

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 20, 1982

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Ronald E. Dunk, First United Methodist Church of Haddon Heights, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we, Your children, bow before You with grateful hearts. We thank You for this world, Your beloved creation. We thank You that, along with You, we are cocreators. Our task, Lord, is to strive to make our world better. We celebrate Your presence in our midst and seek Your loving guidance. We ask for wisdom in our appointed task. Open our minds and hearts to Your leading that our decisions would be made with deep empathy toward our brothers and sisters, Your children, throughout these United States and in the world that You loved and created. In Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 22, 1982:

H.R. 6132. An act to amend section 5590 of the Revised Statutes to provide for adjusting the rate of interest paid on funds of the Smithsonian Institution deposited with the Treasury of the United States as a permanent loan.

On June 23, 1982:

H.R. 4. An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to prohibit the unauthorized disclosure of information identifying certain U.S. intelligence officers agents, informants, and sources; and

H.R. 5432. An act to authorize the presentation on behalf of the Congress of a specially struck gold medal to Adm. Hyman George Rickover.

On June 24, 1982:

H.R. 5566. An act authorizing appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5659. An act to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to construct a building

for the National Museum of African Art and a center for Eastern art together with structures for related educational activities in the area south of the original Smithsonian Institution Building adjacent to Independence Avenue at Tenth Street Southwest, in the city of Washington.

On June 28, 1982:

H.J. Res. 519. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

On June 29, 1982:

H.R. 3112. An act to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to extend the effect of certain provisions, and for other purposes.

On June 30, 1982:

H.R. 1482. An act for the relief of Christina Boltz Sedders;

H.R. 3816. An act to improve the operation of the Fishermen's Contingency Fund established to compensate commercial fishermen for damages resulting from oil and gas exploration, development, and production in areas of the Outer Continental Shelf;

H.R. 3863. An act to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to increase the number of turkeys which may be slaughtered and processed without inspection under such act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4569. An act to designate the U.S. Post Office Building in Hartford, Connecticut, as the "William R. Cotter Federal Building";

H.R. 4903. An act granting the consent of the Congress to an interstate compact between the States of Mississippi and Louisiana establishing a commission to study the feasibility of rapid rail service between the two States;

H.R. 6631. An act to authorize humanitarian assistance for the people of Lebanon;

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution imploring the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to allow Dr. Semyon Gluzman and his family to emigrate to Israel; and

H.J. Res. 518. Joint resolution to designate the week commencing with the fourth Monday in June 1982 as "National NCO/Petty Officer Week."

On July 12, 1982:

H.R. 3127. An act for the relief of S. Sgt. Anne M. Fisher, U.S. Army Reserve; and

H.R. 6451. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise and codify the permanent provisions of law relating to military construction and military family housing.

On July 18, 1982:

H.R. 6685. An act making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

THE REVEREND DR. RONALD DUNK

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

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to welcome Dr. Ronald Dunk, pastor of the First

United Methodist Church of Haddon Heights, N.J., as guest chaplain before the House of Representatives.

Dr. Dunk is the first minister to address the House from my district in South Jersey during my service as a U.S. Representative. Dr. Dunk is a respected member of his congregation and community.

Dr. Dunk is embarking on his fifth year with the Haddon Heights Church. In addition to serving his church, he is an avid participant in community affairs. Dr. Dunk is a member of the Lions Club and an applicant to the Juvenile Conference Committee. He has just recently received his doctorate of ministry from Drew University.

Originally from Bridgeport, N.J., Dr. Dunk has served United Methodist Churches in Milltown, South Amboy, and Bricktown. During his 15 years in Bricktown, he was bestowed several awards. In 1964, Dr. Dunk was presented with the Jaycees Distinguished Service Award, and in 1977, was named Citizen of the Year.

Dr. Dunk resides in Haddon Heights with his wife Alice and their five children: MaryBeth, Alisa, Carl, Paul, and Mark.

I am indeed pleased and honored to have sponsored Dr. Ronald Dunk to deliver the invocation for this morning's session of the U.S. House of Representatives.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

REMEDIOS R. ALCUDIA, CHRISTOPHER, EZRA, VERMILLION, AND PERISTELLO ALCUDIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1547) for the relief of Remedios R. Alcudia, Christopher, Ezra, Vermillion, and Peristello Alcudia.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LASZLO REVESZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1352) for the relief of Laszlo Revesz.

□ 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.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JENNIFER FERRER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1830) for the relief of Jennifer Ferrer.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

IRA BOMBING

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

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, several terrorist bombs have gone off in London, and the Irish Republican Army says it is responsible.

Friends of Ireland in the United States must ask: Why do those who claim to advance Irish unity march this hopeless path of destruction?

These killers convey a truth that they themselves fail to understand.

A peaceful and united Ireland can never be built on a foundation of bloody, innocent corpses.

Every time a bomb goes off, the unification of Ireland becomes that much more distant.

Irish Americans recognize the IRA for what it is: Men who are dedicated to destruction and death and anarchy—not to the old dream of an Irish Republic.

I speak for all Irish Americans in offering my sympathy to the families of those who were killed and to those who were injured. And I express my deep hope that the perpetrators of these crimes will be quickly brought to justice.

IN SUPPORT OF CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS' SUBSTITUTE TO THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from California, RONALD V. DELLUMS, for his leadership in offering to this body a full substitute to H.R. 6030.

Mr. DELLUMS' leadership on this matter is consistent with his contribution to the Congressional Black Caucus budget, known as the Faunt-

roy substitute, which was the only budget proposal which incorporated in its provisions the principles of the nuclear freeze.

The Dellums amendment in the nature of a substitute would save our Nation \$55 billion by eliminating the MX missile, the Trident II, the Pershing II, and other high technology nuclear weapons which buy us no real security but merely escalate global insecurity.

I appreciate the work of my colleague in continually bringing to this body the challenge to examine our assumptions about the nature of the world's problems and reminding us of the levels of insecurity and danger that are the result of our present reliance on expensive and dangerous nuclear weaponry.

IRA VIOLENCE IS CONDEMNED

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. SHANNON) in expressing shock and outrage at the dastardly attack on innocent individuals in London, which has been claimed by the Irish Republican Army. It is yet another horrifying example of the obscene violence which has been perpetrated by this and other terrorist groups.

I hope that all Americans will respond with a shared determination to see that no funds or other support reach terrorist organizations in Ireland which could be used by them to continue the process of killing innocent men, women, and children in the Republic, Northern Ireland, the United Kingdom, or elsewhere. I also hope that all Members will take the opportunity to condemn this latest outrage.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to ask the gentleman, is this being done in order to accommodate a Democratic Caucus? And it has been checked with our leadership, I understand.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, the purpose is exactly as the gentleman suggests; it is for the purpose of permitting the holding of a Democratic Caucus, and it has been discussed with the leadership on the gentleman's side. There is no objection

to the request, and it is a matter of accommodation that we have made in the past to each party for the purpose of these meetings.

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

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

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER'S COMMISSION ON THE PAGES

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I am announcing the convening of the Speaker's Commission on the Pages to be convened at 10 a.m. tomorrow, July 21, in room H-128 of the Capitol.

Members are invited to submit their views on the questions of whether the page system should be continued; if abandoned, how will the page services be performed, and by whom; if continued, what reforms are needed in such areas as housing and supervision?

But in order to complete the report of the Commission within a timely fashion and as soon as possible, Members are encouraged to submit their views in writing to me as Chairman of the Commission.

The following is the announcement of the appointment of this Commission:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 19, 1982.

THE SPEAKER'S COMMISSION ON THE PAGES

The Speaker and the minority leader have appointed a commission to study the page system of the United States House of Representatives with instructions to report recommendations as soon as possible.

The following persons were appointed to serve on the Commission: Bill Alexander of Arkansas, Chairman; John Myers of Indiana; Jim Molloy, Doorkeeper; Joel Janakowsky, Esq.; and Charles Wiggins, Esq.

The purpose of the Commission is to review the page system, in all its aspects including whether it should be continued, the need for supervised housing or improved education.

This study is limited in scope and is not intended to duplicate the present inquiry to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

AIDING THE AIRLINES

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

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Boeing 747 aid plan because we are refusing to accept our responsibility to admit the true purpose of this measure. We can spend additional hours debating the military usefulness of the C-5B over the 747, but

that is not the real question. Clearly, the 747 cannot perform the critically needed outsize airlift mission and we have a critical shortage in that type capability.

The real question we are debating today is whether or not the U.S. House of Representatives is going to use the Defense authorization bill as a vehicle to assist the economically ailing airline industry. Mr. Speaker, I submit that we should not.

I do not question the fact that many of our Nation's airlines are in financial difficulty. I do not question whether the U.S. House of Representatives should address this problem and, possibly, provide some relief. But if we are going to aid the airlines, let us admit it up front. Let us conduct hearings on the impact of airline deregulation. Let us analyze the facts. Let us make concrete proposals on that issue and that issue alone. Let us not jeopardize a vital military mission for the sake of expediency on an entirely separate issue.

Granted, the purchase of used 747 airplanes would provide cash for ailing airlines and, possibly, allow them to purchase more efficient aircraft. By the same token the Air Force would be crippled with a fleet of used commercial airplanes that are incapable of performing the defined military mission.

There is another aspect of this proposed purchase that has not been discussed fully. Thirteen of the surplus 747's are not owned by domestic airlines. They are owned by the manufacturer, the Boeing Co. Eight of the airplanes have been traded in by international carriers. Sale of these airplanes would aid the cash-strapped Boeing Co. So, even if we admit that this plan really is an aid package for the airline industry, let us make sure that we fully understand the implications of the proposed procurement.

If adopted, this amendment could achieve many actions. Some domestic airlines would receive cash for surplus airplanes. Those airlines that are not fortunate enough to have excess 747's will have their competitors subsidized. The airplane's manufacturer could sell excess 747's for which they have no other customers.

We can accomplish all this by merely ignoring the fact that we would erode further a seriously deficient airlift capability. To me, the losers, should we take such action as passing the 747 aid plan, would be the American taxpayer and our military personnel whose very lives will depend upon our ability to get necessary fire-power and equipment where it needs to be and in time.

The only logical choice in this matter is to defeat the proposed amendment and proceed with the recommendations contained in the Defense authorization bill.

□ 1215

FEDERAL RESERVE FINALLY ACTS

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post carries the headline, "Fed Cuts Discount Rate to 11½ Percent," hinting eased interest rates.

The article then states, "The Fed's move to lower the so-called discount rate was seen by financial market analysts as promoting a general easing of interest rates."

Mr. Speaker, let us hope so. Behind this action is a formal and official request made on April 26, by me as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to the General Accounting Office to review the actions of the Federal Reserve System, and the effect that monetary and fiscal policies are having on interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, this investigation has been proceeding since April 26. Apparently, from the Fed's action, it is having its effect. A final report by the GAO is due not later than August 31.

It is hoped that by that time, further action will be taken by Federal Reserve banks to reduce present high interest rates. Such action is a must.

THE PRODUCTION OF NERVE GAS

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

Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the military authorization bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I will offer an amendment to delete funding for the binary chemical weapon, in other words, the nerve gas weapon. We do so because we have concluded that it is not militarily effective and that it is a waste of the taxpayers' dollar.

Furthermore, it breaks a 13-year policy, a wise policy, that was established by President Nixon in 1969, which distinguishes America from the Soviet Union when you consider the arms race that is taking place in the world today.

Members may have the impression that they have voted for binary weapons before. That is not so. Last year Members had an opportunity to vote on a provision which would build a building which could be used later on for the production of nerve gas. Today we have the big one. It is the question of whether or not we are going to break that wise policy and commence production of nerve gas.

We urge the Members to support the Zablocki-Bethune amendment when it comes to the floor.

ANOTHER CHANCE AT A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the front of the Capitol we had a rally which defined for the Nation the fact that we are attempting to achieve a constitutional amendment on balancing the budget, and hopefully sometime before the end of this session of this House we will have a chance to vote on that particular issue.

I want to assure the Members that we are going to continue to have chances to vote on balancing the budget time and time again on other bills as they arise, because the law of the land, 95-435, requires a balanced budget. For instance, I want to tell the Members that when the defense authorization that we are considering comes up I intend to offer my amendment to have us consider the balanced budget in the context of defense as well. But I would warn many people who think that this is going to be a good place to vote to comply with the law which says a balanced budget after 1981. By passing my amendment, what we would do is give the President an opportunity to arrive at the balanced budget, not necessarily cutting it all out of defense, but taking it out of where it was needed in order to make defense comply with the balanced budget act.

So people who think that they are going to get a cheap vote against defense and vote for a balanced budget better think again, because what the law says is that we balance the whole budget, not just on the back of one Department, and the President could be in compliance simply by getting us to a balanced budget using all phases of the budget in that effort. My attempts are not to balance the budget on the backs of anyone. Just to balance the budget is the objective. And once we have defined the objective in a major authorization such as this one, we will hand the President the tools necessary to get the job done using not portions of the budget, but the whole of it.

REPORT ON RECONCILIATION

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the first concur-

rent resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1983, adopted by the House on June 15, contained reconciliation instructions to nine House and eight Senate committees. A deadline of August 1 was set in the resolution for work on reconciliation legislation in the House. Votes on specific cuts and revenue increases may be scheduled before that date. In the Senate a July 20 deadline was set for all committees except the Finance Committee, which has a July 12 reporting date.

SPENDING REDUCTIONS

The reconciliation instructions ask for legislation that will result in reductions over the next 3 fiscal years. The outlay targets set in this year's first budget resolution are as follows: \$6.573 billion for fiscal year 1983, \$9.268 billion in fiscal year 1984 and \$11.312 billion in fiscal year 1985.

As opposed to last year, the reconciliation process this year is limited to entitlement programs only. The principle areas assumed in the reconciliation instructions include reductions in cost of living provisions for military and civil service retirees, food stamps, SSI, AFDC, medicare, and medicaid. As always, the committees are free to follow these assumptions or implement any other approaches or to achieve the targeted reductions.

REVENUE INCREASES

This year's reconciliation also includes revenue increases. The Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee will be working to meet the following revenue targets: \$20.9 billion for fiscal year 1983, \$36.0 billion for fiscal year 1984 and \$41.4 billion for fiscal year 1985.

SUMMARY TABLE

Attached is a table that lists the reductions for each committee and the revenues assigned to the Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee is already proceeding with markup on spending reductions.

We will continue to provide regular updates on the process and reconciliation measures.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

(In millions of dollars)

	1983	1984	1985
Agriculture:			
Budget authority.....	-779	-1,083	-1,428
Outlays.....	-779	-1,083	-1,428
Armed Services:			
Budget authority.....	-213	-693	-1,231
Outlays.....	-213	-693	-1,231
Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs:			
Budget authority.....	-695	-697	-687
Energy and Commerce:			
Budget authority.....	-514	-741	-815
Outlays.....	-675	-739	-811
Foreign Affairs:			
Budget authority.....		-2	-4
Outlays.....		-2	-15
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:			
Budget authority.....	-4	-15	-27
Outlays.....	-4	-15	-27
Post Office and Civil Service:			
Budget authority.....		-242	-538
Outlays.....	-376	-1,061	-1,808

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	1983	1984	1985
Veterans Affairs:			
Budget authority.....	-77	-155	-155
Outlays.....	-77	-155	-155
Ways and Means:			
Budget authority.....	-595	-705	-928
Outlays.....	-3,755	-4,827	-5,168
Grand total:			
Budget authority.....	-2,179	-3,632	-5,119
Outlays.....	-6,573	-9,268	-11,312
Reconciliation of revenues.....	20,900	36,000	41,400

WHY NOT A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN?

(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, President Reagan has made his administration the first to abandon our Nation's longstanding commitment to a comprehensive test ban central to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

Real international peace and security is impossible in a world ruled by swelling arsenals of nuclear weapons. The 1963 aboveground ban, which at the time offered hope that nuclear proliferation could be stopped, has proved to be insufficient. Indeed, underground testing has become so commonplace that nuclear detonations are rarely reported to the public.

Since 1963 both the Soviet Union and the United States have recklessly expanded their nuclear stockpiles to a point where the world could be destroyed nine times over. But the rationale of a comprehensive test ban and an immediate nuclear freeze has escaped the President's policies. America's great, unending stream of knowledge and talent should be focused on ending the threat of nuclear confrontation, not on the testing of new nuclear weapons.

ACHIEVING A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Reagan came to Capitol Hill to beat the drum for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

But there is no way we are going to achieve a balanced budget without significant reductions in military spending.

Pentagon spending takes up nearly 50 percent of the entire 1983 budget if one excludes social security and interest on the debt.

Unfortunately, the Reagan administration refuses to make any significant cuts in the Pentagon budget. Instead, the President plans to spend a stagger-

ing \$1.6 trillion on the military over the next 5 years.

Today, when we consider the 1983 Defense Department authorization, we can trim billions of dollars of waste and mismanagement from next year's budget with just a few votes.

No one questions the need for a strong defense in today's troubled world. But the administration's military spending policies are far too excessive, are actually promoting waste and overspending, and are dangerously undermining our economy.

The President seems content just to talk about a balanced budget. Today we can actually do something to get spending under control by voting to eliminate Pentagon waste and mismanagement.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of this House are much better at demonstrating their support for a balanced budget out on the west side of the Capitol than on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Yesterday's rally was like an old-fashioned medicine show, with Ronald Reagan hawking a magic elixir, guaranteed to cure what ails the country.

But this was just show. If we could really eliminate deficit spending by passing an amendment, it would have happened long ago.

The budget amendment "elixir" is nothing but political snake oil to make the American people forget the \$250 billion deficit endorsed by the Reagan administration.

Most of the people who were parading around outside yesterday—including 98 percent of the Republicans—voted against the "pay as you go" plan for achieving a balanced budget which would have drastically cut the deficit and produced a \$27.5 billion surplus by 1985.

So as we debate the balanced budget amendment, let no one be fooled by the rhetoric. Voting for a balanced budget amendment is one thing; but the President and his supporters failed the real test—the test of voting for a balanced budget itself.

ONE LAST OPPORTUNITY TO ASSIST HOMEBUYERS

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

Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, we have one last opportunity in

this fiscal year to provide much needed assistance to home buyers.

Yesterday, my colleague from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) and I met with President Reagan and Vice President BUSH because we do believe there is an alternative to the previous attempt to assist housing which was vetoed by the President.

That approach would have seriously aggravated the already bloated Federal deficit. Our approach is to transfer \$1 billion in already appropriated funds from synfuels to assist housing through the mortgage revenue bond program already in place.

The President indicated that he would not oppose our initiative.

The soon-to-be-considered regular supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1982 will give us an opportunity to vote on this proposal. It will give Members a real choice—continued subsidies for major corporations or grassroots assistance to home buyers and homebuilders and thousands of small businessmen and women all across America.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today Tuesday, July 20, 1982.)

THE 1981 ANNUAL REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF RADIATION CONTROL FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the house the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, July 20, 1982.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on

which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken today after debate has been concluded on all of the three motions to suspend the rules.

CHARTER FOR AMERICAN EX-PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5380) to recognize the organization known as American Ex-Prisoners of War, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5380

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CHARTER

SECTION 1. American Ex-Prisoners of War, organized and incorporated under the Washington Nonprofit Corporation Act (Wash. Rev. Code Ann. 24.03.005) of the State of Washington by Charles Morgan, Junior, San Antonio, Texas; Edward Fisher, Fairhaven, Massachusetts; Charles Miller, La Jolla, California; C. Earl Derrington, Jackson, Mississippi; Edward Parks, Middleboro, Massachusetts; Henry Goodall, Houston, Texas; Stanley Sommers, Marshfield, Wisconsin; Edward Allen, N. Olmstead, Ohio; Irving Rittenberg, Brookline, Massachusetts; Edgar Van Valkenberg, Saint Petersburg, Florida; W. C. Musten, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Clifford Omtvedt, Eau Claire, Wisconsin; Orlo Natvig, Charles City, Iowa; H. C. Griffin, Houston, Texas; Milton Moore, El Paso, Texas; Marie Harre, Fairway, Kansas; Alfred Galloway, Seattle, Washington; Reginald Reed, Bremerton, Washington; Ralph Moulis, Tucson, Arizona; Betty Rodriguez, Albuquerque, New Mexico; Randall Briere, San Antonio, Texas; Joseph G. Schisser, San Leon, Texas; Herman Molen, Las Vegas, Nevada; Joseph B. Upton, Saint Louis, Missouri; Harold Page, Buckley, Washington; D.C. Wimberly, Springhill, Louisiana; Albert Braun, Phoenix, Arizona; Melvin Madero, San Diego, California; Tillman Rutledge, San Antonio, Texas; Benson Guyton, Decatur, Alabama; Frank Hawkins, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Melvin Routt, Tracy, California; John Romine, Muskogee, Oklahoma; Christopher Morgan, Old Bridge, New Jersey; Allen Smith, Diana, Texas; and John G. Flynn, San Antonio, Texas, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

POWERS

SECTION 2. American Ex-Prisoners of War (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation are those provided in its articles of incorporation and shall include—

- (1) encouragement of fraternity for the common good;
- (2) fostering patriotism and loyalty;
- (3) assistance to widows and orphans of deceased ex-prisoners of war;

(4) assistance to ex-prisoners of war who have been injured or handicapped as a result of their service;

(5) maintenance of allegiance to the United States of America;

(6) preservation and defense of the United States from all of her enemies; and

(7) maintenance of historical records.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

(f) The corporation shall retain and maintain its status as a corporation organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington.

LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope to their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having

the right of vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

(57) American Ex-Prisoners of War."

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit required by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use and to allow or refuse to others the use of the terms "American Ex-Prisoners of War", and the official American Ex-Prisoners of War emblem or any colorable simulation thereof. No powers or privileges hereby granted shall, however, interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

TERMINATION

SEC. 17. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall expire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.).

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the organization known as the American Ex-Prisoners

of War is a nonprofit and nonpartisan organization. It was originally incorporated in the State of New Mexico in 1943 as the Bataan Relief Organization, and currently maintains its charter in the State of Washington. This organization has 12,600 members organized in State and local chapters all across America. The terms of membership and the requirements for holding office in this organization are not discriminatory on the basis of race, color, religious, or national origin. Membership is open to U.S. citizens and members of the Armed Forces of the United States who were taken prisoner or interned in World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict and the Vietnam conflict, except those convicted of treason, subversion, or sedition. Spouses, parents, brothers, sisters, and children of ex-POW's may also be members.

The sole purpose of this organization is to serve the estimated 93,029 living American Ex-Prisoners of War and the widows and orphans of those who have died. The organization is operated for charitable, patriotic, and civic improvement purposes and has maintained its tax-exempt status pursuant to section 501(c) of title 26, United States Code. This organization clearly meets the minimum standards set forth by the Committee for Federally Chartered Organizations.

I urge my colleagues to support this Federal charter bill. Recently, we recognized our ex-prisoners of war by dedicating a week to their honor. This organization works year round to better the lives of ex-prisoners of war and their widows and orphans. The Judiciary Committee solicited comments from the Veterans' Administration on this bill. The letter from the Veterans' Administration is reprinted in the committee report. In the letter Veterans' Administrator Nimmo notes that the American Ex-Prisoners of War is a responsible, professional organization with a very cooperative relationship with the VA that has worked very hard to improve the benefits available and generally improve the lot of all former POW's.

This charter bill conforms to the standards that the Congress has evolved for charter legislation. It contains the same requirements and prohibitions that have been included in other charter bills enacted earlier in this Congress.

I direct my colleagues' attention to two committee amendments. First, we amend the bill to require the corporation to maintain its State charter. The other committee amendment simply inserts the correct subsection number in section 1101 of title 36, United States Code, the provision which defines those private corporations which are subject to the audit and reporting requirements of chapter 42 of title 36, United States Code.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill granting a Federal charter to the American Ex-Prisoners of War.

□ 1230

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, prisoners of war have endured a special kind of hardship. Brutality, malnutrition, humiliation, and forced labor were a daily part of life for these brave men and women. Their ordeal, survival, and return is a very personal victory. Their experience characterizes American resolve, an unbroken spirit and the will to win. How, then, can we show our appreciation at no cost to the Government? H.R. 5380 is a bill providing a Federal charter for the American Ex-Prisoners of War. It is commemorative, it is honorary and in a small way shows the POW that we have not forgotten.

During the first session of this Congress, the Judiciary Committee revised its standards for granting Federal charters. Now it is tougher to receive this special congressional honor. For if we give this recognition too freely it would lose all its prestige. Nevertheless, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, Inc., surpass our new standards. They were originally chartered as a private nonprofit organization in 1943 and known as the Bataan Relief Organization. They have a nationwide membership devoted to charitable, educational, and patriotic endeavors. American Ex-Prisoners of War have no commercial purpose or commercial affiliation. As an organization they focus on patriotism and service. By our standards they are deserving of a Federal charter, not only for their status as POW's, but also for their continuing service to their community and their country. They do not dwell on the past, they look to the future.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting legislation providing a Federal charter to the American Ex-Prisoners of War. They are uniquely qualified for this honor and it will be of no cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD) for his work on this bill. He has been untiring in his efforts and I think that what he has accomplished here today is certainly to his benefit.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to register my strong support for H.R. 5380, legislation granting a Federal charter to the American Ex-Prisoners of War, Inc. The organization maintains an active membership of over 12,600 veterans who were held as prisoners of war during their service in defense of this Nation, as well as their wives, parents, brothers, sisters, and

children. These men and women are devoted to assisting former POW's and their families, fostering American patriotism, defending the United States, and maintaining historical records.

Mr. Speaker, in my work last year to establish National POW-MIA Recognition Day and my assignment as an ex-officio member of the House Task Force on American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, I have become acquainted in a most personal way with the terrible ordeals endured by those held as captives of enemies of the United States. These men suffered torture, malnutrition, and serious permanent disabilities in service to the Nation. Their families faced the anguish of weeks and months of waiting at home to learn the fates of their loved ones.

Through it all, they continued to profess their faith in the American system of government and their steadfast dedication to the principles for which our Nation stands. And, as the work of the American Ex-Prisoners of War, Inc. so amply illustrates, these qualities of faith and loyalty have led many ex-prisoner of war families to active peacetime roles for the betterment of their communities.

I am proud of my close association with the newly founded Northern New Jersey Chapter of American Ex-Prisoners of War, and I am proud to vote in support of H.R. 5380 today.

In the truest sense of the word, we are recognizing American heroes in granting this Federal charter.●

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5380. The bill would grant a congressional charter to the organization known as American Ex-Prisoners of War. Many of the names mentioned in this legislation are very familiar to those of us who serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We worked closely with them last year in enacting H.R. 1100 (Public Law 97-37) that expanded benefits and medical services for former prisoners of war. We received counsel and good advice from Mr. Charlie Morgan of San Antonio, Tex., the current president of the American Ex-Prisoners of War. We worked closely with Stanley Sommers of Marshfield, Wis., the immediate past president of the organization; C. Earl Derrington, a close friend of mine from Jackson, Miss.; Gen. John P. Flynn of San Antonio, Tex., and many other members. So I take special pride, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this legislation, having worked with so many other ex-POW's in bringing about meaningful legislation in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that the distinguished gentleman from Texas, my good friend, SAM HALL, is the floor manager of this bill. As chairman of our Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension and Insurance, Mr. HALL cosponsored the legislation

and helped steer it through Congress without delay. The bill we passed last year did several things that will be helpful to this group of individuals for the rest of their lives.

First, it reduced the requisite period of incarceration from 6 months to 30 days for presumption of certain disabilities and diseases.

Second, it provided service-connected benefits for former prisoners of war held captive for 30 days or more for any of the anxiety states, including post traumatic stress neurosis.

Third, it gave special eligibility to ex-POW's for hospital and outpatient care.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it established an advisory committee made up of physicians and former prisoners of war to advise the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the administration of new benefits for 100,000 living former American prisoners of war.

Now that we have enacted this legislation and established this advisory committee, I am pleased that the Congress is recognizing the importance of this group of American citizens by the granting of a congressional charter. This Nation owes a great debt to our former service men and women who defended our Nation in time of peril. We owe a special debt to those combat veterans who were captured by the enemy and who suffered indescribable brutality and torture at the hand of their captors. The legislation we enacted last year, which is now the law of the land, and the bill we are considering today, will go a long way toward helping these distinguished citizens overcome many hardships they have had to endure for so many years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the President has announced his plan to send to the Senate the name of Everett Alvarez, Jr., to be the Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. Mr. Alvarez was a prisoner of war in North Vietnam for 8½ years, the longest held American POW of that conflict. As I mentioned before, Gen. John P. Flynn has been selected to chair the Advisory Committee on Former Prisoners of War. General Flynn was a POW in North Vietnam for 5½ years and was the highest ranking American captured during the Vietnam conflict.

I am glad the President is putting former POW's in key positions in the Government. Their experience will be tremendously beneficial to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, in the years that I have worked with former prisoners of war I know of no individuals more dedicated to our Nation's welfare and I am very pleased indeed with the attention and priority we have given their recommendations during the 97th Congress. I know this bill will receive the unanimous approval of the House, and I am extremely pleased to join my friend, the gentleman from Texas, and all the others who worked so closely with this

great organization in supporting this legislation.

I hope it will be swiftly adopted by the other body and sent to the President as I am sure he will take great pride in signing the bill.●

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5380, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5380, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CHARTER FOR NATIONAL FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2317) to recognize the organization known as the National Federation of Music Clubs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2317

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CHARTER

SECTION 1. The National Federation of Music Clubs, organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

POWERS

SEC. 2. The National Federation of Music Clubs (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes for which the corporation is organized shall be those provided in its articles of incorporation and also shall be—

(1) to bring into working relations with one another, music clubs and other musical organizations and individuals directly or indirectly associated with musical activity for the purpose of developing and maintaining high musical standards;

(2) to aid and encourage musical education; and

(3) to promote American music and American artists throughout the United States of America and the world.

The corporation shall function as a patriotic, civic, and historical organization as authorized by the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amount approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

(f) The corporation shall retain and maintain its status as a corporation organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois.

LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having

the right of vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(53) National Federation of Music Clubs."

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit required by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

TERMINATION

SEC. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall expire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MOORHEAD) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.).

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Music Clubs is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization which was originally chartered in the State of Illinois in 1898, and which has been operating continually since that year. This organization is national in scope. The terms of membership and the requirements for holding office in this organization are not discriminatory on

the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. The sole purpose of this organization is to promote American music and American musical artists. It is therefore dedicated to patriotic, educational, charitable, and civic improvement purposes. The organization has maintained its tax-exempt status pursuant to section 501(c) of title 26, United States Code. Clearly, this organization meets our basic standards for federally chartered organizations.

I believe that this organization is particularly worthy of the honor of being federally chartered. More than 60,000 persons all over this Nation belong to this organization. It represents over 6,000 musical organizations including State federations, student and junior music clubs, college and university music departments, and both amateur and professional musicians and composers. It is supported financially by membership dues and contributions.

The federation fulfills a key role in our society by promoting American music both within their organization and in the media. The National Federation of Music Clubs provides thousands of dollars annually for scholarships. It sponsors awards programs for excellence in voice, piano, and strings; makes cash awards to blind and veteran musicians; and supports music clubs, summer music festivals, and educational institutions. Aside from these continuing projects, the organization has initiated some very special projects. For example, during World War II, the federation donated 2.5 million pieces of musical equipment to U.S. servicemen stationed abroad and at home.

I want to make it clear to the Members of the House that this charter bill conforms to the standards that the committee has evolved for such legislation. It contains the same requirements and prohibitions as were contained in the charter legislation enacted earlier in this Congress.

I call my colleagues' attention to the two committee amendments. Both are simple. First, we include by reference in the Federal charter, those objects and purposes which are enumerated in the organization's articles of incorporation at the State level. Second, we require the corporation to maintain its State charter as mandated by our committee standards. These amendments make it clear that by granting this Federal charter, Congress is giving this organization no legal authority it does not already have, and that we do not intend for this charter to supplant the State charter.

I urge my colleagues to support this charter for a very worthy organization, the National Federation of Music Clubs.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, music is the speech of angels. It is the universal communication that binds humanity. This legislation is a tribute to music lovers everywhere. Who of us does not have a favorite tune, or wish they could play an instrument. How many of us have danced in a New Year to Auld Lang Syne; or fought tears when the Wedding March sounded for kin or friend, or felt the brief rush of memories when we hear our alma mater. Few of us have not been inspired by joyful gospel or solemn hymn. Ballad and blues, calypso and classic, ragtime and raga demonstrate that there is music for everyone. S. 2317 is for the composer, the conductor, the player, the lyricist, and the listener. A bill that gives recognition to music clubs also pays silent tribute to Brahms, Beethoven, John Phillip Sousa, Scott Joplin, Benny Goodman, Duke Ellington, Nancy Wilson, Sarah Caldwell and thousands of others in the congressional act.

Everyone who has hummed a tune in a free moment, put a child to sleep by lullaby or sang fortissimo in the shower should vote for this bill.

I ask for an aye vote in granting a Federal charter to the National Federation of Music Clubs.

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, as the original sponsor of the identical House measure, I rise in full support of S. 2317.

Mr. Speaker, for 84 years the National Federation of Music Clubs has worked for the preservation of America's musical heritage. A nonprofit, tax-exempt organization, it has grown into the largest philanthropic musical organization in the world, boasting 600,000 members and 6,000 organizations in State federations. The membership includes both professionals and amateurs, ranging from choral, dance and symphonic organizations to college and university music departments, not to mention the active senior music clubs in communities all over the United States from the smallest town to the largest city.

The federation's goals encompass a wide range of activities which include: The support and encouragement of music education; the sponsorship and promotion of performing and creative artists; increasing public knowledge and appreciation of the arts; and promotion of musical activity in the Armed Forces. In the past the federation has given hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for awards and scholarships, including special awards for the handicapped and veterans. Thanks to the talent-recognizing eye of the federation, we are today able to enjoy the virtuosity of Mr. Van Cliburn, a former federation prize winner. Their programs run the gamut

of providing music in hospitals, thus giving countless hours of service and dollars to those who are ill, to an audiovisual program that encourages the networks to inspire and stimulate an appreciation for better music.

Through the years, no job proved too big for the National Federation of Music Clubs. During World War II more than \$106,000 was raised by the clubs for war service, and 2½ million articles of musical equipment were shipped to our men stationed in the United States and foreign countries. Hospital ships and trains were supplied with phonographs and records and the chaplain's kit supplied by the federation provided suitable music for any type of church service. Further, when the Athens, Greece, Symphony Orchestra pleaded for money to replace the strings that had rusted on their instruments while they had been hidden in caves from the Nazis, it was the National Federation of Music Clubs that purchased and delivered the replacement parts.

During all these years of hard work and dedication, the federation has sought no assistance of any kind from the Government. In fact, the three members of the staff in the national headquarters office are the only paid employees in the entire organization. All of the members, through the payment of a small amount of dues, pay for the privilege of working for the federation without 1 cent of Government remuneration.

We now have the opportunity to express our appreciation to this outstanding organization. As you are aware, a Federal charter symbolizes congressional recognition of an existing State-chartered organization. It involves no cost to the Government, and yet provides us with a means to commend those organizations that we feel have played an important role in our Nation. I urge you to vote for passage of this bill and give the National Federation of Music Clubs the recognition it so richly deserves.●

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2317, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2317, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 278) expressing the sense of the Congress that funding for community service employment programs for senior citizens for fiscal year 1983 and subsequent fiscal years should be provided at levels sufficient to maintain or increase the number of employment positions provided under such programs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 278

Whereas community service employment programs under title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) currently provide employment for fifty-four thousand two hundred senior citizens;

Whereas community service agencies and community residents are benefited by the valuable community service work of these senior citizens;

Whereas these benefits to community service agencies and community residents, and the income tax and social security revenues resulting from the employment of these senior citizens, make these community service employment programs cost effective;

Whereas the Congress, in enacting the Older American Act Amendments of 1981 (Public Law 97-115; 95 Stat. 1595), clearly expressed its intent that funding for community service employment programs should at least be maintained at current levels;

Whereas these community service employment programs provide hope for a self-sufficient and dignified existence to senior citizens who otherwise would face shrinking employment opportunities; and

Whereas the Budget of the United States Government proposed by the President for fiscal year 1983 entirely eliminates funding for these community service employment programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that funding for community service employment programs for senior citizens under title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) for fiscal year 1983 and subsequent fiscal years should be provided at levels sufficient to maintain or increase the number of employment positions provided under such programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 278, which would put the Congress on record as supporting full funding for title V of the Older Americans Act. This is popularly known as the senior community service employment program, and was reauthorized only last December for 3 additional years.

Title V provides part-time job opportunities for persons who are over 55 years of age, poor, unemployed, and who, perhaps most importantly, want to work. Rather than simply sitting back and receiving welfare or other forms of public assistance, these older citizens would prefer to work an average of 24 hours a week, at about minimum wage, making contributions to their communities at the same time. They work in libraries and day care centers, in schools and hospitals, in senior nutrition centers, and in the homes of frail elderly persons who might otherwise have to go to an institution. They work with the mentally retarded. They deliver meals to the homebound. In short, they provide varied community services, usually to those in considerable need, for low pay, which Federal, State, and local governments would be hard pressed to replace. In hearings last March before our Subcommittee on Human Resources we heard nothing but praise for this program and what it is accomplishing. Of prime importance, title V allows older workers to become taxpayers instead of tax users.

In spite of all this, the administration requested zero funding for title V for fiscal year 1983. Congress has already rejected that position, by agreeing to the first budget resolution which provides for continued funding at the 1982 level. However, if the program is to continue to be forward funded, as the authorizing legislation requires, we will need to include funds for that purpose in the spring supplemental appropriations bill. We had hoped to have this problem solved in the Urgent Supplemental Act, and the first two versions, that were vetoed by the President, did contain \$210 million for title V forward funding. You know what happened to those bills.

By our action today, we hope to affirm congressional support for the future employment of the 54,200 senior citizens who work under title V, and to insure that this valuable program is not weakened by funding gaps, or eliminated altogether as the President has recommended.

I believe that causing disruption of or cutting back title V would be shortsighted, both economically and in terms of domestic policy. I urge favorable consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 278.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I defer to a very good friend of this program, a very valuable member of our subcommittee, our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Maine (Mrs. SNOWE).

Mrs. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278 and continued funding for the senior community service employment program.

This program has enjoyed strong bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress for the best of reasons: It is a proven effective program, the benefits of which extend not only to the elderly who receive the jobs but to their communities at large and it is one program that has actually saved our Nation money with a minimum of bureaucratic regulation. At a time when the social security system faces severe financing problems, these older workers are actually contributing money into the system. For all these reasons, Congress reauthorized title V for 3 more years last December, specifically providing that money be available for 54,200 jobs nationwide.

Three hundred and forty of these jobs are available to low-income seniors in the State of Maine. In one title V program in my State, the average age of the enrollees is 62.6 and the average annual income, excepting wages earned on the program, is \$2,402. This particular program has targeted employment to widows—aged 55 to 64—the single group hardest hit by poverty and unemployment in the country.

On behalf of these 340 Mainers and the countless others nationwide who have benefited from the senior community service employment program—as workers or recipients of services—I join my colleagues in the House in this strong show of support for House Concurrent Resolution 278.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the resolution, I rise in support of this measure.

This resolution reiterates Congress strong support for the senior community service employment program operated by the Department of Labor under title V of the Older Americans Act.

Last December the Congress reauthorized the title V program for 3 additional years without making substantial changes in the program. In this reauthorization which passed the House by a vote of 379 to 4, Congress made the commitment to continue those aspects of the program which

have made it perhaps the most popular and successful of the many Federal programs serving the elderly.

The program's success is largely due to the fact that it is well targeted both for the senior citizens and for the communities in which they live.

The average age of a Green Thumb worker employed under the title V program is 70. In my own State of Wisconsin a full 18 percent of the participants are age 75 or older. Another 18 percent are between the ages of 70 and 75.

These workers receive annual physical examinations, personal and job-related counseling, and assistance in obtaining placement into unsubsidized jobs. Participants work up to 1,300 hours per year and average 20 to 25 hours per week.

The program has been particularly successful in attracting minorities and undereducated individuals into the program. These individuals often are the worst off economically and stand the most to gain from participation in the program. Nationally, a full 30 percent of title V workers are minority, over 66 percent of the participants are women, and a full 60 percent have less than a high school education.

