that we are proposing to reduce Government revenues to less than what the Government has been receiving. This is not true. Actually, the discussion has to do with how much of a tax increase should be imposed on the taxpayer in 1982.

Now, I know that over the recess in some informal polling some of your

constituents have been asked which they would rather have, a balanced budget or a tax cut. And with the common sense that characterizes the people of this country, the answer of course has been a balanced budget. But may I suggest with no inference that there was wrong intent on the part of those who asked the question, the question was inappropriate to the situation. Our choice is not between a balanced budget and a tax cut. Properly asked, the question is, do you want a great big raise in your taxes this coming year, or at the worst a very little increase with the prospect of tax reduction and a balanced budget down the road a ways.

With the common sense that the people have already shown, I am sure we all know what the answer to that question would be. A gigantic tax increase has been built into the system. We propose nothing more than a reduction of that increase. The people have a right to know that even with our plan they will be paying more in taxes, but not as much more as they will without it.

The option I believe offered by the House Budget Committee will leave spending too high and tax rates too high. At the same time, I think it cuts the defense budget too much. And by attempting to reduce the deficit through higher taxes, it will not create the kind of strong economic growth and the new jobs that we must have.

Let us not overlook the fact that the small, independent business man or woman creates more than 80 percent of all the new jobs and employs more than half of our total work force. Our across-the-board cut in tax rates for a 3-year period will give them much of the incentive and promise of stability they need to go forward with expansion plans calling for additional employees.

Tonight I renew my call for us to work as a team, to join in cooperation so that we find answers which will begin to solve all our economic problems and not just some of them. The economic recovery package that I have outlined to you over the past few weeks is, I deeply believe, the only answer that we have left. Reducing the growth of spending, cutting marginal tax rates, providing relief from over-regulation, and following a non-inflationary and predictable monetary policy are interwoven measures which will insure that we have addressed each of the severe dislocations which threaten our economic future. These policies will make our economy stronger and the stronger economy will balance the budget which we are committed to do by 1984.

When I took the oath of office, I pledged loyalty to only one special interest group—"We the people." Those people—neighbors and friends, shop-

keepers and laborers, farmers and craftsmen—do not have infinite patience. As a matter of fact, some 80 years ago Teddy Roosevelt wrote these instructive words in his first message to the Congress: "The American people are slow to wrath, but when their wrath is once kindled, it burns like a consuming flame."

Well, perhaps that kind of wrath will be deserved if our answer to these serious problems is to repeat the mistakes of the past. The old and comfortable way is to shave a little here and add a little there. Well, that is not acceptable any more. I think this great and historic Congress knows that way is no longer acceptable.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

I think you have shown that you know the one sure way to continue the inflationary spiral is to fall back into the predictable patterns of old economic practices.

Isn't it time that we tried something new?

When you allowed me to speak to you here in these Chambers a little earlier, I told you that I wanted this program for economic recovery to be ours, yours and mine. I think the bipartisan substitute bill has achieved that purpose. It moves us toward an economic vitality.

Just 2 weeks ago you and I joined millions of our fellow Americans in marveling at the magical historical moment that John Young and Bob Crippen created in their space shuttle Columbia.

The last manned effort was almost 6 years ago, and I remembered on this more recent day over the years how we had all come to expect technological precision of our men and machines. And each amazing achievement became commonplace, until the next new challenge was raised.

With the Space Shuttle, we tested our ingenuity once again, moving beyond the accomplishments of the past into the promise and uncertainty of the future. Thus we not only planned to send up a 122-foot aircraft, 170 miles into space, but we also intended to make it maneuverable and return it to Earth landing 98 tons of exotic metals delicately on a remote dry lake bed.

The Space Shuttle did more than prove our technological abilities. It raised our expectations once more. It started us dreaming again. The poet Carl Sandburg wrote, "The Republic is a dream. Nothing happens unless first a dream."

And that is what makes us as Americans different. We have always reached for a new spirit and aimed at a higher goal. We have been courageous and determined, unafraid and bold. Who among us wants to be first to say we no longer have those qualities, that we must limp along doing

the same things that have brought us our present misery?

I believe that the people you and I represent are ready to chart a new course. They look to us to meet the great challenge, to reach beyond the commonplace and not fall short for lack of creativity or courage.

Someone, you know, has said that he who would have nothing to do with thorns must never attempt to gather flowers.

But we have much greatness before us. We can restore our economic strength and build opportunities like none we have ever had before.

As Carl Sandburg said, all we need to begin with is a dream that we can do better than before.

All we need to have is faith, and that dream will come true.

All we need to do is act, and the time for action is now.

Thank you and goodnight.

[Applause.]