In my home State of Wisconsin, title V workers are involved in a number of projects directly enhancing the quality of life of other senior citizens. These projects include doing home repairs for low-income older persons in rural areas, operating transportation programs, assisting in health care projects, and working in libraries. In addition, title V workers are directly contributing to the operation of the nutrition projects operating through the Administration on Aging and the local aging network.

In Wisconsin's rural areas, two of the national grantees have enjoyed particular success in operating the program, the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Green Thumb program. In other areas of the State, the National Council of Senior Citizens and the Governor's office provide the organizational structure for the program. All told, there were approximately 1,428 senior citizens in the program during the program year just ended.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the title V program in Wisconsin and elsewhere. I think it is a well-run and effective program.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for his efforts in getting this resolution passed, and also the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), for the work he did in getting the committee to come together and expedite this resolution.

As primary author of this resolution, I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 278, which expresses the sense of the House that title V programs of the Older Americans Act, the senior community service employment program, should continue to be funded in fiscal 1983 to support the same number of participants as we had in fiscal year 1982. A similar resolution was adopted by the Senate in the early part of July.

As you know, the administration has recommended in its proposed fiscal year budget eliminating funding for title V entirely for future years. I am sure I do not need to detail for my colleagues the tremendous benefits that are derived from this program.

At least 54,000 disadvantaged senior citizens across this country have been provided with useful jobs that help supplement their incomes. Countless communities and individuals have benefited from the community service work provided by these workers.

In my area, these workers are used to assist in health care centers, in areas related to nutrition; they are the primary volunteers—the workers who are assisting others in a variety of elderly programs.

It was important to note today that in this country we have 32 million people who are now below the poverty line—the highest number in 15 years. Of those, 12.1 percent are the elderly of this country.

Almost 100,000 seniors are benefiting from the job training and referrals that are provided through title V employment services for seniors.

Needless to say, the Congress recently passed a reauthorization bill extending all older Americans programs, including title V, for 3 years.

The efforts to reduce the funding for this program do not only, it seems to me, make no sense in human terms, but also these efforts make no sense as far as their cost effectiveness is concerned.

The title V program, in effect, says to senior citizens: "Go out and work and be able to supplement your incomes. The opportunities are there."

We have over the last few months seen the social security system continue to be strained. Here is an opportunity to put seniors to work—to be able to help contribute toward their social security benefits rather than simply drawing them out.

Ultimately, however, the main concern regarding the administration's proposal rests in its direct impact on

the senior citizens who benefit from the program. For many seniors, title V programs have meant the final hope for a self-sufficient and dignified existence, at an age when traditional employment opportunities shrink, and self-worth is hinged more and more to the desire to play a truly useful role in society.

I am sure most of you have received many letters from senior citizens in your own district who directly or indirectly benefit from this program. At a time when we are asking so much of our Nation's disadvantaged, we should not eliminate such a cost-effective and worthwhile program.

In addition, since I introduced this resolution on March 2, 1982, another important factor affecting the strength of the title V program has emerged, that of the need to protect its forward funding. Programs that are forward funded depend on their forward funding. If title V does not receive the over \$200 million it needs in fiscal 1982 for forward funding, the program could crumble. Cities, counties, and private funding organizations that provide the requisite non-Federal matching shares for this program are unwilling to tie up the \$30,000-\$40,000 which represents the non-Federal match with little or no assurance that the program will continue.

We need to have this kind of service for seniors in this country. The main concern on this issue is that we need to provide and to continue to provide opportunities for seniors to continue to make a contribution in their communities.

This is, I think, a positive approach to try to assist our senior citizens in this country. This resolution is the expression of this Congress—and of this House—that we stand by title V and that we intend to see that it is fully funded. Furthermore, we intend to see that seniors continue to be responsible and contributing members of the communities in this country.

I urge the Members of the House to strongly support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a fine member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA).

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 278, I would like to state my full support for continuation of programs under title V of the Older Americans Act, which provide community service employment for the aging community. I believe that the title V program is effective in providing part-time public service employment to low-income elderly persons and is keeping administrative expenses low. In addition, participants are making valuable contributions to the community through their services.

Currently nearly 54,000 older persons are employed through the title V program, which is currently funded at \$277.1 million. The fact is that for every dollar spent under title V, \$1.15 is saved by the Government. Not only are these low-income elderly kept off the public assistance rolls, but through their employment they contribute to Federal tax revenues.

Giving these older Americans the opportunity for work not only puts their experience to good use but makes it possible for State and local governments to use their human capital to provide services at an expanded level. The average participant—a low income female over 65 with less than a high school education—would have little chance of finding employment in the private sector. Without the title V program these people would be forced to subsist on welfare payments, kept against their will out of the productive sector of our economy.

The only criticism I can find of this program is simply that it does not encompass sufficient area—currently over 8 million older Americans are eligible for its benefits, but only 54,000 can be supported under the current budget. It is imperative that we continue to support the 54,000 slot level as a baseline, looking toward an increase in size in future years. As life spans increase and the economy forces our elderly to remain in the job market, programs such as this which provide on-the-job training to low skilled workers are vital to our Nation. The older Americans community service employment program continues to be an effective approach to solving the elderly's desire to continue as contributing, self-dependent members of society. Rather than relegating them to the public assistance rolls, let us continue to provide them the opportunity to retain human dignity and independence throughout their later years.

I trust Members will support this resolution and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, but I have to question the priority of even bringing it to the floor. Virtually every one of us supports title V programs; we funded it last year; we included it in our budget resolution; the President supports the levels in that budget resolution, and we certainly will be funding the program again this year.

It is a good program; no question about it. It has helped many of our senior citizens. There is no controversy over it.

So why do we waste the time of the Congress with political grandstanding resolutions of this sort when we have

so many other bills of vital importance still awaiting action?

Where is the regulatory reform bill? How about the export trading bill? Where is the Caribbean Basin bill? Where is the nuclear waste disposal bill; the highway aid bill; the illegal alien bill; the balanced budget amendment; the job training bill? How about the 13 regular appropriation bills and the budget reconciliation legislation that we still have not even begun to act on?

We have been procrastinating around here now for almost 7 months. It is about time we stop all this dilly-dallying and get on with the really important legislation before us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding for that comment.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader and share his frustration that we do not control the agenda here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHN ERLBORN).

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278.

In favorably acting upon House Concurrent Resolution 278, the Congress will be sending a clear message to senior citizens across the Nation: That America cares about the quality of life of its senior citizens.

Presently, over 52,000 persons, aged 55 or older, are participating in meaningful part-time employment under the senior community service employment program. Seniors participating in the program are employed as day care workers, telephone operators, teacher and hospital aides, receptionists, typists, security guards and drivers. They are directly contributing to the work of organizations such as the Veterans' Administration, Goodwill Industries, school systems, and others. The seniors earn an average of \$3.47 per hour worked.

The goals of the program are clearly focused on enhancing the quality of life of the individuals involved. The program objectives are first, to reestablish or enhance the self-worth of the program participant; second, to develop or, as is often the case, redevelop marketable job skills; third, to place program participants into unsubsidized jobs.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Education and Labor Committee held an oversight hearing on the title V program. At that hearing personal stories of several title V participants were related to the subcommittee:

A 56-year-old widow from Meniffee County, Ky., is now able to support herself without the aid of food stamps. At the time her employment with

Green Thumb began, she had no income or savings and was selling household items out of her modest furnishings to get enough money to buy food stamps.

In Summers County, W. Va., two Green Thumb workers are assisting in the making of quilted window shades. The Shades of West Virginia Cooperative had a small grant from DOE to provide materials and labor to install various window insulation in public buildings. With the help of the two older workers, who did the quilting of these beautiful pieced designs, the agency was able to spread their small grant a long way and add beauty as well as conserve energy and provide greater warmth to these buildings.

A disabled Lee County, Ky., lady, through very careful budgeting, has been able to get a loan and buy a home for the first time since her divorce. She was receiving aid to the totally disabled for a serious cervical disorder. She had a 13-year-old daughter to support and keep in school. Because she was able to secure a Green Thumb job where she could work a split day and have bed rest in the middle of the day, she has regained her dignity and does a fabulous job in the office position she holds.

These stories are supplemented by many others. Perhaps more important, however, is the fact that the positive experiences many employees are having with the program is leading to permanent, unsubsidized jobs for many former title V workers. One researcher testifying before the subcommittee for example, found that 31 percent of the title V placements which occurred in the second quarter of 1978 are still working with the original employer, and hence have remained on the job 36 to 41 months. Among those who terminated, the most frequently cited reason for termination was because the employee had taken a new job, a somewhat surprising result, given the low-income levels and job market disadvantages apparent at program entry. Twenty-six percent of the terminations occurred for this reason.

Mr. Speaker, the title V program works. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 278.

□ 1300

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. RATCHFORD), a member of the committee and a good friend of the program.

Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish the minority leader were still on the floor, because the fact of the matter is, I have just come back from Connecticut and all weekend long older workers said to me, "What is happening to title 5?"

It is a very legitimate question because, as I understand the administra-

tion's budget recommendation, as I understand the intent of the budget resolution passed special weeks ago, this program, if we go along with the administration, will have no forward funding whatsoever. So, it is not something that is out here as an arbitrary issue. It is not out here as an illusion. It is a very real concern, and it is a concern that I carry to the floor of the House.

In Connecticut, I will tell the Members as the former Commissioner on Aging of the State, this is one of the best programs we have. It is both cost-efficient, and, at the same time allows the older worker to work with decency, to retain dignity, and to make a contribution to society. Look at some of the programs: Tutors in the schools, working with children who need help; library aides; nutrition workers; home care staff; staff for nursing homes, where they are working with patients who have legitimate complaints that otherwise cannot be determined. To cut here, as the administration calls for, is a cut in the wrong place.

A cut here, Mr. Speaker—and yes, Mr. President—would force the older worker on to welfare. Is there concern? There is legitimate concern, and the only way we can serve the older worker; the only way we can serve the older American; the only way we can say to the administration that we believe in the program, and apparently they do not, is to support this resolution. I wish we were here with the support of the administration, but if it were not for the administration this resolution would not be necessary.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for giving this time to me and for his leadership in this matter.

I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 278, of which I am an original cosponsor with my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

There is no doubt in my mind that Congress intends to preserve the title V community services employment program for older Americans by maintaining or increasing the 54,200 jobs the program supports. This House stated its intent last December, when it reauthorized the program for 3 years by a vote of 379 to 4. The other body spoke recently as well, when it passed Senate Resolution 340, similar to the one we are considering today, by a vote of 89 to 6.

Even so, it is important for the House to approve this resolution overwhelmingly. The debates ahead of us on funding for 1983 will be difficult;

they will be bitter; they will be divisive. Before we get there, and we will be there soon, let us step back for a moment and agree that this program—which targets jobs for less well-off older Americans who might not find jobs elsewhere and might not make it without these jobs—that this program is one we agree to preserve and we agree to support.

I, for one, am exceedingly proud of this program, which provides needed work to the participants, and which provides important and equally needed services to the communities.

There is another reason to support this resolution. Two days prior to the other body's action on its similar resolution, that body acted on H.R. 6685, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, which I am happy to say has been signed by the President. The Senate added many items to our temporary measure, but they did not add funding for this title V program. In conference, we tried to restore it, but the Senate would not yield. The chairman of the Labor/HHS Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky, my good friend Mr. NATCHER, and myself made a commitment to seek to restore that funding in the general supplemental which is currently being worked on. I hope that everyone who votes for this resolution will not back down when it comes to a decision about funding this program in the upcoming general supplemental. Likewise, I hope the Members of the other body, who voted so overwhelmingly for the principle of this program, will have the courage of their convictions when the issue becomes providing the funds that will maintain the program.

I urge you to vote for this resolution on your principles, but I warn you to be ready to stand firm on your vote today when you are called on to take the steps that will, in fact, provide 54,200 community service jobs for our older Americans.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my good friend from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I am happy to see that on both sides of the aisle we have appropriate and, in my opinion, extremely proper support for this program. There is not a better one, and there are few of which this Congress can be as proud.

When we are facing a vote on something of such importance and such consideration, we should not get into partisan politics. This should not be hampered by attacks on one section of the Government or another. This is a fine program on which both sides of the aisle can join without rancor and without anger.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 278, which expresses the sense of Congress that funding for community service employment programs for senior citizens for fiscal year 1983 under title V of the Older Americans Act and subsequent fiscal years should be provided at levels sufficient to maintain, if not increase, the number of employment positions provided under this act. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am proud to say that over half of our colleagues in the House of Representatives have joined in support of this resolution.

Under this program over 54,000 low-income seniors across our Nation of which there are 4,000 in New York State have been provided with useful jobs to help supplement their income and many communities have benefited from their community services work.

Since the administration proposed eliminating funding for community service employment programs for senior citizens, as part of its budget recommendations for fiscal year 1983, several hearings have been held, and we have had the opportunity to listen to the testimony of many older Americans who participate in these programs. Their testimony, along with other information which we have received from offices on aging throughout the Nation, substantiates that these programs are not only cost effective, but are also vital to the dignity and self-respect of our Nation's senior citizens.

I wholeheartedly lend my support to House Concurrent Resolution 278, which aims to preserve these important programs for our elderly who serve, and are served, by them and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this measure.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I too regret that the minority leader has left. He asked why we are taking the time to pass this resolution, and the answer is very simple. As long as the President of the United States continues to scare older people, we have to take some time to reassure them. The President said that he wanted the program abolished. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. RATCHFORD), cited an experience that many of us have had. The people who work on this program are frightened. The people who benefit from the work of the program are frightened. Perhaps they should not take the President seriously. Perhaps the minority leader is right to chide us

for assuming that when the President says he is out to abolish a program, he means it. But how are older people to know this?

Maybe we could work out a system. Maybe when the President says he is going to abolish a program, but is only kidding, he could wink or wave or in some other way communicate the fact that he is not serious. But for now, as long as the President says he wants to abolish a program, leaves it out of the budget, and objects to putting it back into the urgent supplemental, please do not think that the elderly people of this country are being hypersensitive when they think the program may be in danger.

In fact, it is a program which is a superb one. It leverages public dollars. We get work out of the senior citizens on behalf of nutrition programs, home care programs, and other programs far beyond what we could buy in an open market situation not only that it appears to be very well run. I made a point of asking, because we are told all the time that these programs have to be cut to do away with fraud, waste, and inefficiency, if there was fraud or waste here. As a member of the Select Committee on Aging, at several hearings I have asked Labor Department officials, I have asked State officials, if they know of abuse in this program, and no one has alleged any incidents of abuse or fraud or waste. So we have a program where, for ideological reasons, the President proposed to wipe out. We think it is important to give reassurance to people that it will not be abolished. I am sorry that the minority leader thinks it is a poor use of our time, but I hope that he would ask the President not needlessly to set those fires, and we would not have to take the time on the House floor to put them out.

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

Mr. FRANK. I yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all here in favor of this program, and the minority leader, the Republican leader, also said that he was in favor of the program. In fact, was not the funding for this program contained in the budget which this House passed recently?

Mr. FRANK. The problem is with the forward funding of the appropriation. I would ask the gentleman from New Hampshire to consult with his ranking member on the Appropriations Committee. (Mr. CONTE) It was the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee who pointed out his frustration that, at the

objection of the President and the Senate, title V was dropped out of the supplemental appropriation bill. We are talking about giving people some reassurance through forward funding so that they can plan ahead, and it was at the objection of the President and of the Senate that we were not able to put the money for title V into the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. GREGG. Was it not in the 1983 budget?

Mr. FRANK. I am not sure which budget. It was not in the President's budget. It may have been in the budget resolution.

Mr. GREGG. It was in the budget that was passed by this House for 1983, and the gentleman voted against this funding.

Mr. FRANK. Let me say to the gentleman in the interest of saving time, as the minority leader has suggested, I would suggest that he not ask me questions to which he knows the answers. If he wants to make a statement, he ought to make it.

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman voted against the program, how can he come to the floor and now support it?

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

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

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. The fact is, this program helps primarily older women, who are the ones who benefit from the program.

In the President's original budget message, which I think we have to pay some heed to, the whole thrust of that, and in the economic report, the suggestion was made that these people could find jobs once the economy recovered. Well, of course, the economy is not recovering. Second, these people are not going to be able to find jobs.

I want to express my strong support for House Resolution 278, which expresses congressional support for the senior community services employment program. I expect this resolution will be supported by a great majority of—if not unanimously by—my colleagues.

But I do have one question. Where were all these Members when their avowed support for title V could have been more than symbolic? I am talking about the last two opportunities we have had to override a Presidential veto to two urgent supplemental appropriations requests. These urgent supplementals included \$210 million that would have allowed the program to continue. Without this money, the program will die this September.

The title V program is forward funded, and it cannot legally use 1983 moneys until July 1983. Because of funding complications last year, title V received only one-quarter of the money needed to fund it for 1982.

Come the end of September, there will be a 9-month gap before the 1983 funds can be used. And who really believes that any program—and one the administration is desperately opposed to—will start up again after it has been shut down for a period of 9 months?

The resolution that we are voting on today contains a lot of pretty words—words that we can go home and repeat to our senior citizens. But these words are absolutely meaningless unless they are backed up with some substantive action.

The House will almost certainly have another opportunity to save the program, in the form of a supplemental appropriations request. Every Member that casts a "yea" vote today should be prepared to vote for that supplemental—and to override a possible Presidential veto. If they do not, then today's vote becomes nothing but an empty, hypocritical gesture made to fool their constituents in to believing a lie.

□ 1315

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. DOWNEY).

I am just a bit perplexed, and I wish the Members on the other side would decide. I ask them, are you mad at us for not taking the President seriously, or are you mad at us because we do take the President seriously? I will be glad to play it either way, but when the President says in his budget message that he does not want the program, please do not accuse us of creating issues when we want to reaffirm and reassure the people who benefit from the program that we think it ought to continue to exist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in my understanding that we have 6 minutes remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a member of the full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK) had occasion to say a moment ago that since everybody is for this program, we should not make a partisan issue out of it or blame another branch of Government.

Well, whom should we blame? Should we blame the tooth fairy for the lack of funding?

The fact is that the President of the United States has been responsible for eliminating forward funding of this program. This is a program which everybody agrees is a sound, solid program. It is a program which provides jobs to 55,000 older Americans who, if

they do not get the assistance, are going to have to receive some kind of welfare assistance, food stamps, medic-aid or SSI.

It seems to me that it is better to allow people who want to work to work, and that is what this resolution is trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of House Concurrent Resolution 278, which expresses congressional support for maintaining the title V senior community service employment program.

This program currently provides employment for 54,500 individuals 55 years or older on a daily basis. Over the years, title V has proved its value and worth to older Americans, the communities they serve, and to the Nation. It has enabled low-income senior citizens to help themselves while helping others in the community at the same time. Its administrative expenses have been kept a minimum, allowing more disadvantaged elderly persons to participate in a program. Without title V, many older Americans would be forced to depend upon food stamps, SSI, medicaid, and other assistance.

Despite the success and effectiveness of this important program, the administration wants to terminate its funding, causing nearly 55,000 elderly Americans to lose their jobs this October. This is one more item in a long list of Reagan attacks on the welfare and quality of life of our Nation's elderly.

The need to continue the senior employment program is absolutely essential because unemployment for older Americans is at an alltime record high. Nearly 92,000 persons 55 or older were added to the joblessness rolls during the past month, raising the total from 732,000 in May to 824,000 in June. In fact, unemployment has increased by 54.3 percent for individuals 55 or older in the past year. Moreover, it simply does not make good sense—economically, politically, or socially—to wipe out an extraordinarily effective employment program for older workers when the national unemployment rate has reached the near-depression level of 9.5 percent.

These grim facts underscore the bankruptcy of Reaganomics for older Americans. This administration has consistently failed to recognize and meet the needs of older Americans for jobs, as well as for health care, housing, nutrition, and income security.

This resolution represents a rejection of the administration's harsh policies toward the elderly and a clear affirmation of congressional support for assisting the older Americans with an effective jobs program that deserves to be continued, and well funded. I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the committee for bringing to us this opportunity to reaffirm our belief that senior Americans can make an important contribution to our Nation, that many of our older citizens need special assistance and that many of our older Americans want and need to be able to continue earning income.

There are more than 230,000 people in my State of Arkansas who are 60 years old and older. Another 63,000 are between 55 and 60 years old. More than 60 percent of our older Arkansans according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, have incomes at or below the poverty level.

Under the older Americans employment program more than 54,000 of our senior citizens across the Nation are providing needed services to their communities and improving their income at the same time. They provide critically needed services to handicapped persons, many of them children. They help improve homes through weatherization programs for low-income persons, thereby contributing to our national energy conservation effort. And, of course, they help provide services to their fellow older Americans who, without them, would frequently be homebound and malnourished.

These older Americans move into permanent jobs when those jobs are available. They work because they want and need to do so.

Yet, President Ronald Reagan, our first older American, says let them make their contributions to their communities through volunteer service. Our senior citizens working through the older Americans employment program can afford little time for volunteering. They have to be too busy trying to find a way to earn income. And, in this time of Reagan recession with unemployment standing at the highest levels since 1941, finding jobs regardless of your age is not easy.

President Reagan, our all-time champion Federal budget deficit maker, says we have to balance the budget so let us do it by cutting out the funding for the older Americans employment program.

I have already mentioned that more than 183,000 of our older Arkansans live at or below the poverty level. We have had the money to employ only 628 of them in the older Americans program, but that is better than zero.

Mayors, county judges, citizens who have seen the benefits from the work done by the older Arkansans through this program, and our older Arkansans who take such pride in their ability to and the opportunity for work urge us to continue this employment program.

The Ronald Reagan who wants to end the Older Americans Act employment programs is the same budget unbalancing President whose spending reduction programs have blocked 100,000 Americans who could have benefited from getting the minimum social security payment of \$122 per month this year. He is the same President whose policies have increased the medical costs of our older Americans. And, now he wants to slash the funding that has helped our senior citizens get work.

When we talk about the older Americans employment program we are not talking about job slots, we are talking about people who want to and need to work and take pride in doing so.

I believe that it is far better for our Government to help our older Americans who need help with the everyday cost of living and want and are physically able to earn their way, to work for the price of their food and fuel than to force them to rely on the food stamp program or low-income energy grants.

That was the kind of thinking that brought about the passage of the Older Americans Act employment program in 1973. It is the kind of thinking that went into congressional decisions every year since then to keep the older Americans jobs program going.

And, it is the kind of thinking that is behind the resolution before us today in support of continued funding for our senior Americans employment program.

Our senior citizens, by their contributions to our Nation, have earned the right to live their retirement years with dignity and a measure of economic security. Those of our older Americans who are able and who need to work to achieve that financial security ought to have the opportunity to do so that programs like the older Americans employment programs are providing, have provided in the past and can continue to provide in the future.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), a member of the full committee.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in strong support of title V of the Older Americans Act, which I had the good fortune to be a part of in its authorship in 1971.

I think that one of the very important subjects that is being discussed here on the floor today is the strong support being given by my Republican colleagues to this measure and we certainly welcome that support. But I think it is equally important that the senior citizens of this country recognize that this Congress sent another message last year.

As unbelievable as it may seem, the message was this: Let us cut social security, let us cut senior citizen benefits, and by so doing we will also in-

clude the President's right of cutting title V.

Well, we are glad to have our Republican colleagues back with us in an election year, but I also give the senior citizens a great deal of credit in understanding just what is happening and who has worked for them and who will continue to work for them in this Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PAUL SIMON.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that I wish each of you could visit beautiful southern Illinois and see what this program does for these people. We are an area of high unemployment in which people need help, and when you take the liability of unemployment and you convert it into an asset of helping people with Meals on Wheels or tearing down an old house that ought to be torn down and giving people some meaning in life, I think it is a great program.

I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS) in supporting this resolution, and I commend him for his leadership. It is a marvelous program that we ought to be expanding, not contracting.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278, the sense of Congress resolution on full funding for title V of the Older Americans Act which provides community service employment for 54,200 senior citizens around the Nation.

In his state of the Union address in 1964, President Johnson declared "unconditional war on poverty in America." Congress created an arsenal to join with the President with programs such as Job Corps, VISTA, Foster Grandparents, Head Start, and community development programs. These programs represent a "hand up" rather than a "hand out" and provide valuable community services and employment opportunities. Over the last 17 months, we have seen successful programs of self-help, education, and service dismantled through block grants and inadequate budgets. Our economy and the resulting plight of millions of Americans should tell us that the need is still current, and that it is simply being ignored.

Those Americans at the lowest end of the income scale can profit as much from community service employment programs as when these programs were enacted and reauthorized through the administrations of both Republicans and Democrats. Our communities are perhaps in greater need of the services provided under these programs.

Two out of ten Americans living below the poverty line are over 60 years old. That statistic is getting worse. Proposed cutbacks in social se-

curity will only exacerbate the situation.

Title V of the Older Americans Act provides employment for 54,200 senior citizens in various community service jobs. Let me give you an example of what this means to the communities served and individuals in the program. In my home State of Illinois, 2,200 senior citizens are employed by title V programs. One program is Green Thumb which serves 62 counties and employs 857 part-time workers. Green Thumb is responsible for services such as Meals on Wheels, providing balanced, hot meals to the elderly who are unable to leave their homes. The benefits to the workers are as real as to the shut-ins who are served by these programs. Arthur Shewmake of Jefferson County, Ill., is 71 years old and a crew leader for Green Thumb. Two years ago Mr. Shewmake lost his leg and found himself facing a hopeless and helpless future. He was employed by Green Thumb and was able to utilize his previous supervisory experience to help others. He has said, "Green Thumb is wonderful and I have regained my feeling of self confidence. I feel like a person again."

In Harden, Ill., three men aged 75 and over are participating in the senior aides program. They have rebuilt the virtually unused fairground in the community which now hosts three events every year which are well attended. Each of the aides credits the program for giving direction and meaning to his life.

A title V worker in Joppa, Ill., opened a communal meal center in an underutilized Federal building, and is now responsible for serving 25 meals per week to senior citizens. Without the title V program, there would be no service in this area.

I began by quoting President Johnson and the beginnings of social and community service programs. In 1981 another President stated in his inaugural address:

How can we love our country and not love our countrymen? And loving them, reach out a hand when they fall, heal them when they are sick, and provide opportunity to make them self-sufficient so they will be equal in fact and not just in theory.

That President is Ronald Reagan whose fiscal 1983 budget provides zero funding for title V of the Older Americans Act. Where is the hand reaching out, the opportunity and the jobs for self-sufficiency?

It is up to Congress to make the final determination on title V programs. I enthusiastically go on record in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278 to make the rhetoric of the President a reality for those senior citizens who have so much to give the community and who we can never fully repay for their contributions both past and present.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON) for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, and the champion of the elderly, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman for his kindness in yielding some time to me.

One of the shocking provisions of the President's proposed budget at the beginning of this year was the elimination of this program, cutting 54,200 elderly people off the job rolls where they were rendering essential community services to other people, old and young. Two-thirds of the participants in this program have been women, and one-half of those have been minority members.

This program not only helps the recipients of the aid but helps the elderly people who have the privilege of getting out of their isolation and off of their loneliness and getting out and helping other people. It gives them a sense of exhilaration that in many instances lengthens their own lives, improves their health, and thus promotes their own happiness.

This program goes only to those who are needy. They must be within 125 percent of the poverty level, and 87 percent of them are below the poverty level.

Now, it is a shocking fact that the President did not propose in his budget any provision for the continuance of this program. The Congress did, and we brought it within 4 percent of the level of last year.

Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution, which expresses the sentiment of Congress, would have the Congress increase or at least sustain substantially the program at the level of last year. This is a great program. It is a program of great meaning to human beings. It will enable the Government to save money by enabling more elderly people to get medical care at home rather than having to go to a hospital or to a nursing home. This is a great resolution. I commend the gentleman on his leadership, I commend the authors of it and those who support it, and I hope this House will, by a resounding majority, vote for and support this program.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud the efforts of our distinguished colleague CLAUDE PEPPER in his support of the title V program. There is no greater representative for the elderly of

this country and I wholeheartedly support his statement.

I am proud to be a supporter of title V. I have seen firsthand the help that the older citizens provide for our communities and know how title V helps the elderly maintain productive and useful lives. Throughout my district, in Austin, Tex., and the surrounding counties, the senior aides and Green Thumb workers provide services on which we have come to depend.

We are fortunate to have such a good program and I am glad that the recently passed budget resolution maintained this program, rather than phasing it out in fiscal year 1983, as the President had originally requested. I ask all of you to join me in support of the Older Americans Act and title V.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this proposal has tremendous support within the House, as the title V program has had consistently within the House, and it is also clear that it has support especially on this side of the House.

I believe that the representation, especially of the Members from New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, that this should be a political issue and should be reflected as one in which there has been a partisan position on this side of the aisle is totally incorrect. The fact of the matter is that the budget which was just passed by this House which many Members on this side of the House voted for and which the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Connecticut, and the two gentlemen from New York voted against, included in it specific reference for funding in 1983 of the title V proposal.

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

Mr. GREGG. I will yield in just a few seconds.

Secondly, I point out that the proposal which came from the administration originally was not to eliminate the program completely, it was to merge it with two other programs, the migrant workers program, and the seasonal farm labor program, and yes, there would have been a cut under the original proposal. But because that original proposal ran into trouble not only on that side of the aisle but also on this side of the aisle and because there is strong support for the title V program on both sides of the aisle, this program continues and will continue as a viable program. Therefore, I think it is totally inappropriate for us to make this into a partisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe anybody on this side of the aisle is trying to make it into a partisan issue. The minority leader raised a question which I sought to answer. I keep getting in trouble trying to pay attention to what other people say.

The minority leader asked us why we thought it had to be brought up. Our answer is that the President of the United States has answered his opposition to the program in several forms, and we want to counteract the fears he has generated.

I am glad that the minority members have not followed him on this one, and I hope that that trend is one that will continue. But the fact is that we simply pointed out, in answer to a question by the minority leader, who first raised the question in a partisan way, that we were simply trying to reassure the people who were made nervous by the President.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I want to take back my time from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and I would note that had the gentleman from Massachusetts followed the minority leader or the Republican leader, as we refer to him, then he would have voted for the title V program in the budget process which we just went through.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would have voted for that part of this budget resolution, but it was weighted down with so much other junk that I could not support the overall budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) has expired.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DAUB).

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of the first cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 278, expressing the sense of the House that the title V, senior employment program, under the Older Americans Act, be funded adequately despite proposals to substantially cut it.

As an active member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I was particularly pleased to have the opportunity to speak on behalf of this program when our Retirement Income Subcommittee held a hearing on title V. Although I wholeheartedly share the President's determination to maximize the effectiveness and fiscal accountability of Government programs, I have some concerns in regard to the services provided under title V. This program has proved itself to be effective and cost efficient. I am fearful that any effort to eliminate this program will result in trading gainful employment costs for welfare cost. We could be trading taxpayers for tax eaters.

Beyond the fiscal considerations, this program takes advantage of a vast resource of talent often ignored by private and public employees alike. It gives our seniors job training and experience, but perhaps more important, employers learn the advantage of hiring older Americans.

As you may know, the administration has suggested that several employment related programs be consolidated into one employment and training block grant to the various States. They believe that most training and employment activities should be carried out by the private sector and that in areas where potential workers lack basic skills required for entry-level jobs, training can best be provided by the States.

The administration also recommends that a nationally administered program be authorized for providing special target groups with employment and training services and older workers are mentioned as one of these special target groups. Certainly, I am pleased to see that the special needs and contributions of older workers are recognized; however, I fail to see the need for eliminating a program which is working successfully at the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BOUQUARD).

Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my strong endorsement of this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 278. I was disappointed that the forward funding difficulties facing title V were not addressed in the urgent supplemental appropriations bill though I understand that this was due to administration opposition. This resolution will not solve that problem but it is at least gives us a chance to go on record in support of a jobs program for older Americans. These older citizens have contributions to make, skills that should be tapped to the benefit of their communities. I am deeply concerned that we may be overlooking this by failing to protect title V. I urge my colleagues to support not only this resolution but to join efforts in providing forward funding and maintaining the community service employment programs for senior citizens at sufficient levels.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely pleased to observe the overwhelming support in this Chamber for House Concurrent Resolution 278, which expresses the sense of the Congress that funding for title V of the Older Americans Act in 1983 and future years should be maintained at levels which insure that the 54,200

jobs the senior community services employment program currently provides are maintained or increased. I am proud to join 219 of my colleagues as a cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the measure we are considering today is of tremendous importance as a signal to this Nation's elderly population that we, their elected representatives, are behind them 100 percent. Last November I voted for H.R. 3046, the reauthorization bill that extended all Older Americans Act programs, including title V, for 3 years. I remember how gratifying it was for me to see that measure signed into law in December 1981; I felt then that we had made an important commitment to our older Americans that we truly were keeping their interests and their welfare at heart. The task before Congress today is to reaffirm that commitment to the Older Americans Act and title V program.

I have supported, since its inception, the senior community services employment program that provides low-income senior citizens with useful jobs to supplement their incomes. This year 54,200 seniors benefitted directly from this program through jobs provided by title V. But the indirect benefits have been just as real. Since the program's start, almost 100,000 seniors have received valuable job training and referral services, while the community service work these seniors perform has enriched the lives of countless citizens across the country. Title V not only helps our Nation's elderly—it helps them by providing opportunities for fulfilling work, and it helps them in a cost effective manner.

My support for the Older Americans Act is only part of my effort to insure that senior citizens be given the opportunity to live active and fulfilling lives. I have been a strong supporter of alternatives to mandatory retirement, including phased-in retirement and training for second careers. I steadfastly believe that as the American population shifts and grows older, we must not set up roadblocks to productivity, independence and simple human dignity among our Nation's elderly.

I need not remind my colleagues of the complexities involved in financing a Government program. I am aware that the title V senior community services employment program is funded through September 30, 1982. I am also aware that several paths may be taken toward funding this program for fiscal year 1983. We must not let the complexities of the budget process cloud the fact that this Congress is committed to the Older Americans Act and, in particular, the title V program. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 278, as a signal that this Congress believes all Ameri-

cans deserve the opportunity to grow older with grace and dignity.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 278, I rise in strong support of the resolution in behalf of full funding for senior community service.

The programs administered under title V of the Older American Act bring enormous benefit, at low Federal cost, to the older Americans who work in the programs and those senior and younger persons whom they serve. Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to meet and speak with a number of senior aides in my district, and I was encouraged by the wisdom and experience that they are contributing to their communities.

However, senior aides in my district and throughout the country are worried about the future of the program. It is my fervent hope that passage of this resolution will assure them that the Congress is full behind this effective program.

We are constantly preoccupied with the need to establish and expand cost-effective and beneficial programs, particularly those that return more to communities than they cost initially. The senior employment programs return an estimated \$1.15 for each dollar spent on the program itself. These programs represent good government: They enrich communities across the country, while helping individual citizens.

As a cosponsor of this resolution, I look forward to the senior employment programs continuing to help local communities use local personal resources to solve local problems, while utilizing individuals who have given a great deal to their country and offer further services.

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278 expressing the sense of Congress that title V of the Older Americans Act should receive full funding for 1983 and subsequent fiscal years.

That the administration should consider cutting title V appropriations at all is merely a reflection of its myopic view of budgetary priorities. As many of my colleagues will agree, title V has been a tremendously successful program. Rhetoric about waste, fraud, and abuse does not apply to the senior community service employment program. Title V meets the strictest criteria of cost effectiveness: For every \$1 spent by the program, approximately \$1.15 is saved in food stamp, supplemental security income, and unemployment benefits.

Nor can the need for the title V program be disputed. At current funding levels, title V allows some 54,000 senior citizens across the country near or below the poverty level to perform valuable public service tasks in their community. Many of the participants in

title V will go on to find gainful employment in the private sector.

The fight for the title V program does not end here. While I commend those of my colleagues who support this resolution, I must point out that the real test of their commitment will come in the upcoming votes on supplemental appropriations and fiscal 1983 appropriations. House Concurrent Resolution 278 should not be an empty gesture, but a real signal to the administration of our determination to keep the title V program alive at current funding levels. We owe a great debt to the generation which preceded us. Let us not forget their plight.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 278, I rise in strong support of the resolution. The ravages of inflation have really hurt our senior citizens and they are truly deserving of support, especially those who are constructively and effectively participating in community service employment programs.

The community service employment programs will provide hope and dignity to our senior citizens and they will do so in programs that have proven to be very cost-effective.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in December of 1981, the House and Senate by overwhelming margins voted to reauthorize the Older Americans Act. Included in the reauthorization bill were provisions to extend and strengthen title V, the older Americans community service employment program.

Prior to the submission of the fiscal year 1983 budget in February, there were indications that the President might not make a specific budget recommendation for the title V program. I joined with a number of my colleagues in writing to the President and urging him not to eliminate the program. In spite of these entreaties, the fiscal year 1983 budget, as submitted, contained no specific budget request for the community service employment program. In my judgment, the lack of a request was a serious mistake.

Title V has provided nearly 100,000 senior citizens with job training and employment referral services. In the current fiscal year, 54,200 low-income seniors have been provided with a job by the program. These jobs provide our elderly citizens with a chance to perform a meaningful community service and to contribute to their own self-sufficiency. It is absolutely imperative that these job opportunities be retained.

House Concurrent Resolution 278, which I was pleased to cosponsor, will reiterate the support of Congress for title V. Weakening or eliminating the title V programs would be neither a sound fiscal nor social policy. I hope that my colleagues will agree and that

House Concurrent Resolution 278 will be overwhelmingly approved.●

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278, a resolution which expresses Congress support of title V of the Older Americans Act.

Title V of the Older Americans Act enables more than 50,000 senior citizens in communities across the Nation to engage in employment. These seniors, 55 years or older and defined as low-income earners, not only contribute their services to the community at large, but establish for themselves a sense of worth. At the present time, title V programs could cease to exist in early September if Congress does not act soon.

Termination of such a worthwhile program could be devastating for those participating and those benefiting from the 54,000 part-time jobs. Studies have shown that title V jobs returns to the taxpayers \$1.15 for every dollar spent on the program. Data also indicates that SSI and food stamp costs were reduced an average of \$24 a month whenever a new person joined the title V program. Of course, the self-worth that is attained through helping others is immeasurable.

It is time that the Congress act affirmatively. Our senior citizens have suffered enough hardship and frustration in the name of frugal spending. Title V has been proven successful, we cannot stand idly by and watch the program cease. These jobs must be maintained.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278 of which I am a cosponsor.

Title V moneys must be saved and passage of this resolution will mark a victory for America's senior citizens. The money we spend on senior employment is one of the best investments this Nation can make. For the few hundreds of dollars spent on each senior worker, this country reaps thousands of dollars worth of productive employment. The Government that denies employment to its seniors delegates them to living on the dole. How can we on the one hand urge our people to provide for themselves then take away the very means they have to do so?

I for one have witnessed the decimation of Green Thumb and RSVP programs in my State. The failure of this administration to fund these programs is an insult to the seniors of America. We should be ashamed that we have allowed this neglect to go on for so long.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to cast my vote in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278 and in doing so cast a vote in support of the senior citizens of the United States.●

● Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, as cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 278, I rise today in support of this important resolution which expresses the concern of Congress for the very worthwhile and productive community service employment program. This program, serving over 52,000 seniors nationwide, allows older members of our society the opportunity to actively contribute to the local community while earning a small income which, as we all know, has become an economic necessity for those on fixed means.

In Rhode Island alone, over 300 seniors participated in the senior employment program in 1981. These individuals worked as library aides, fire safety counselors, retail sales clerks, and in numerous other positions that allowed them access to public contact and opportunities for renewed confidence and enthusiasm.

As it was only last year that Congress voted in overwhelming support for the Older Americans Act 3-year extension, I believe the majority of this year's Members fully intend for the community service employment program to be sufficiently funded. I ask that every consideration be given to maintain adequate funding to this very valuable and yet cost-effective senior community employment program.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my full support to House Concurrent Resolution 278, the legislation before us which reaffirms our strong support for the title V senior community employment program. As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging as well as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee which considered this legislation, I am heartened that we are considering this measure today. Clearly, a strong endorsement of title V will send a clear signal to the White House that the Congress is serious about maintaining our commitment to this small, but vital, program.

The title V program was extended for another 3 years last year in the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1981 (Public Law 97-115). As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I can personally attest to the favorable consideration this program received from Members of both parties, throughout the entire reauthorization process.