At 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the Committee of Escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order: The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Charge d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER, The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 9 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 29, 1981, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of the rule XXIV, executive communications were taken

from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1204. A letter from the Acting Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1205. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for more efficient and expeditious disposal of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed property in the custody of the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1206. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 313 of title 32, United States Code, to permit the appointment of noncitizen medical and dental officers in the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1207. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a nutritionally adequate, consumer-acceptable ration for the Armed Forces, to authorize the issuance and sale of rations, to prescribe special rations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1208. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report on the impact on U.S. readiness of the Army's proposed sale of certain defense equipment to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-43), pursuant to section 813 of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1209. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report on the impact on U.S. readiness of the Air Force's proposed sale of certain defense equipment and services to Korea (Transmittal No. 81-40), pursuant to section 813 of Public Law 94-106; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1210. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the international affairs functions of the Department of the Treasury for fiscal years 1982 and 1983; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1211. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend programs under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1212. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Head Start and Native American programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1213. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate and simplify the administration of Federal aid for elementary and secondary education and to restore control over education to States and local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1214. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting notice of a delay until June 15, 1981, in the submission of the annual report of the Public Health Service for fiscal year 1980, required by section 511 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1215. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on State compliance with medicaid utilization control requirements, pursuant to section 1903(g)(6) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1216. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report covering the quarter ended March 31, 1981, listing the price and availability estimates provided to countries and the requests for issuance of letters of offer received, pursuant to section 28 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1217. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment to the Netherlands (Transmittal No. 81-39), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1218. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Air Force's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment and services to Korea (Transmittal No. 81-40), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1219. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Air Force's intention to offer to sell certain defense services to the Federal Republic of Germany (Transmittal No. 81-42), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1220. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense equipment to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. 81-43), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1221. A letter from the Acting President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 1980 development report, assessing the economic and social development impact and benefits of OPIC-supported projects during fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 240A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1222. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting notice of a proposed new records system for the Navy, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1223. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, transmitting notice of a proposed new records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1224. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's administration of the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1980, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1225. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the third annual report on various bidding options used in fiscal year 1980 lease sales on the Outer Continental Shelf, pursuant to section 8(a)(9) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1226. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the 1980 annual report of the Bonneville Power Administration,

containing a consolidated financial statement for the Federal Columbia River Power System, pursuant to section 3(a) of Public Law 89-448; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1227. A letter from the Special Assistant, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for October 1980, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act as amended; to the Committee on Small Business.

1228. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting volume II of the Small Business Administration's annual report for fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 10 of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Small Business.

1229. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian programs for fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1983, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Science and Technology.

1230. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 94th annual report of the Commission, covering fiscal year 1980, pursuant to section 10311 and 10327(j) of title 49, United States Code; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

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. ANDERSON:

H.R. 3266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide royalty holders a credit against the windfall profit tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend certain authorizations of appropriations made in such act, and to make certain revisions in the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 3268. A bill to improve the administration of criminal justice with respect to organized crime and the use of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 3269. A bill to clarify the circumstances under which territorial provisions in licenses to distribute and sell trademarked malt beverage products are lawful under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By BROOKS (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 3270. A bill to extend and amend the authority of the President to reorganize the executive branch of the Government under chapter 9 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 3271. A bill to extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for 1 year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COELHO:

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gains from dispositions of patents or similar property for purposes of applying the limitation on the foreign tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

H.R. 3273. A bill 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; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to terminate the payment of benefits thereunder to inmates of penal institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 3276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income up to \$1,000 of interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HOLT:

H.R. 3277. A bill to amend section 320 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3278. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide additional standards for determining the amount of space to be programed for military retirees and their dependents in medical facilities of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide estate and gift tax equity for family enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3280. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to repeal the special tariff treatment accorded to articles assembled abroad with components produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURSELL:

H.R. 3281. A bill to assure that job skills training and employment opportunities are furnished through Opportunities Industrialization Centers and other community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness in certain block grant programs involving the creation of urban jobs in enterprise zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURSELL (for himself, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. WINN, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BENEDICT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. ROBINSON):

H.R. 3282. A bill to provide for permanent tax rate reductions for individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H.R. 3283. A bill to repeal certain provisions applicable to compensation for the

overtime inspectional services of employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 3284. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., a legal public holiday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 3285. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate polygraph and other detection of deception examinations and prohibit certain practices with respect thereto for the purpose of protecting the privacy rights of employees and individuals seeking employment with employers engaged in any business or activity in or affecting interstate commerce while permitting such employers to use such examinations to protect their businesses and control property losses attributable to employee theft and other acts of misconduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. GINN, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. NAPIER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. LOEFFLER):

H.R. 3286. A bill to assure adequate supplies of peanuts and the products thereof to meet the food needs of consumers at reasonable prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BELENSON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3287. A bill to repeal baseball's antitrust exemption, to prohibit certain territorial restrictions in professional sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHANNON (for himself and Mr. ROUSSELOT):

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for research and development expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD) (by request):

H.R. 3289. A bill to authorize appropriations under the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 3290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of a cooperative housing corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 3291. A bill to provide for the gradual reduction in payments for certain types of children under the impact aid program of Public Law 874; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 3292. A bill to amend the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 to extend certain authorizations of appropriations contained in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DE LUGO (for himself, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. PHILLIP BURTON):

H.J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to approve a constitution for the U.S. Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIG:

H.J. Res. 239. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate the week beginning June 21, 1981, as "National Oldtime Fiddlers Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.J. Res. 240. Joint resolution to proclaim June 4, 1981, as "Jack Jouett Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RITTER:

H.J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to designate the week commencing with the first Sunday in October of each year as "National Hawk Watching Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Patience Lovell Wright; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating October 16, 1981 as "World Food Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 10, 1981, as "Taxpayers Independence Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORCORAN (for himself and Mr. LEE):

H. Res. 130. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to use of committee funds for travel; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

52. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to deregulation of the price of natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 3293. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Viola P. Warbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORRADA:

H.R. 3294. A bill for the relief of Mireille Laffite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 3295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 3296. A bill for the relief of Simon Marriott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 3297. A bill for the relief of Maria de Lourdes Tipan de Brewer; 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. 27: Mr. BLANCHARD, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LUJAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. SANTINI, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.