The title V senior community service employment program provides part-time community service employment to low-income seniors over 55. The jobs which these working older Americans perform for their neighborhoods are many and varied, including delivering meals at senior centers, working with foster children and the mentally disabled, as well as providing essential support staff at community centers which serve all local residents. The current funding level for this program

now supports 54,200 job slots nationwide, at a cost of approximately \$5,111 per participant per year.

We bring this resolution to the floor at a time when the funding picture for this program is in grave jeopardy. At present, the 1982 appropriation only extends this program through the last quarter of this fiscal year at a level of \$67 million, in part, because this is a forward-funded program. Unless the remaining \$210 million is provided for title V prior to September 30, which would bring the program up to current operating levels, the title V program, its sponsors, and its participants face extinction.

The urgent supplemental appropriations bills, which were both vetoed by President Reagan, contained the \$210 million to keep the program operating. Sadly, this final version which we adopted excluded money for title V despite my efforts and those of my colleagues on the Aging Committee—Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER, MATTHEW RINALDO, JOHN BURTON, and WILLIAM RATCHFORD—which urged the conferees to maintain the money in the legislation. Happily, while the money was not retained in the urgent supplemental, I have been advised by our colleague, Chairman NATCHER of the Labor-HHS Appropriations Subcommittee, that his subcommittee has included the entire \$210 million in the regular supplemental appropriations bill they are now considering in committee.

Advocates of title V were further heartened by the actions taken by our colleagues in the Senate on July 1 on a similar resolution, Senate Resolution 340. By a resounding 89 to 6 vote, the Senate voted to oppose any actions which would terminate or otherwise weaken the program.

The title V program has proven its worth many times over for it keeps older workers as taxpaying citizens, rather than forcing them into dependency. It has promoted self-sufficiency for its participants as well as age-integrated services to the communities where it operates. This program has also shattered the antiquated myth that older Americans are unable to continue working and maintaining a productive and useful function within our society. Undoubtedly, the demographics of the older work force in this Nation will place greater demands upon programs for older workers and at a time when demand is escalating, it seems hardly a fair and fitting response to seek to eliminate this program which can capably respond to this demand.

I commend my colleagues, Mr. PARNETTA and Mr. CONTE, for introducing this measure. Their support and leadership in this area has been invaluable for the program. I further commend my chairman, CARL PERKINS, of the Education and Labor Committee, for

his expeditious consideration of this measure. His demonstrated commitment to our Nation's seniors has not once wavered in my entire tenure as a member of his committee since my election to Congress nearly 14 years ago. I urge my colleagues here to join us in support of this measure and send a clear signal to everyone that title V is a program which cannot be tampered with, for to do so would be to tamper with a program which keeps our senior citizens working and productive.●

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 278 today, of which I am a cosponsor, will again reaffirm our commitment to title V funding for the senior community service employment program so that the jobs of the 54,200 senior Americans employed by the program continue without disruption.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it is my intention to see that the \$210.6 million needed to fund the program through June 30, 1983, will be included in the supplemental appropriation bill we will soon consider.

The value and success of the senior employment program has been demonstrated many times over, and as I said in testimony in February before the House Select Committee on Aging, there is no part of our Nation that better exemplifies the true value of this program than Pinellas County, Fla., which I represent. During my testimony, I cited numerous examples of community service employers, including fire chiefs, law enforcement officials, library directors, and hospital administrators, who have contacted me to reiterate the importance of this program to their individual organizations and to the community as a whole.

In both 1975 and 1976, recommendations were made to eliminate funding for the senior community service employment program; however, the Appropriations Committee I serve on was successful in continuing funding for the program in those years and each year since.

It is my hope that the passage of this resolution today reassures those who depend on the senior employment program for their livelihood that their jobs will be protected so they can continue to provide a variety of important services to their communities.●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278, which expresses our strong support for the senior community service employment program.

Since its inception in 1967, this program has provided much needed job training to thousands of seniors. We endorsed this program last year when we reauthorized title V of the Older Americans Act. However, the Presi-

dent has proposed eliminating this program, and it is highly appropriate for us to reaffirm our commitment to senior employment and training at this time.

As a nation, we cannot afford to ignore the vast reservoir of experience and skill that our senior citizens have to offer. To enable elderly individuals to avoid poverty and continue as self-sufficient members of society is indeed an important function of our Government. Moreover, many of those participating in this program are providing valuable community services while in training.

In my own county of Santa Clara, this program is operated by the county council on aging. In 1982, the program will train 164 seniors, each of whom was below the poverty line before entering the training. Of these, 51 percent are in service to the general community, with the rest in senior related positions. In all, more than 80 different agencies and businesses throughout the county are participating in the senior employment program.

Since 1977, the Santa Clara program has exceeded its placement goal in each year. I have seen this program work on a local level. It fills an important community need.

Today, the House will also be considering a military spending program of more than \$250 billion. Surely we can find the relatively slight funding needed to maintain this useful community service.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the senior community service employment program, and strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 278. In the words of the resolution before us, we must "provide hope for a self-sufficient and dignified existence to senior citizens who otherwise would face shrinking employment opportunities."

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 278. This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the current level of 54,000 public service jobs for low-income, older Americans be maintained, under title V of the Older Americans Act, for fiscal year 1983 and subsequent years.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration proposed to eliminate the title V program. The elimination of this program would mean the loss of over 54,200 federally financed jobs nationwide.

In February, I held hearings in New York on the title V program for the House Select Committee on Aging, Subcommittee on Retirement Income and Employment. Janet Sainer, commissioner of the New York City Department for the Aging, testified on the importance of this program in New York. The title V program is the last Federal employment program di-

rected to low-income older people in the country. Last year, in New York City, 800 older people lost their jobs when CETA was eliminated. Within the same year, another 800 older workers became unemployed with the demise of the title X job opportunity program. This number would have been much greater if the city had not picked up some of the positions. If the title V program does not continue, another 900 men and women will lose their jobs. This time, New York City will not be able to pick up the positions.

Commissioner Sainer testified that if the program is eliminated, over 100 frail elderly who receive essential home care services, because of disabilities or illness, would require institutionalization. Recent studies have revealed that it now costs over \$24,000/year to institutionalize one person for 1 year in New York City. The title V program also allows older Americans to continue to be productive, taxpaying citizens. Considering all these factors, the program is obviously cost effective.

The elimination of the title V program is another indication of the fiscal shortsightedness and callousness of this administration. For the President to try to save money by cutting this program is just outrageous and shameful.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this resolution and to do whatever we can to restore full funding of this highly worthwhile older worker program.

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those of my colleagues who are speaking here today in favor of the resolution by the gentleman from California.

I, too, am convinced that the administration's effort to provide zero funding for title V of the Older Americans Act is just one more example of the manner in which senior citizens are being asked to shoulder a tremendously unfair burden of the budget cuts. If the administration succeeds in cutting the more than 54,000 jobs funded by title V, it will only be adding to the misery it has already caused with its cuts in medicare, its threats to the social security program, and its attacks on a broad range of programs which are critical to the survival of our elderly people—programs such as housing assistance and nutrition services.

I am further convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there is significant support for title V not only among the American public, but in this very Chamber. I am certain that this support will be reflected in our vote today, just as it was reflected in the response to the two letters which I asked my colleagues to join me in sending to President Reagan on this issue.

That first letter, Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, was signed by some 68 Members. We stressed to the President that the failure to provide categorical funding for title V would seriously jeopardize an effort which has been judged to be effective in providing jobs and services to our seniors and to our community at large. We also stressed that this effort has been judged to produce a considerable cost savings, with a minimum of bureaucratic regulation.

Our first letter to the President further stated, Mr. Speaker, that beyond the stark reality of whatever cost savings lies a contribution to the lives of senior citizens who have played a major role in building the social and economic strength of our Nation. We urged that the administration not lose sight of the fact that title V takes advantage of a vast pool of talent which otherwise has been ignored by private and public employers.

We did receive a reply from the White House, Mr. Speaker. But because I felt that the reply overlooked the need to maintain categorical funding for title V, I organized a followup letter.

This time, 115 of our colleagues joined me, Mr. Speaker. We pointed out that the administration's proposed \$200 million for targeted jobs assistance would force older Americans to compete with native Americans, displaced workers, offenders, and other needy groups. Given the legitimate and considerable needs of these groups, we stated our strong feelings that \$200 million for these groups and senior citizens would hardly replace the \$227 million we spent last year on senior citizen employment alone.

For these and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleague from California is providing a very much needed statement today. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution, so that we can demonstrate a mandate in support of title V.

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the overwhelming support for House Resolution 278, which expresses congressional support for maintaining an adequate funding level for the Older Americans Act title V jobs program.

Title V is a basic bread-and-butter economic issue to the thousands of low-income elderly that benefit from the program.

When we talk about title V, we are not talking about make-work jobs, but jobs that provide valuable community services. Many title V jobholders are employed in senior centers, nutrition and transportation projects, or other programs providing vital services to the elderly.

And when we talk about title V, we are not talking about a program to en-

tain senior citizens for the day, but one that provides critical part-time employment to assure an older person sufficient income to put food on the table and oil in the stove.

Employment for the elderly under title V is a good self-help program that assists low-income elderly in providing for the vital necessities of life, both for themselves and often for other seniors in the community.

The roots of the title V dilemma can be traced to events earlier this year. President Reagan's 1983 budget request called for the elimination of the jobs program. In its place, the President proposed a new "displaced workers program" under which older workers would be forced to compete for funds against veterans, displaced homemakers, exconvicts, and numerous other groups. This new jobs program was to be funded at a level of \$180 million in 1983, nearly one-third less than the amount earmarked just for older workers last year.

No one can express the need for this program as eloquently as a senior employed under title V. I would like to read for the record a letter I received today from a senior citizen in my State who is sincerely fearful that the Older Americans job program will be eliminated.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I received some news today that was very upsetting to say the least.

The Senior Community Service Employment Program will be terminated this September 30th.

The writer of this letter is a Senior who is in the 70th year of life. My beloved husband passed away five years ago. It was necessary for me to find work and I found work through that program. If that program goes under, I as well as many other seniors will be unemployed. What then? Welfare?

Personally, I have felt so fortunate that I have not found it necessary to go on Relief, but what happens when work for seniors is not available? Looks to me we will have to ask for help whether we want to or not.

Mr. Congressman, this is a cry for help, not only for me, but from many, many other concerned senior citizens. Please, we are asking you to do everything within your power to see that the SCSEP is not terminated.

Sincerely,

MRS. A. W. GINGER,
Bellingham, Wash.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this strong show of congressional support for the title V jobs program will convince the administration not to pull the rug out from under Mrs. Ginger and the thousands of elderly nationwide who depend upon this program. ●

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time, if I have any time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is one the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the con-

current resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 278.

The question was taken. Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on the motion on which further proceedings were postponed and will then put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, July 19, 1982, in the order in which those motions were entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 278, H.R. 5228, H.R. 6258, and House Concurrent Resolution 310, all by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote in this series.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING OLDER AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 278).

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 278, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 4, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—407

Addabbo	Benjamin	Broyhill	Hammerschmidt	Minish
Alexander	Bennett	Burgener	Hance	Mitchell (MD)
Anderson	Bereuter	Burton, Phillip	Hansen (ID)	Mitchell (NY)
Andrews	Bethune	Butler	Hansen (UT)	Moakley
Annunzio	Bevill	Byron	Harkin	Moffett
Anthony	Bingham	Campbell	Hartnett	Molinari
Applegate	Billey	Carman	Hatcher	Mollohan
Archer	Boggs	Carney	Hawkins	Montgomery
Aspin	Boland	Chapple	Heckler	Moore
Atkinson	Bolling	Cheney	Hefner	Moorhead
AuCoin	Boner	Chisholm	Heftel	Morrison
Badham	Bonior	Clausen	Hendon	Mottl
Bafalis	Bonker	Clinger	Hertel	Murphy
Bailey (MO)	Bouquard	Coats	Hightower	Murtha
Bailey (PA)	Breaux	Coelho	Hiler	Myers
Barnard	Brinkley	Coleman	Hillis	Napier
Barnes	Brodhead	Collins (IL)	Holland	Natcher
Beard	Brooks	Collins (TX)	Hollenbeck	Neal
Bedell	Broomfield	Conable	Holt	Nelligan
Bellenson	Brown (CA)	Conte	Hopkins	Nelson
Benedict	Brown (CO)	Conyers	Horton	Nichols
			Howard	Nowak
			Hoyer	O'Brien
			Hubbard	Oakar
			Huckaby	Oberstar
			Hughes	Obey
			Hunter	Ottinger
			Hutto	Oxley
			Hyde	Panetta
			Ireland	Parris
			Jacobs	Pashayan
			Jeffords	Patman
			Jeffries	Patterson
			Jenkins	Pease
			Johnston	Pepper
			Jones (NC)	Perkins
			Jones (OK)	Petri
			Kastenmeier	Peysner
			Kazen	Pickle
			Kemp	Porter
			Kennelly	Price
			Kildee	Pritchard
			Kindness	Pursell
			Kogovsek	Quillen
			Kramer	Rahall
			LaFalce	Railsback
			Lagomarsino	Ratchford
			Lantos	Regula
			Latta	Reuss
			Leach	Rhodes
			Leath	Richmond
			Lee	Rinaldo
			Lehman	Ritter
			Leland	Roberts (KS)
			Lent	Roberts (SD)
			Levitas	Robinson
			Lewis	Rodino
			Livingston	Roe
			Loeffler	Roemer
			Long (LA)	Rogers
			Long (MD)	Rosenthal
			Lott	Rostenkowski
			Lowery (CA)	Roth
			Lowry (WA)	Roukema
			Lujan	Royal
			Luken	Rudd
			Lundine	Russo
			Lungren	Sabo
			Madigan	Santini
			Markey	Savage
			Marks	Sawyer
			Mariennee	Scheuer
			Marriott	Schneider
			Martin (IL)	Schroeder
			Martin (NC)	Schulze
			Martin (NY)	Seiberling
			Martinez	Sensenbrenner
			Matsui	Shamansky
			Mattox	Shannon
			Mavroules	Sharp
			Mazzoli	Shaw
			McClory	Shelby
			McCloskey	Shumway
			McCollum	Shuster
			McCurry	Siljander
			McDade	Simon
			McEwen	Skeen
			McGrath	Skelton
			McHugh	Smith (AL)
			McKinney	Smith (IA)
			Mica	Smith (NE)
			Michel	Smith (NJ)
			Mikulski	Smith (OR)
			Miller (CA)	Smith (PA)
			Miller (OH)	Snowe
			Mineta	Snyder

Solarz	Udall	Williams (MT)	Atkinson	Evans (DE)	Leath	Ritter	Skeen	Walgren
Spence	Vander Jagt	Williams (OH)	Badham	Evans (GA)	Lee	Roberts (KS)	Skelton	Walker
St Germain	Vento	Wilson	Bafalis	Evans (IA)	Lehman	Roberts (SD)	Smith (AL)	Wampler
Stangeland	Volkmer	Winn	Bailey (MO)	Evans (IN)	Leland	Robinson	Smith (IA)	Washington
Stanton	Walgren	Wirth	Balby (PA)	Fary	Lent	Rodino	Smith (NE)	Watkins
Stark	Walker	Wolf	Barnard	Fascell	Levitas	Roe	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Staton	Wampler	Wolpe	Barnes	Fazio	Lewis	Roemer	Smith (OR)	Weaver
Stenholm	Washington	Wortley	Beard	Fenwick	Livingston	Rogers	Smith (PA)	Weber (MN)
Stokes	Watkins	Wright	Bedell	Ferraro	Loeffler	Rosenthal	Snowe	Weber (OH)
Stratton	Waxman	Wyden	Bellenson	Fiedler	Long (LA)	Rostenkowski	Snyder	Weiss
Studds	Weaver	Wylie	Benedict	Fields	Long (MD)	Roth	Solarz	White
Stump	Weber (MN)	Yates	Benjamin	Findley	Lott	Roukema	Spence	Whitehurst
Swift	Weber (OH)	Yatron	Bennett	Fish	Lowery (CA)	Roybal	St Germain	Whitley
Synar	Weiss	Young (AK)	Bereuter	Flippo	Lowry (WA)	Rudd	Stangeland	Whittaker
Tauke	White	Young (FL)	Bevill	Florio	Lujan	Russo	Stanton	Whitten
Tauzin	Whitehurst	Young (MO)	Bingham	Foglietta	Luken	Sabo	Stark	Williams (MT)
Taylor	Whitley	Zablocki	Billey	Foley	Lundine	Santini	Staton	Williams (OH)
Thomas	Whittaker	Zerferetti	Boggs	Ford (MI)	Lungren	Savage	Stenholm	Wilson
Traxler	Whitten		Bolling	Ford (TN)	Madigan	Sawyer	Stokes	Winn

NAYS—4

Ashbrook	McDonald
Crane, Phillip	Paul

NOT VOTING—23

Akaka	Clay	LeBoutillier
Albosta	Coyne, James	Rangel
Biaggi	Crane, Daniel	Rose
Blanchard	de la Garza	Rousselot
Bowen	Fithian	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Green	Solomon
Burton, John	Hagedorn	Trible
Chappell	Jones (TN)	

□ 1345

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on all the additional motions to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

IMPLEMENTING THE CONVENTION ON PHYSICAL PROTECTION OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5228, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES) that the house suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5228, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 9, answered "present" 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—396

Addabbo	Andrews	Applegate
Alexander	Annunzio	Archer
Anderson	Anthony	Aspin

Atkinson	Evans (DE)	Leath	Ritter	Skeen	Walgren
Badham	Evans (GA)	Lee	Roberts (KS)	Skelton	Walker
Bafalis	Evans (IA)	Lehman	Roberts (SD)	Smith (AL)	Wampler
Bailey (MO)	Evans (IN)	Leland	Robinson	Smith (IA)	Washington
Balby (PA)	Fary	Lent	Rodino	Smith (NE)	Watkins
Barnard	Fascell	Levitas	Roe	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Barnes	Fazio	Lewis	Roemer	Smith (OR)	Weaver
Beard	Fenwick	Livingston	Rogers	Smith (PA)	Weber (MN)
Bedell	Ferraro	Loeffler	Rosenthal	Snowe	Weber (OH)
Bellenson	Fiedler	Long (LA)	Rostenkowski	Snyder	Weiss
Benedict	Fields	Long (MD)	Roth	Solarz	White
Benjamin	Findley	Lott	Roukema	Spence	Whitehurst
Bennett	Fish	Lowery (CA)	Roybal	St Germain	Whitley
Bereuter	Flippo	Lowry (WA)	Rudd	Stangeland	Whittaker
Bevill	Florio	Lujan	Russo	Stanton	Whitten
Bingham	Foglietta	Luken	Sabo	Stark	Williams (MT)
Billey	Foley	Lundine	Santini	Staton	Williams (OH)
Boggs	Ford (MI)	Lungren	Savage	Stenholm	Wilson
Bolling	Ford (TN)	Madigan	Sawyer	Stokes	Winn
Boner	Forsythe	Marky	Scheuer	Stratton	Wirth
Bonior	Fountain	Marks	Schneider	Studds	Wolf
Bonker	Fowler	Marlenee	Schroeder	Stump	Wolpe
Bouquard	Frank	Mariott	Schulze	Swift	Wortley
Breaux	Frenzel	Martin (IL)	Seiberling	Synar	Wright
Brinkley	Frost	Martin (NC)	Shamansky	Tauke	Wyden
Brodhead	Fuqua	Martin (NY)	Shannon	Tauzin	Wylie
Brooks	Garcia	Martinez	Sharp	Taylor	Yates
Broomfield	Gaydos	Matsui	Shaw	Thomas	Yatron
Brown (CA)	Gedjenson	Mattox	Shelby	Traxler	Young (AK)
Brown (CO)	Gephardt	Mavroules	Shumway	Udall	Young (FL)
Broyhill	Gibbons	Mazzoli	Shuster	Vander Jagt	Young (MO)
Burgener	Gilman	McClory	Siljander	Vento	Zablocki
Burton, Phillip	Gingrich	McCloskey	Simon	Volkmer	Zerferetti
Butler	Ginn	McCollum			
Byron	Glickman	McCurdy			
Campbell	Goldwater	McDade			
Carman	Goodling	McEwen			
Carney	Gore	McGrath			
Chappie	Gradison	McHugh			
Cheney	Gramm	McKinney			
Chisholm	Gray	Mica			
Clausen	Gregg	Michel			
Clinger	Grisham	Mikulski			
Coats	Guarini	Miller (CA)			
Coelho	Gunderson	Miller (OH)			
Coleman	Hall (OH)	Mineta			
Collins (IL)	Hall, Ralph	Minish			
Collins (TX)	Hall, Sam	Mitchell (MD)			
Conable	Hamilton	Mitchell (NY)			
Conte	Hammerschmidt	Moakley			
Conyers	Hance	Moffett			
Corcoran	Hansen (ID)	Mollinari			
Coughlin	Hansen (UT)	Mollohan			
Courter	Hartnett	Montgomery			
Coyne, William	Hatcher	Moore			
Craig	Hawkins	Moorhead			
Crockett	Heckler	Morrison			
D'Amours	Hefner	Motti			
Daniel, Dan	Heftel	Murphy			
Daniel, R. W.	Hendon	Murtha			
Dannemeyer	Hertel	Myers			
Daschle	Hightower	Napier			
Daub	Hiler	Natcher			
Davis	Hillis	Neal			
Deckard	Holland	Nelligan			
Dellums	Hollenbeck	Nelson			
DeNardis	Holt	Nichols			
Derrick	Hopkins	Nowak			
Derwinski	Horton	O'Brien			
Dickinson	Howard	Oakar			
Dicks	Hoyer	Oberstar			
Dingell	Hubbard	Obey			
Dixon	Huckaby	Ottinger			
Donnelly	Hughes	Oxley			
Dorgan	Hunter	Panetta			
Dornan	Hutto	Parris			
Dougherty	Hyde	Pashayan			
Downey	Ireland	Patman			
Dreier	Jacobs	Patterson			
Duncan	Jeffords	Pease			
Dunn	Jeffries	Pepper			
Dwyer	Jenkins	Perkins			
Dymally	Johnston	Peysner			
Dyson	Jones (NC)	Pickle			
Early	Jones (OK)	Porter			
Eckart	Kastenmeier	Price			
Edgar	Kazen	Pritchard			
Edwards (AL)	Kennelly	Quillen			
Edwards (CA)	Kildee	Rahall			
Edwards (OK)	Kogovsek	Railsback			
Emerson	Kramer	Ratchford			
Emery	LaFalce	Regula			
English	Lagomarsino	Reuss			
Erdahl	Lantos	Rhodes			
Erlenborn	Latta	Richmond			
Ertel	Leach	Rinaldo			

NAYS—9

Ashbrook	Harkin	Paul
Crane, Daniel	Kindness	Petri
Crane, Phillip	McDonald	Sensenbrenner

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—28

Akaka	Chappell	LeBoutillier
Albosta	Clay	Pursell
AuCoin	Coyne, James	Rangel
Bethune	de la Garza	Rose
Biaggi	Dowdy	Rousselot
Blanchard	Fithian	Schumer
Boland	Green	Solomon
Bowen	Hagedorn	Trible
Brown (OH)	Jones (TN)	
Burton, John	Kemp	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL ACT AUTHORIZATION FOR 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 6258.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FLORIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6258, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic vote, and there were—yeas 241, nays 167, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—241

Addabbo	AuCoin	Bedell
Alexander	Badham	Benedict
Anderson	Bafalis	Benjamin
Annunzio	Bailey (PA)	Boggs
Anthony	Barnard	Boland
Applegate	Barnes	Bolling

Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Bouquard
Brinkley
Brodhead
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Burton, Phillip
Byron
Campbell
Carman
Carney
Chisholm
Clausen
Coeiho
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conte
Conyers
Courter
Coyne, William
Crockett
D'Amours
Daschle
Davis
Deckard
Dellums
DeNardis
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Dougherty
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Emery
Erdahl
Ertel
Evans (DE)
Evans (GA)
Fary
Fascell
Fazio
Ferraro
Fish
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Gonzalez
Gore
Gray
Guarini
Hall, Ralph

Harkin
Hawkins
Heckler
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Holland
Hollenbeck
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Jeffords
Jeffords
Hansin
Jones (NC)
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Kildee
Kogovsek
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Lee
Lehman
Leland
Lent
Long (LA)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Madigan
Markey
Marks
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McClory
McCollum
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell (MD)
Mitchell (NY)
Moakley
Molinar
Mollohan
Morrison
Mottl
Murphy
Murtha
Napier
Nelligan
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Ottinger
Panetta
Parris

Pashayan
Patterson
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Price
Pritchard
Quillen
Rahall
Railsback
Reuss
Rhodes
Richmond
Rinaldo
Roberts (SD)
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roybal
Russo
Santini
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schneider
Shamansky
Shannon
Shaw
Shuster
Siljander
Simon
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (PA)
Snowe
Solarz
Spence
Stangeland
Stark
Staton
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauke
Traxler
Vander Jagt
Vento
Walgren
Wampler
Washington
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Williams (MT)
Wilson
Wirth
Wolf
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zablocki
Zeferetti

NAYS—167

Andrews
Archer
Ashbrook
Aspin
Atkinson
Bailey (MO)
Beard
Bellenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Bingham
Bliley
Breaux
Brooks
Brown (CO)
Broyhill

Burgener
Butler
Chapple
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Collins (TX)
Conable
Corcoran
Coughlin
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Dannemeyer
Daub
Derwinski

Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IN)
Fenwick
Fiedler
Fields
Flippo
Forsythe
Fountain
Frenzel

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Glickman
Goldwater
Goodling
Gradison
Gramm
Gregg
Grisham
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Huckaby
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffries
Johnston
Jones (OK)
Kennelly
Kindness
Latta
Leach
Leath
Levitas

Lewis
Livingston
Loeffler
Long (MD)
Lujan
Lungren
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Mattox
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDonald
McEwen
Michel
Miller (OH)
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
O'Brien
Obey
Oxley
Patman
Paul
Pease
Petri
Porter
Ratchford
Regula
Ritter
Roberts (KS)
Robinson
Roemer
Roukema

Rudd
Sabo
Schroeder
Schulze
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shelby
Shumway
Skeen
Smith (AL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (OR)
Snyder
St Germain
Stanton
Stenholm
Anthony
Taubin
Taylor
Thomas
Udall
Volkmer
Walker
Weber (MN)
Weber (OH)
White
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wolpe
Wylie
Yates

NOT VOTING—26

Akaka
Albosta
Biaggi
Blanchard
Bowen
Brown (OH)
Burton, John
Chappell
Clay

Coyne, James
de la Garza
Findley
Fithian
Ford (MI)
Green
Hagedorn
Jones (TN)
LeBoutillier

Moffett
Pursell
Rangel
Rose
Rousselot
Schumer
Solomon
Trible

□ 1400

Mr. HERTEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?
There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS RE SITUATION ON CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 310), as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) that the House suspend

the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 310), as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 6, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—405

Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Ashbrook
Aspin
Atkinson
AuCoin
Badham
Bafalis
Bailey (MO)
Bailey (PA)
Barnard
Barnes
Beard
Bedell
Beilenson
Benedict
Benjamin
Bennett
Bereuter
Bethune
Bevill
Bingham
Bliley
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Boner
Bonior
Bonker
Bouquard
Breaux
Brinkley
Brodhead
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burgener
Burton, Phillip
Butler
Byron
Campbell
Carman
Carney
Chapple
Cheney
Chisholm
Clausen
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (TX)
Conable
Conte
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne, William
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Crockett
D'Amours
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Dannemeyer
Daschle
Daub
Davis
Deckard
Dellums
DeNardis
Derrick
Derwinski

Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Donnelly
Dornan
Dougherty
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Emery
English
Erdahl
Erlenborn
Ertel
Evans (DE)
Evans (GA)
Evans (IA)
Evans (IN)
Fary
Fascell
Fazio
Fenwick
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Forsythe
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Ginn
Glickman
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Gray
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
McCurdy
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins

Heckler
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holland
Hollenbeck
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jeffries
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kogovsek
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
Lee
Lehman
Leland
Lent
Levitas
Lewis
Livingston
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Madigan
Markey
Marks
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McClory
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKinney
Mica

Michel	Regula	Stanton
Mikulski	Reuss	Stark
Miller (CA)	Rhodes	Staton
Miller (OH)	Richmond	Stenholm
Mineta	Rinaldo	Stokes
Minish	Ritter	Stratton
Mitchell (MD)	Roberts (KS)	Studds
Mitchell (NY)	Roberts (SD)	Stump
Moakley	Robinson	Swift
Moffett	Rodino	Synar
Molinari	Roe	Tauke
Mollohan	Roemer	Tauzin
Montgomery	Rogers	Taylor
Moore	Rosenthal	Thomas
Moorhead	Rostenkowski	Traxler
Morrison	Roth	Udall
Mottl	Roukema	Vander Jagt
Murphy	Roybal	Vento
Murtha	Rudd	Volkmmer
Myers	Russo	Walgren
Napier	Sabo	Walker
Natcher	Santini	Wampler
Neal	Savage	Washington
Nelligan	Sawyer	Watkins
Nelson	Scheuer	Waxman
Nichols	Schneider	Weaver
Nowak	Schroeder	Weber (MN)
O'Brien	Schulze	Weber (OH)
Oakar	Seiberling	Weiss
Oberstar	Sensenbrenner	White
Obey	Shamansky	Whitehurst
Ottinger	Shannon	Whitley
Oxley	Sharp	Whittaker
Panetta	Shaw	Whitten
Parris	Shelby	Williams (MT)
Pashayan	Shumway	Williams (OH)
Patman	Shuster	Wilson
Patterson	Siljander	Winn
Pease	Simon	Wirth
Pepper	Skeen	Wolf
Perkins	Skelton	Wolpe
Petri	Smith (AL)	Wortley
Peysner	Smith (IA)	Wright
Pickle	Smith (NE)	Wyden
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wyllie
Price	Smith (OR)	Yates
Pritchard	Smith (PA)	Yatron
Pursell	Snowe	Young (AK)
Quillen	Snyder	Young (FL)
Rahall	Spence	Young (MO)
Railsback	St Germain	Zablocki
Ratchford	Stangeland	Zeferettti

NAYS—6

Conyers	Grisham	Paul
Findley	McDonald	Solarz

NOT VOTING—23

Akaka	Clay	LeBoutillier
Albosta	Coyne, James	Rangel
Biaggi	de la Garza	Rose
Blanchard	Fithian	Rousselot
Bowen	Fountain	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Green	Solomon
Burton, John	Hagedorn	Trible
Chappell	Jones (TN)	

Mr. FINDLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 278.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1983

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6030) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1983 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, and for operation and maintenance, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, to authorize appropriations for such fiscal year for civil defense, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6030, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 19, 1982, the Clerk had designated section 1.

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 525, it is in order to consider the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 15, 1982, by and if offered by Representatives BENNETT, STRATTON, and DAN DANIEL of Virginia, and said amendments shall not be subject to amendment while pending, except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: Page 4, line 7 strike out "\$2,485,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,786,000,000".

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just read would reduce the authorization for the Trident submarine program by one submarine, from two to one, and would reduce the authorization for appropriation by \$699 million. The amendment is the first of three amendments to be offered to achieve the reductions mandated by the budget resolution. The amendment was arrived at after consultation with the Seapower Subcommittee, which concluded that a reduction in the Trident program was the best course of action to satisfy the spending levels targeted in the budget resolution. Mr. SPENCE, the ranking member of the subcommittee, concurs in the amendment.

Let me briefly explain why the subcommittee concluded that a reduction in the Trident program was the best way to make the reduction.

Subsequent to completion of committee action on the Defense authorization bill the Secretary of Defense informed the committee that he had decided the most cost-effective way to deploy the Trident II missile would be to build the two Trident submarines requested in the fiscal year 1983 budget to carry the Trident II missile. The submarine equipment necessary to support the larger, heavier, and more accurate Trident II missile will add several hundred million dollars to the cost of each of the two Tridents included in the authorization bill as passed by the committee.

In light of the adoption of a budget resolution that mandates reductions in the Defense budget, the subcommittee concluded that it would not be possible to add the necessary funds for two Trident submarines, equipped to carry the Trident II missile, to the 1983 budget. Accordingly, the subcommittee was faced with the situation of feeling compelled to make some reductions to the bill as reported and with a bill containing an authorization for the Trident program that authorized two ships but which did not authorize appropriations sufficient to build the two ships. Therefore the subcommittee concluded that one ship should be authorized, and that the authorization should be sufficient to construct the ship fully equipped to carry the Trident II missile. This action would result in a net reduction of \$699 million in authorization for the Navy shipbuilding program.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the reductions in the Defense budget that the House has targeted in adopting the first budget resolution, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. It represents the best way of achieving the mandated reduction.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I rise in support of the amendment offered by my chairman, I wish to state that I endorse his actions and also the action taken by the House Armed Services Committee to reduce the Navy's Trident budget for fiscal year 1983 by \$699 million.

We carefully examined the alternatives that would permit us to fulfill our obligation to reduce recommended authorizations for naval shipbuilding to conform with the committee's desire to approve legislation generally consistent with the House-passed budget resolution.

I had hoped that in reaching our decision that we could do so without cutting into major programs essential to broad plans to build at least a 600-ship Navy and to strengthen and modernize our naval combatant fleet. The Tri-

dent ballistic missile submarine is a vital element in our strategic Triad, and with the new D-5 Trident II missile installed, is likely to play an even greater deterrent role in the future. The members of the Armed Services Committee feel strongly about that.

Consequently, it was difficult to deny the Navy a submarine which it should have. However, I was persuaded by the most recent letter from the Secretary of the Navy that it is possible that the restructured Trident program will bring on line the advanced D-5 ballistic missile sooner, produce cost savings by reducing the requirements for C-4 missiles and subsequent retrofitting procedures and still retain the D-5 system initial operating capability—IOC—date of 1989. Based on this information, a reduction to one Trident submarine for fiscal year 1983 seems to be an acceptable alternative at this time without prejudice to future enhancement of the Navy's submarine programs.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to inquire from the gentleman from Florida, if I might—we are all aware that we have one Trident at sea today. How many are under construction at this point in time?

Mr. BENNETT. There are nine.

Mr. HUCKABY. And will all nine of these—how will they be equipped as far as with the new Trident II missile?

Mr. BENNETT. They will all be Trident I, except the ones we are going to build; from henceforth, it will be Trident II.

Mr. HUCKABY. But would the gentleman agree with the proposition that our submarine forces are probably the most effective of our Triad forces today, since they are probably the least vulnerable?

Mr. BENNETT. I think everybody agrees on that, and I do.

Mr. HUCKABY. The gentleman does concur with that, and yet the gentleman, even aware of this, is willing to cut back the authorization by 50 percent?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I am not very happy about it, but the Congress has enacted a law that requires us to reduce the national defense and the Navy has to take its share of it.

Mr. HUCKABY. My point is, is this the most effective point we should be obtaining these moneys? I agree we have got to make some cutbacks as such, but here we are talking about the most effective leg of our Triad and making cuts there.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, actually, it is not going to slow up any of these ships getting to sea. They are all going to get to sea about the same time that they would have, anyway. In other words, we are really not slowing up the program, because they have a backlog of work that they have not yet done anyway.

I guess the worst argument that one could make against the thing that I have offered, one could say, they do have an option to build this submarine, but the argument against that is that the option cannot be fulfilled anyway, because they are going to make it a Trident II submarine. Therefore, it has to be opened up and we would not save any money.

As far as time is concerned, we are not going to lose any time.

I myself did not start off with this idea of doing this with the Trident. I was a last-minute convert and the real reason I was converted was because all the suggestions of other places for cuts lacked candor. They were not real savings. They were apparent savings that really were not going to take place, like cost overruns and things like that which are not going to be effective. That is like saying you are going to cut out waste and extravagance in Government. Unless you have a specific place to do it, it does not cut it out.

The suggestions given to us by the Navy did not meet, in my opinion, the standard of candor.

Mr. HUCKABY. If what the gentleman is saying, the immediate construction program of the Tridents will not be affected at all by this out?

Mr. BENNETT. It will not. It will go just as fast for the whole Trident fleet.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

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

Mr. KAZEN. The state of the matter is the fact that under the budget resolution we must cut some funds in defense and the gentleman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, has reviewed the entire naval program, came forward with this proposition to the full committee, and the full committee has agreed with him.

Now, the gentleman is a very strong advocate of a strong national defense. The majority of us on the floor are and it goes against the grain for us to vote to cut funds for defense.

I think that we have no option except to go with the gentleman. He has studied the budget very carefully and has found out that this is the more effective way that we can cut back to the limits of the budget resolution already adopted by this Congress and at the same time not do any harm or less harm than we would do by cutting somewhere else as far as our defense posture is concerned.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has stated it very accurately. This amendment is the least harmful amendment that we could come up with, because it is not going to really delay, in my opinion, the production of the Trident.

Mr. KAZEN. We are not doing it because we want to, but because we are mandated by the budget; am I correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct, and it should in no way be construed as a criticism of the Electric Boat or how these Tridents are produced or anything else. They are being produced well. This is not a criticism of that. It is not a rebuke to anybody. The Trident submarine is going to come out just about the same time it was going to come out anyway. It is an honest statement that we are not going to give the money in this bill, however.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, on this I would like to ask for a rollcall vote.