H.R. 116: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LOTT, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROE, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 119: Mr. McCLORY.
H.R. 131: Mr. PARRIS.
H.R. 134: Mr. BEVILL and Mr. NICHOLS.
H.R. 135: Mr. CLAUSEN.
H.R. 148: Mr. DASCHLE.
H.R. 149: Mr. TRAXLER.
H.R. 151: Mr. TRAXLER.
H.R. 182: Mr. CONABLE.
H.R. 248: Mr. CHENEY, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. FORSYTHE.

H.R. 412: Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 654: Mr. FRANK, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 741: Mr. GINGRICH.
H.R. 822: Mr. WIRTH.
H.R. 878: Mrs. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 879: Mr. BUTLER.

H.R. 1177: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MICA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DAUB, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1294: Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 1297: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.

H.R. 1298: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.

H.R. 1300: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1304: Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. BADHAM, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1353: Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LeBOUTILLIER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1362: Mr. BENEDICT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1507: Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. KOGOVSEK, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1509: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. FARY, Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1541: Mr. BOWEN.
H.R. 1720: Mr. WOLPE and Mr. RINALDO.
H.R. 1723: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1725: Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. SIMON.
H.R. 1743: Mr. BEDELL and Mr. ROBINSON.
H.R. 1805: Mr. STOKES, Mr. FRANK, Mr. EDGAR, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 1817: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1852: Mr. COELHO, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. CHAPPIE.

H.R. 1861: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 1864: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 1918: Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. LeBOUTILLIER, Mr. DECKARD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 1978: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2052: Ms. MIKULSKI and Mr. BREAU.

H.R. 2112: Mr. STARK, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. PEPPER.

H.R. 2113: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GREEN, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 2244: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2262: Mr. KOGOVSEK and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 2384: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2385: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. HECKLER, and Mrs. BOGGS.

H.R. 2390: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2456: Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ZEPHERETTI, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 2472: Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2474: Mr. SEIBERLING and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2567: Mr. RAILSBACK.

H.R. 2643: Mr. NELSON.

H.R. 2776: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 2879: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 2949: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mrs. SNOWE, Mr. MOTT, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LeBOUTILLIER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COELHO, Mr. ROE, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. BENJAMIN.

H.R. 3045: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FISH, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. YATES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3046: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FISH, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. YATES, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. STUDDS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. COELHO, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. ROE, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. ECKHART.

H.R. 3210: Ms. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 3218: Mr. BRODHEAD.

H.J. Res. 227: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.J. Res. 230: Mr. WALGREN and Mr. WOLPE.

H.J. Res. 234: Mr. FRANK, Mr. VENTO, and Ms. FERRARO.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. REGULA, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. LeBOUTILLIER.

H. Res. 126: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. LELAND.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By Mr. KAZEN: Petition of George T. Knoblauch, San Antonio, Tex., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

66. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Erie County Legislature, New York relative to petroleum pricing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

67. Also, petition of the Board of Directors, American Association of Meat Processors, Elizabethtown, Pa., relative to support of the Reagan administration's economic program; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

68. Also, petition of the board of directors, Health Industry Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C., relative to support of the President's economic, regulatory, and defense programs; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Ways and Means, and Armed Services.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H. CON. RES. 115

By Mr. OTTINGER:

—Page 6, line 4, strike out "\$688,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$691,860,000,000".

Page 6, line 6, strike out "\$30,450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$27,540,000,000".

Page 6, line 13, strike out "\$25,600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,690,000,000".

Page 6, line 15, strike out "\$1,060,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,057,090,000,000".

Page 6, line 17, strike out "\$65,900,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$62,990,000,000".

Page 15, line 12, strike out "\$778,250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$781,556,000,000".

Page 15, line 13, strike out "\$864,850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$868,552,000,000".

Page 15, line 15, strike out "or decreased".

Page 15, line 17, strike out "\$000,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,306,000,000".

Page 15, line 18, strike out "\$000,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,702,000,000".

Page 16, line 2, strike out "or deficit".

Page 16, line 5, strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,056,000,000".

Page 16, line 6, strike out "+\$25,800,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$29,502,000,000".

Page 16, line 9, strike out "\$1,094,850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,091,544,000,000".

Page 16, line 10, strike out "\$34,850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,544,000,000".

Page 16, line 14, strike out "\$1,800,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800,000,000".

Page 16, line 15, strike out "\$000,000,000,000".