□ 1430

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 344, noes 65, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—344

Addabbo	Coelho	Evans (IA)
Anderson	Coleman	Evans (IN)
Andrews	Collins (IL)	Fary
Annunzio	Collins (TX)	Fascell
Anthony	Conte	Fenwick
Archer	Conyers	Ferraro
Ashbrook	Corcoran	Fiedler
Aspin	Coughlin	Fields
AuCoin	Coyne, William	Findley
Badham	Craig	Fish
Bafalis	D'Amours	Floppo
Bailey (MO)	Daniel, Dan	Foglietta
Barnard	Daniel, R. W.	Foley
Barnes	Dannemeyer	Ford (TN)
Beard	Daschle	Forsythe
Bedell	Daub	Fountain
Benedict	Davis	Fowler
Benjamin	Deckard	Frank
Bennett	Dellums	Frenzel
Bereuter	Derrick	Frost
Bethune	Derwinski	Fuqua
Bevill	Dickinson	Garcia
Bingham	Dicks	Gaydos
Bliley	Dixon	Gephardt
Boggs	Dorgan	Gibbons
Boland	Dornan	Gilman
Boner	Dougherty	Gingrich
Bonior	Dowdy	Ginn
Bonker	Dreier	Glickman
Bouquard	Duncan	Goldwater
Breaux	Dunn	Gonzalez
Brinkley	Dwyer	Goodling
Brodhead	Dymally	Gore
Brooks	Dyson	Gradison
Broomfield	Early	Gramm
Brown (CA)	Eckart	Gray
Brown (CO)	Edgar	Gregg
Broyhill	Edwards (AL)	Grisham
Burgener	Edwards (CA)	Guarini
Burton, Phillip	Edwards (OK)	Hagedorn
Butler	Emerson	Hall (OH)
Byron	Emery	Hall, Ralph
Campbell	English	Hall, Sam
Carman	Erdahl	Hamilton
Carney	Erlenborn	Hammerschmidt
Chappie	Ertel	Hance
Clausen	Evans (DE)	Hansen (ID)
Clinger	Evans (GA)	Hansen (UT)

Harkin	McGrath	Seiberling
Hatcher	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Hawkins	Mica	Shamansky
Hefner	Mikulski	Shannon
Heftel	Miller (OH)	Sharp
Hertel	Minish	Shaw
Hightower	Mitchell (MD)	Shumway
Hillis	Moakley	Shuster
Holland	Mollohan	Simon
Hollenbeck	Montgomery	Skeen
Holt	Moore	Skelton
Hopkins	Moorhead	Smith (AL)
Horton	Morrison	Smith (IA)
Howard	Mottl	Smith (NE)
Hoyer	Murphy	Smith (NJ)
Hubbard	Myers	Smith (OR)
Hutto	Napier	Smith (PA)
Hyde	Natcher	Snowe
Ireland	Neal	Snyder
Jacobs	Nelligan	Spence
Jeffords	Nelson	Stangeland
Jenkins	Nichols	Stanton
Johnston	Nowak	Stark
Jones (NC)	Oekar	Staton
Jones (OK)	Obey	Stenholm
Kastenmeier	Oxley	Stokes
Kazen	Parris	Stratton
Kildee	Pashayan	Stump
Kindness	Patman	Swift
Kogovsek	Patterson	Synar
LaFalce	Paul	Tauke
Lagomarsino	Pease	Tauzin
Lantos	Pepper	Taylor
Latta	Perkins	Thomas
Leach	Petri	Traxler
Leath	Peyser	Trible
LeBoutillier	Pickle	Udall
Lehman	Porter	Vander Jagt
Leland	Price	Volkmer
Levitas	Pritchard	Walgren
Lewis	Pursell	Walker
Livingston	Rahall	Wampler
Loeffler	Railsback	Washington
Long (LA)	Rangel	Watkins
Lott	Regula	Waxman
Lowry (WA)	Reuss	Weaver
Lujan	Richmond	Weber (MN)
Luken	Rinaldo	Weber (OH)
Lundine	Ritter	Weiss
Lungren	Roberts (KS)	White
Madigan	Roberts (SD)	Whitehurst
Markey	Robinson	Whitley
Marks	Rodino	Whittaker
Marlenee	Roe	Whitten
Marriott	Roemer	Williams (OH)
Martin (IL)	Rogers	Winn
Martin (NC)	Rosenthal	Wirth
Martinez	Rostenkowski	Wolf
Matsui	Roth	Wortley
Mattox	Roukema	Wright
Mavroules	Roybal	Wyden
McCloskey	Rudd	Wyllie
McCollum	Santini	Yates
McCurdy	Savage	Yatron
McDade	Sawyer	Young (FL)
McDonald	Scheuer	Zablocki
McEwen	Schroeder	

NOES—65

Alexander	Hendon	O'Brien
Applegate	Hiler	Oberstar
Atkinson	Huckaby	Ottinger
Bailey (PA)	Hughes	Panetta
Bellenson	Hunter	Quillen
Cheney	Jeffries	Ratchford
Coats	Kemp	Rhodes
Conable	Kennelly	Russo
Courter	Kramer	Sabo
Crane, Daniel	Lee	Schneider
Crane, Phillip	Lent	Schulze
DeNardis	Long (MD)	Shelby
Dingell	Lowery (CA)	Siljander
Donnelly	McClory	Solarz
Downey	McKinney	St Germain
Fazio	Michel	Studds
Florio	Miller (CA)	Vento
Ford (MI)	Mineta	Williams (MT)
Gejdenson	Mitchell (NY)	Wilson
Gunderson	Moffett	Wolpe
Hartnett	Molinari	Zeperetti
Heckler	Murtha	

NOT VOTING—25

Akaka	Biaggi	Bolling
Albosta	Blanchard	Bowen

Brown (OH)	de la Garza	Rousselot
Burton, John	Fithian	Schumer
Chappell	Green	Solomon
Chisholm	Jones (TN)	Young (AK)
Clay	Martin (NY)	Young (MO)
Coyne, James	Mazzoli	
Crockett	Rose	

□ 1445

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Akaka for, with Mr. Chappell against. Messrs. MINETA, PANETTA, and VENTO changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WEBER of Minnesota, GUARINI, ARCHER, and DICKS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: Page 2, line 11, strike out "\$2,612,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,541,600,000".

Page 2, line 12, strike out "\$2,948,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,898,500,000".

Page 2, line 14, strike out "\$4,843,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,707,700,000".

Page 2, line 15, strike out "\$2,622,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,439,000,000".

Page 2, line 16, strike out "\$4,638,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,509,500,000".

Page 2, line 21, strike out "\$11,774,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$11,424,500,000".

Page 6, line 7, strike out "\$2,209,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,984,900,000".

Page 6, line 13, strike out "\$18,116,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,243,400,000".

Page 6, line 14, strike out "\$6,388,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,333,300,000".

Mr. STRATTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I know that on the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) there was a certain amount of confusion among the membership as to exactly what was happening when senior members of the Armed Services Committee were getting up and offering amendments to cut the defense program, items like the Trident submarine, and others. I am sure that many Members are feeling that something has gone haywire when the Member from the 28th District of New York rises to offer an amendment that would cut \$2 billion from defense programs originally authorized by the Armed Services Committee. I have not gone berserk. I have not been converted by the various cau-

uses that have been trying to convert me.

The amendment is being offered rather, as the gentleman from Florida explained in connection with his own amendment, because the House in its wisdom, when it adopted the budget resolution, required a \$10 billion cut in defense. Since our committee had spent a good deal of time in developing the initial defense legislation, we wanted to try to see if it was possible to cut that kind of money out of defense without doing harm at least in a major way. I must say I think the amendment I am proposing now does accomplish that reduction in the procurement account, some \$2.070 billion, remarkably well in the sense that it does not gut or do severe damage to any major programs.

What the amendment would do would be to delete \$568.1 million from the Army; \$574.4 million from the Navy, which comes in addition to the reduction offered by the gentleman from Florida, and \$928.4 million from the Air Force. Together with the other amendments that are going to be offered, this will bring the total cost of H.R. 6030 into full conformity with the First Concurrent Resolution on the budget.

There are some 37 programs involved in these amendments, and I do not plan to discuss each of them since the program reductions that make up the amendments have already been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Individuals who have a heartburn about one item or another should consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I ought to point out that we have tried to spread the suffering as widely as possible, including the districts and States represented by members of the Armed Services Committee. For example, we have deleted six F-14's, one of the Nation's greatest aircraft and produced in the Nation's Empire State, simply to demonstrate that we are all suffering a little bit with these reductions.

However, make no mistake about it, we are going beyond the fat layer down to the muscle and bone. Our amendments would delete 42 combat aircraft, 114 combat vehicles. They curtail major aircraft, vehicle and missile modifications; a major program, the Copperhead cannon-launched guided missile, is terminated. The amendments reduce spare and repair parts, ammunition and communications programs, the critical readiness items that make our forces able to shoot, move and communicate, by over \$400 million.

Obviously, this will demonstrate that whenever we cut defense budgets we are going to have problems. Perhaps already those who at the time of the budget debate proposed so glibly and easily substantial cuts in defense

may now feel that they made a little mistake. But we have responded to the directions of the House and we offer this amendment in that spirit.

I am not proposing to delete these various items because I believe they are not needed. If I believed that I would have recommended they be deleted when H.R. 6030 was marked up in committee back in April.

Rather, I am offering this amendment because it was the will of the Congress that the 1983 defense budget be reduced by \$10 billion. I believe that it is the responsibility of senior members of the committee to make responsible recommendations to the House on where reductions should be taken, instead of marking up the bill on the floor of the House without a careful review of all the consequences of some of the amendments offered.

Many of these reductions will be painful to individual Members because all of these cuts ultimately translate into lost jobs and lost capability. They are painful to me and my colleagues from New York where the F-14 is made, since one of these amendments as I have already pointed out deletes six F-14's.

The truth is, that I can probably make a better case against these reductions than anyone in this House on the merits of the individual programs. But Mrs. HOLT and I did not prepare this amendment in isolation. We worked on it for more than 3 weeks, trying to weigh all the priorities, and I can assure you it was not a labor of love. But what you have before you is our best judgment as to where programs should be reduced in order to conform to the congressional mandate. I reluctantly urge the adoption of these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(At the request of Mr. MARKS and by unanimous consent, Mr. STRATTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARKS. I wonder if I might ask the gentleman from New York a question. He seemed to indicate that the cutting of two aircraft that would be built in the State of New York was being done just to show good faith by the State of New York. Is that the gentleman's comment? Does he really mean that? Was there not some consideration given as to whether or not we need those two aircraft at some point in time?

Mr. STRATTON. Let me say to the gentleman that the bill that was reported out by the House Armed Services Committee in April was a bill that, in my judgment, was vitally important, every single item in that bill, for the

defense of the country. We would not have put those items in if they were not important. But subsequent to that time, and before our bill had an opportunity to come on the floor, the House directed the Armed Services Committee to cut \$10 billion. You cannot really cut \$10 billion without cutting bone and muscle in a very substantial number of programs.

The point is that if we are going to get people to agree to this kind of massive reduction we have got to make it clear that we are spreading the impact, as I indicated earlier, over a number of areas and a number of programs. We on the Armed Services Committee, felt we had to make it clear that we are not shielding our own districts and our own States and only making other districts and other States take all the cuts.

Mr. MARKS. I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. SANTINI and by unanimous consent, Mr. STRATTON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield.

Mr. SANTINI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I was unaware that the committee was considering any action to reduce the Minuteman extended survivable power program until the details of the Stratton amendment were published in the RECORD on July 15. However, at the same time I learned of the details of the Stratton amendment, I also found that the rule on H.R. 6030 precluded any amendments to the Stratton amendment.

Let me be candid about this issue. The lithium battery program is matter of parochial interest to me. The plant is located in Henderson, Nev., and cancellation of the program would result in the loss of approximately 100 jobs in the Henderson area and it would have a significant impact on the economy of southern Nevada. As their Representative, that concerns me.

But as an American and a strong supporter of national defense, I am even more concerned about the military implications of this decision. We are going to have to rely on the Minuteman system for strategic deterrence until the MX becomes a reality. And particularly in view of the current uncertainties surrounding the MX, we must plan on keeping the Minuteman force at a high state of readiness for some time to come. The current lead-acid batteries in the Minuteman are beginning to deteriorate to the point of affecting the system's operational readiness.

It has been estimated that the lithium batteries could increase Minute-

man operational readiness by a factor of 20 and in addition, these batteries could be used for MX power modules.

I appreciate the practical necessity of asking for a rule that would make the Stratton amendment not subject to amendment. However, since I cannot offer an amendment at this point to restore the funds, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he would give consideration to restoring the authorization in the conference with the Senate.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly recognize that the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. SANTINI) has been a strong supporter of defense, and he has made, in conversation with me, a very persuasive case. I am really indebted to him indeed for bringing the merits of the lithium battery to my attention. I know that the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. SANTINI) has fought for this program very effectively over the past few years when the former Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, and the current Secretary, Caspar Weinberger, both appeared lukewarm on the program. In fact, I would go so far as to say that there would probably not be a lithium battery program today if it had not been for the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. SANTINI).

As I said in my statement and in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARKS) we had to cut a lot of good, sound programs, in this amendment, not because they were without merit, but because of the mandate of the Congress to cut the defensed budget by \$10 billion.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. HOLT), the ranking minority member of the committee, and I made some very hard choices in putting this amendment together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STRATTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, to conclude my response to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. SANTINI) we made some very hard choices in putting this amendment together, including the recommendation to reduce the F-14 program, as I pointed out earlier to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which is important to my own State.

But, as I said, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. SANTINI) has made some sound points, and I would certainly be prepared to review the lithium battery program and give serious consideration to a restoration of authorization during the committee of conference.

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York

(Mr. STRATTON) for yielding, and I thank him for his responsive answer.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 6030 offered by the distinguished chairman of the Procurement and Military Nuclear Systems Subcommittee, Mr. STRATTON.

As Chairman PRICE indicated, in offering these amendments the committee is complying with the spirit of the budget resolution. As the cosponsor of this amendment, I must tell you, however, that identifying the program reductions required by the budget resolution was a very difficult task. It was especially difficult because I am of the belief that these reductions are beginning to cut into the muscle of many of our national defense programs. Unfortunately, this is occurring at a point in our Nation's history when we should be investing in building our defense muscle, not reducing it. However, we have no alternatives but to recognize the fiscal realities imposed by tight budget constraints and to reduce the levels of authorizations for the procurement of defense systems in fiscal year 1983.

In order to reach these reduced levels of authorizations, it was necessary to review—for the second time—the Defense Department's entire procurement request. I must add that as a result of this exhaustive second review, I am even more convinced that the Defense Department's authorization bill—H.R. 6030—which I supported earlier, is lean and executable. I believe that H.R. 6030 contains only those programs which are necessary to continue to close the gap between what we need to accomplish our national defense objectives and what we have available in terms of defense resources. As you may recall, in previous years we have witnessed a downward trend in defense spending. In my judgment, the fiscal year 1982 defense authorizations and appropriations represented the first installment toward reversing this downward trend. I certainly feel that we should continue those defense improvements that the Congress started last year.

Notwithstanding my commitment to continue to reverse this dangerous downward trend, I fully understand our obligation to the people of this great Nation to enact authorizing and spending legislation which is fiscal responsibility. Consequently, I feel that we must report reductions in defense spending which not only comply with the spirit but also with the intent of the recently passed budget resolution. How does one reconcile a strong commitment to enhance our national defense with a commitment to reduce the rate of Federal spending? It was not easy. This amendment, however, attempts to satisfy these seemingly diametrical objectives by recommending program reductions which will

have the least adverse impact upon many of the programs which are vital to our national defense.

As the chairman indicated, Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force procurement programs were cut by over \$2½ billion. These program reductions are wide sweeping and include:

A \$568.1 million reduction in Army programs; over \$1.27 billion reductions in Navy-Marine Corps programs; and \$928.4 million worth of program reductions in the Air Force.

This represents a distribution of program reductions across the military services of 20 percent for the Army, 45 percent for the Navy/Marine Corps, and 35 percent for the Air Force.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not inform you that as a result of these reductions there is a greater potential for increased cost inefficiencies in the acquisition of several defense programs. These inefficiencies could occur because several reductions will require that programs be stretched-out, underfunded, or terminated. Historically, when programs are stretched out or underfunded, frequently they experience program and procurement unit cost increases. I am clearly not suggesting that these increases are acceptable should they occur, but I am only pointing out the probable cost implications of making these reductions. I might also point out that in structuring these program reductions, my colleague and I have made a concerted effort to minimize, where possible, any program cost inefficiencies which might have resulted from interruptions in production lines.

As you know, I have long been a staunch advocate of improving our defense posture by acquiring the necessary defense systems to allow this country to meet and counter the ever increasing Soviet threat. You will, therefore, not be surprised when I tell you that it goes against my grain to propose cuts in defense spending of this magnitude. However, as I said earlier, I recognize the reality of the situation, and under the circumstances it would appear that reducing defense programs is a reasonable and prudent action. Again, I must caution you, however, that we are cutting into defense muscle, and we—the Congress—must resist any further cuts—beyond those offered by the Armed Services Committee—in our national defense programs.

I hope you will support this amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I, like other Members, do not particularly like this amendment. It cuts into some of my favorite programs. But certainly I am going to support the amendment because we have been directed by the budget resolution, which I supported, that we have to make cuts

somewhere, and someone has to come up with some recommendations.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that one of the key programs is equipment for the National Guard and the Reserves. There was an addition of about \$1,200,000,000 in this bill for equipment that is certainly needed for the Guard and Reserves. As I understand from the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. HOLT) there has been about a \$600 million cut from the Guard and Reserve programs. It still leaves some funding there, and I wonder if the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) would like to comment on how much of a cut had to be made pertaining to the National Guard and the Reserves in this amendment?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to respond.

I share the gentleman's deep concern over the cuts that were forced in the programs that he and I supported very strongly in the committee to add combat capability to the Guard and the Reserves. This is the same thing that happened last year when President Reagan asked for a \$2 billion cut, and then the recommendations that came up from the Department of Defense wiped out almost the entire \$1 billion we had put in earlier for the Guard and the Reserves.

What has happened in this particular bill is that we have cut \$600 million, which is about one-half of the \$1.2 billion that we had previously added on for Guard and Reserve programs.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I understand why the gentleman had to do that.

I support the amendment. I am sorry that we had to take the F-16's away from the National Guard, but we have to make cuts across the board to get within the budget, and I commend the gentleman for taking this tough step.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, just let me say by way of explanation and in line with what the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) was saying earlier that it is somewhat out of character for many of us to be supporting such drastic cuts. We do so reluctantly. Because of the action taken by the full House on the budget resolution, we found ourselves, after the committee had already reduced the budget by some \$3 billion, being compelled to find \$3 billion in additional cuts.

As a result of the action of the Budget Committee, we went back to

the full committee to reassess the authorization bill that had already been passed by the full committee. We went back to the various subcommittees and reexamined what had been done, and it was agreed that in three areas we would take additional cuts. Those areas were in procurement, shipbuilding, and operation and maintenance. The three areas took their proportionate part of the \$3 billion in additional cuts that had been mandated by the budget resolution.

As a result of this, the Sea Power Subcommittee came up with its proportionate part, then the Procurement Subcommittee and then the Readiness Subcommittee. We agreed that they would be presented in three different parts in three different amendments, and that the Members of the House would be given an opportunity to express themselves in each of these areas.

So it is for this reason that we have done this, and we have just finished the shipbuilding part of it. We are dealing now with the procurement part. This will be followed by the operation and maintenance part, and these will be the committee recommended cuts worked out in conjunction with the Department of Defense. This is where we determined that the cuts would hurt the least if we had to make the cuts.

□ 1510

So we have made the cuts and these are the proposals that we bring to the House as areas in which we can make reductions totaling the \$3 billion we have been ordered to make.

So we have done it.

After these three amendments offered by the committee are completed we will be in compliance with what the House has said. We will have made the \$3 billion additional in cuts.

It is our hope that time that the membership would be satisfied with the level of expenditure for the Department of Defense and that there will be no more additional cuts because it is the intention of the majority of the members of the committee, at least, to resist any further cuts after having taken some \$6 billion out of the original bill.

So with that explanation I hope it will be helpful to some of the Members who ask why we are supporting these cuts in defense when normally we resist them.

We are doing it because we have been ordered to do so. We are doing it surgically rather than with a meat axe approach.

We hope we have done this where we do the least harm to our defense posture.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Chairman, in the past I have often supported efforts to cut defense spending on projects which I believe were wasteful or unnecessary. I have always felt that the Pentagon should not be exempt from close scrutiny by the Congress. We must make every effort to cut down on waste and mismanagement in the military as well as in other Government agencies. But I simply cannot support this amendment, offered on behalf of the House Armed Services Committee, which would cut defense spending by \$2.1 billion by attacking some of the Defense Department's most worthwhile systems, while leaving many more dubious programs completely intact.

I am especially opposed to the committee's attempt to cut over \$500 million from two of our most important fighter planes; that F-14 and the F-16.

The F-16 is the world's best fighter. General Dynamics, Pratt & Whitney, and other firms have pushed our technology to the limit to produce this extraordinary aircraft. In the Middle East, it has accumulated what is probably the best batting average of any fighter in history, in both air-to-air and air-to-ground missions. But it is not only an incredible performer, far outclassing anything the Soviets have; it is relatively cheap to build and maintain as well.

The F-14 is by far the world's best interceptor, offering an excellent example of how highly advanced technology can be made to work, and work well, in the fleet. It has a strong capability against both the Soviet Backfire bomber and the Foxbat reconnaissance jet. Yet the committee's amendment proposes to cut production of the F-14 by one-fifth—from 30 per year to 24 per year—even though the committee's own report acknowledged that such a cutback would result in less efficient production, costing the taxpayers an additional \$21 million per aircraft.

We do not have to look very hard to find items in the military budget which ought to be cut. The Navy's F-18 fighter, which will receive \$2.85 billion in this year's defense budget, is known to naval aviators as the "Fat Dog." It is a lightweight fighter that is not lightweight anymore, and its cost growth is even greater than its weight growth. Although this fighter is not in the same class as the F-14 and the F-16, it has been spared any cuts. Another such white elephant in the military budget is the B-1 bomber. At a cost of nearly \$4 billion per plane, it will not be able to penetrate Soviet air defenses for more than a few years after its completion. But once again,

the committee has made no effort to cut spending on this program.

I would be the first to admit that substantial cuts could and should be made in the defense budget. But such cuts should be made carefully and thoughtfully, without attacking those programs which are so important to our national security.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I suppose those of us who think that the armed services budget could be cut even more should not be rising to question where the Armed Services Committee in fact cut.

Having served as a member of the committee, I can see from the list that the choice was painful and difficult and I congratulate the committee on some of the choices.

But on some of the choices I have some questions because the fact that you have cut does not necessarily mean that in all instances you have cut wisely.

I want to ask, beginning with the subheading "ammunitions" on Copperhead, which is, as I understand it, a precision guided projectile which has had some cost growth and is an unglamorous system, but one that is capable of wreaking havoc on the battlefield against Soviet armor.

Because of its unattractive nature it seems to me to be one of those systems that we single out.

Why did the committee decide that \$183 million out of the precision guided projectiles, which is, frankly, one of the directions I think we need to be going in on the modern battlefield, was a target for reduction?

Can the chairman of the Procurement Subcommittee or someone else respond to that?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me say I am delighted the gentleman is pleased with some of the things we have done. I would have really been shocked had he agreed with everything that we have done.

Mr. DOWNEY. So would I.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me say in response to the gentleman's question on Copperhead that at the present time the Army has on hand some 8,400 Copperheads.

We cut the program by \$183.6 million for two fundamental reasons. One was that the cost has been increasing dramatically and the second is that the recent tests have been plagued by failures.

One out of every three test shots has been a failure.

The Army is considering terminating the Copperhead in either fiscal year 1984 or perhaps reviewing the possibility of terminating in 1983.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can I ask the gentleman on that question, given the development problems and the development costs, there are a number of weapons systems, and I cite for the gentleman's edification the Mark 48 torpedo that was riddled with development problems and has turned out to be a superb weapon system, is it the intention of the committee that because of these problems that possibly in the next fiscal year or the fiscal year thereafter that the committee will try and make sure that money is kept in for the Copperhead program?

Mr. STRATTON. I think if the record of the Copperhead is as bad as I have outlined it to the gentleman, we would certainly want to look very closely as to whether we should go along with the Army if they should request such funds.

As the gentleman well knows, the committee, and certainly this member, is no patsy for the Defense Department or the Army, and a number of programs that have been requested have been denied.

So I cannot give the gentleman a statement as to how many Copperheads we are going to authorize for next year. But a program that has only one out of three failures I think is one that is in trouble.

Mr. DOWNEY. One out of three successes? I understand that it has a 78-percent effective rate.

I might also ask why again is the Maverick missile not included, since the Maverick missile spends most of its time striking the ground as opposed to targets?

I hope that is not reason alone, the fact that it has had some short-term development problems.

I might add for the rest of the membership, the Copperhead is not built in my district or in New York, as far as I know. It is simply one of those systems that for the future for the Army it seems to me makes an eminent amount of sense to procure in large numbers.

I would hope that the gentleman and the members of the committee will not quickly cast it aside, both because of cost increases and because of some developmental problems.

Mr. STRATTON. I have forgotten exactly how many systems we considered, several hundred systems, and I am not sure we want to go through every system. But the Maverick program was reduced by \$72 million. That was done to hold it at a low rate of production. It, too, has had some problems, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me ask next about the F-16, if I can ask the gentleman, since it is scheduled for \$329.5 million in reductions.

If we have learned anything from the Arab-Israeli conflict, the latest numbers that the Israelis have given us with respect to kill ratios suggest

that they dominated the skies as a result of the high technology and the weapons systems that we have sold them, principally the F-16 and the F-15.

With respect to the F-16, what is the justification for cutting that, which I consider to be one of the finest air superiority fighters built in the world? what is the justification for cutting that and not, for instance, cutting more out of the F-15?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DOWNEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. DOWNEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. STRATTON. Let me take one aircraft at a time rather than mixing them all up.

We all have our favorite types of aircraft.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know the gentleman has made reference to the F-14, obviously, not one of his favorites.

Mr. STRATTON. The fact of the matter is that we cut back what we had previously added on. We had added on 20 F-16's for the Guard and the Reserve, as I have just pointed out in the colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi, and that is what we then cut out.

We felt that because of the prior requirements of the active forces we needed to go back to the original request figure.

I might point out that under the Carter administration we were going to buy 180 a year of the F-16's. Under the Reagan administration we are now down to 120 a year. This is the number that we went back to in our reductions.

Mr. DOWNEY. Back to 120?

Mr. STRATTON. That is right.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me ask about a parochial concern and that is the F-14. Why was it that the F-14 was cut and, for instance, not the F-18, which has had severe developmental problems and other concerns, as the gentleman is well aware?

Mr. STRATTON. I thought I had indicated rather clearly in my exchange with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARKS) that I wanted to give some indication that the chairman of the Procurement Subcommittee, who was offering this amendment on his own, because as the gentleman well knows from his service on the committee that individual members are not going to be very happy to vote for reductions in weapons systems they have previously authorized. So the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT), myself, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAN DANIEL) are taking upon our shoulders the pain and suffering of the members of the committee.

We are offering the amendments ourselves.

I felt that if we were to retain everything for Grumman in our bill that the gentleman from New York would like, and that this Member from New York would like, we would be placing ourselves in an untenable position.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking for this time because I have at least one important question that I want to raise. Then I think I have an important comment to make.

Could the chairman advise me how much is cut out of the Navy, the naval appropriation?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. As I indicated in my earlier remarks, which the gentleman may not have heard, we cut some \$574.4 million from the Navy in the procurement bill, and previously the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) also with anguish in his heart, cut \$699 million by slowing down one of the very vital Trident submarines.

That adds up to the astonishing total of \$1,273,000,000, I say to my friend from Maryland.

□ 1520

I thank the gentleman for his reply.

I will now tell my colleagues what prompts this question. Bethlehem Steel shipyards, right outside of the city of Baltimore, normally employs about 3,000 people. The work force is now reduced to 700. We had a meeting with the Maryland congressional delegation and Mr. Lehman at Bethlehem Steel, and during the course of that conversation he pointed out that the shipyard had not been getting contracts for many years for many reasons but that he would look into them. Subsequent thereto, representatives of management and of the unions have approached me, and I assume that they have approached other Members of the Maryland delegation—I do not know this—saying that the word has come down that unless the entire Maryland delegation votes for the DOD authorization bill, there will be no contracts.

If there is one scintilla of truth in this, if there is the slightest minuscule element of truth in this, then this is the most despicable kind of behavior that can be found in government. We do not operate a government by extortion. We do not operate a government by blackmail. I would hope that the Armed Services Committee would look into these very, very serious allegations that are being brought to me by both management and by the unions. The allegations are that if any single Member of the Maryland delegation

fails to vote for this bill, then it is guaranteed that there would be no contracts coming to the shipyard at Bethlehem Steel.

Mr. STRATTON. Will the gentleman yield to me just so that I understand what he is saying?

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. No contract for what?

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. For shipbuilding or anything else with reference to the Navy.

Mr. STRATTON. Are there contracts that are under consideration?

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Bethlehem Steel has assiduously sought contracts and has not gotten them. The unions have made many, many, many concessions to management in order to try to get some contracts. But that is not the issue. The issue is that I am asking that you look at and investigate whether or not there is any truth to these allegations. Let me tell you why.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman can give me some names and places and dates, certainly the Investigation Subcommittee, I am sure, would be willing to look into it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I can give you the names of those representatives who came to my office this morning urging my vote, pointing out that that is what the situation is, insofar as they are concerned.

Let me tell you why I think this is so serious. It is really not a matter of the Bethlehem Steel shipyards. It is a matter of whether or not any agency of Government could use that kind of tactic to dominate the legislative process. And once that occurs, then you have put in jeopardy the democratic system under which we operate.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. HOLT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I attended the same meeting that the gentleman from Maryland attended. I heard the same statements by Secretary Lehman, and the way I heard the statement was that we had many shipyards in this country that are desperate for work and that unless we go forward with creating the 600-ship Navy, that there is not going to be enough work to go around for every shipyard.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I will recover my time because that also was what I heard; and I made it very clear that in that meeting the Secretary indicated that he would do his best to look at this situation and try to help. What I am talking about has transpired since then. I am talking about a delegation from management and union coming to my office today, saying that the word is out that if a

single Member in the delegation fails to vote favorably, then contracts for the shipyard are in jeopardy. I will give you as much information as I can.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. AuCoin). The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. All that I ask is that you look into this, because it is deadly serious.

I frankly would not care to serve any longer in the Congress of the United States if that kind of tactic can be used against the Maryland delegation, or any other State delegation. That is extortion, and it borders on blackmail.

Mrs. HOLT. If the gentleman will yield, the same delegation came to my office this morning. They were members of the AFL-CIO. And they said that they had realized that they had been pricing themselves out of the market, that unless we build these ships to defend this country, unless we build these ships to restore our Merchant Marine, that there were going to be no jobs in that area, and that they would like for us to go with the 600-ship Navy.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I will reclaim my time again, because what the gentlewoman is saying is not addressing the concern that brings me to this well. The concern is what those people told me this morning, and that is: No full compliance, no contracts. And that is no way to run a government.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman is raising an important issue here, because I think this kind of thing happens quite often in this lobbying that surrounds the defense authorization bill.

I know that, for example, when I am offering an amendment, at times the word comes back from a contractor in Wisconsin—I have no contractors in the District—but if my amendment passes, this particular contractor in Wisconsin is the one that is going to fall out of the system. Or the word will come back that if an amendment I am offering is passed, then the Guard and the Reserve will lose the money, and the funny thing is that the Guard and Reserve units that happen to be in southeastern Wisconsin will lose. It is said a lot of times, or the word gets back, or maybe it gets exaggerated as it goes down. I think that the gentleman is raising a point that happens here more often than we would like to admit, not that I think what the gentleman is saying or that the threats

that are being made are in any sense true. I do not think, in fact, that it would happen, that if, for example, the Maryland delegation were to vote unanimously against the defense budget, that in the last analysis it would affect the amount of contracts going to the shipyard the gentleman is talking about. But I think that that kind of lobbying and that kind of discussion does take place, and when the gentleman said it, it sounded awfully familiar to me.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I will refer you to an editorial that appeared in the Sunpapers in Baltimore City shortly after a visit by Mr. Lehman. The Sunpapers indicated in their editorial that this is no way to handle a difficult situation for a shipyard that is in trouble, by almost threatening no contracts if we do not get full compliance.

Mr. ASPIN. I agree with the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in January of this year the Under Secretary of Defense made a decision which has a relevance to the debate that we are entering into today. At that time the Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Carlucci, said that he had found \$3.7 billion of funds that could be used to go ahead with the procurement of the C-5B in lieu of the C-17 which had won a competition last fall to be the new modern airlifter.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if it is not true that the amount of money that we have in his amendment, I think, totals about \$872 million, almost exactly the \$860 million request for the C-5.

Now, I guess the point that I am trying to make is that there is not any \$3.7 billion of found money that can be used to finance the C-5.

We are faced here, as we were with the Navy amendment, with major cuts in vitally important programs that would not have to have been made if the Under Secretary had not overturned the decision of the Army and the Air Force, because it would not have required as much money this year to go forward with the C-17, which is the airplane which was recommended by the Army and the Air Force.

□ 1530

So I take exception to Mr. Carlucci's statement that he found money that would not impact upon the defense budget because by requesting \$862 million this year, for the C-5, we have had to cut back the F-16's by 20. We have had to cut back the F-15 ground support equipment by \$97 million, we have had to make a reduction of four C-130H's, we have had to reduce by

\$115 million the funding for the KC-135 reengining, which by the way it would improve the productivity of the C-5 by 25 percent, we have had to reduce spare parts by \$72 million, we have had to cut back on AWACS and Pods for the A-7's and \$33 million for B-52 modifications, and other amendments to make reductions in order to find room for the C-5.

So, I want to make it clear that we have paid a tremendous price on existing weapon systems and Mr. Carlucci I think was wrong on the facts when he said that he had found \$3.7 billion over the next 5 years to fund the plane.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not clear as to whether the gentleman was asking me a question or if he was simply making a statement. If it is a question I would ask him to repeat the question.

Mr. DICKS. The question is, Is it not true that we had to make cuts in vitally important programs in order to fund the C-5? In other words, if we had been going forward with the C-17, which was the recommendation of the Army and the Air Force, we would have had a lower funding profile in 1983 and thus would have been able to afford some of the programs mentioned on the list of cuts in the aircraft area.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me respond to the gentleman in this way.

First of all, I do not recall Mr. Carlucci saying anything about finding \$3.7 billion lying around.

Mr. DICKS. That is how he justified the C-5 decision. He testified before the gentleman's committee that he had found an additional \$3.5 billion.

Mr. STRATTON. I would be happy to have the gentleman cite the place in the record. I was present at all of the meetings and I do not recall—

Mr. DICKS. It was on the June 15 hearing.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me point out that the cuts that we are proposing today were not made in any desire to get any particular aircraft but simply to respond to the will of the House of Representatives, to the Congress, as a matter of fact, with respect to the budget resolution; and I might point out to the gentleman, because I have had the opportunity of hearing the gentleman's views previously, as late as last evening, that in order to pay for the 747's, we would be required to expend in present year and next year outlays \$2 billion more than would be required in the case of the C-5.

Mr. DICKS. It is very hard for me to understand that when we are talking about \$350 million in fiscal year 1983

versus \$860 million in fiscal year 1983, but we will correct the record.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Stratton amendment to cut the procurement of a variety of weapon systems.

While I will vote aye on the amendment, I find the cuts in some instances to be very curious. Equally puzzling is the weapon systems that have been insulated from any reductions. Certainly with a skyrocketing defense budget and procurement costs and our National Government's fiscal policy in disarray, this amendment is merely a feeble attempt to respond to the wrath of public opinion that demands a more equal sharing in program reductions.

Amendments by Congressmen BENNETT of Florida, STRATTON of New York, and DANIEL of Virginia really do not begin to restore equity to our budget. The fact is that the DOD budget will far exceed the rate of inflation and continue the breakneck pace of irrational spending resulting in significant additional waste for our recession plagued economy.

Adding insult to injury we note that some of these cuts enhance the risk that the American people face. For example, by reducing the Trident submarine purchase, a survivor in a nuclear conflict, and maintaining the Pershing II missile procurement, we give the distinct impression of a U.S. interest or tilt toward first strike capacity.

The symbolic cutback of two F-14's with an explanation that good faith must be demonstrated is perplexing especially in light of the extensive purchase of the outlandish F-18.

I have been a critic of the F/A-18 and remain so. This aircraft does not enhance our defense capabilities and is siphoning away limited funds from essential programs. The F/A-18, I understand, is again under review by the Navy and well it should be. Is there not any better way to meet our fighter and attack missions without the purchase of such a low performance, high cost overrun plagued program as the F/A-18?

I have maintained for the past couple of years that there is and has been such an option, to be met with irrational arguments on this floor.

Perhaps it is not too late, if only those who are having this outrageous program foisted upon them would finally speak up. If finally we would reckon with reality.

I hope that these three amendments, somewhat symbolic in substance, are the genesis for the Congress reclaiming some legislative responsibility in holding the Pentagon, as well as the contractors, accountable to the American people and the need to eliminate wasteful spending.

That would be no small feat.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. AU COIN). The question is on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 6, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

AYES—406

Addabbo	DeNardis	Hall (OH)
Anderson	Derrick	Hall, Ralph
Andrews	Derwinski	Hall, Sam
Annunzio	Dickinson	Hamilton
Anthony	Dicks	Hammerschmidt
Applegate	Dingell	Hance
Archer	Dixon	Hansen (ID)
Ashbrook	Donnelly	Hansen (UT)
Aspin	Dorgan	Harkin
Atkinson	Dornan	Hartnett
AuCoin	Dougherty	Hatcher
Badham	Dowdy	Hawkins
Bafalis	Dreier	Heckler
Balley (MO)	Duncan	Hefner
Barnard	Dunn	Heftel
Barnes	Dwyer	Hendon
Beard	Dymally	Hertel
Bedell	Dyson	Hightower
Bellenson	Early	Hiler
Benedict	Eckart	Hillis
Benjamin	Edgar	Hollenbeck
Bennett	Edwards (AL)	Holt
Bereuter	Edwards (CA)	Hopkins
Bethune	Edwards (OK)	Horton
Bevill	Emerson	Howard
Biaggi	Emery	Hoyer
Bingham	English	Hubbard
Billey	Erdahl	Huckaby
Boggs	Erlenborn	Hughes
Boland	Ertel	Hunter
Boner	Evans (DE)	Hutto
Bonior	Evans (GA)	Hyde
Bonker	Evans (IA)	Ireland
Bouquard	Evans (IN)	Jacobs
Breaux	Fary	Jeffords
Brinkley	Fascell	Jeffries
Brodhead	Fazio	Jenkins
Brooks	Fenwick	Johnston
Broomfield	Ferraro	Jones (NC)
Brown (CO)	Fiedler	Jones (OK)
Broyhill	Fields	Kastenmeier
Burgener	Findley	Kazen
Burton, Phillip	Fish	Kildee
Butler	Fithian	Kindness
Byron	Flippo	Kogovsek
Campbell	Florio	Kramer
Carman	Foglietta	LaFalce
Carney	Foley	Lagomarsino
Chapple	Ford (MI)	Lantos
Cheney	Ford (TN)	Latta
Clausen	Forsythe	Leach
Clinger	Fountain	Leath
Coats	Fowler	LeBoutillier
Coelho	Frank	Lee
Coleman	Frenzel	Lehman
Collins (IL)	Frost	Leland
Collins (TX)	Fuqua	Lent
Conable	Garcia	Levitas
Conte	Gaydos	Lewis
Conyers	Gephardt	Livingston
Corcoran	Gibbons	Loeffler
Coughlin	Gilman	Long (LA)
Courter	Gingrich	Long (MD)
Coyne, William	Ginn	Lott
Craig	Glickman	Lowery (CA)
Crane, Daniel	Goldwater	Lowry (WA)
Crane, Phillip	Gonzalez	Lujan
Crockett	Gore	Luken
D'Amours	Gradison	Lundine
Daniel, Dan	Gramm	Lingren
Daniel, R. W.	Gray	Madigan
Dannemeyer	Green	Markey
Daschle	Gregg	Marks
Daub	Grisham	Marlenee
Davis	Guarini	Mariotti
Deckard	Gunderson	Martin (IL)
Dellums	Hagedorn	Martin (NC)

Martinez	Pickle	Solarz
Matsui	Porter	Spence
Mattox	Price	St Germain
Mavroules	Pritchard	Stangeland
Mazzoli	Pursell	Stanton
McClory	Quillen	Stark
McCloskey	Rahall	Staton
McCollum	Rallsback	Stenholm
McCurdy	Rangel	Stokes
McDade	Ratchford	Stratton
McDonald	Regula	Studds
McEwen	Reuss	Stump
McGrath	Rhodes	Swift
McHugh	Richmond	Synar
McKinney	Rinaldo	Tauke
Mica	Ritter	Tauzin
Michel	Roberts (KS)	Taylor
Mikulski	Roberts (SD)	Thomas
Miller (CA)	Robinson	Traxler
Miller (OH)	Rodino	Trible
Mineta	Roe	Udall
Minish	Roemer	Vander Jagt
Mitchell (MD)	Rogers	Vento
Mitchell (NY)	Rosenthal	Volkmer
Moakley	Rostenkowski	Walgren
Molinari	Roth	Walker
Mollohan	Roukema	Wampler
Montgomery	Roybal	Washington
Moore	Rudd	Watkins
Moorhead	Russo	Waxman
Morrison	Sabo	Weaver
Mottl	Savage	Weber (MN)
Murphy	Sawyer	Weber (OH)
Murtha	Scheuer	Weiss
Myers	Schneider	White
Napier	Schroeder	Whitehurst
Natcher	Schulze	Whitley
Neal	Schumer	Whittaker
Nelligan	Seiberling	Whitten
Nelson	Sensenbrenner	Williams (MT)
Nichols	Shamansky	Williams (OH)
Nowak	Shannon	Wilson
O'Brien	Sharp	Winn
Oakar	Shaw	Wirth
Oberstar	Shelby	Wolf
Obey	Shumway	Wolpe
Ottinger	Shuster	Wortley
Oxley	Siljander	Wright
Panetta	Simon	Wyden
Parris	Skeen	Wylie
Pashayan	Skelton	Yates
Patman	Smith (AL)	Yatron
Patterson	Smith (IA)	Young (AK)
Paul	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Pease	Smith (NJ)	Young (MO)
Pepper	Smith (OR)	Zablocki
Perkins	Smith (PA)	Zerfretti
Petri	Snowe	
Peyster	Snyder	

NOES—6

Downey	Kemp	Moffett
Gejdenson	Kennelly	Santini

NOT VOTING—22

Akaka	Brown (OH)	Holland
Albosta	Burton, John	Jones (TN)
Alexander	Chappell	Martin (NY)
Bailey (PA)	Chisholm	Rose
Blanchard	Clay	Rousselot
Bolling	Coyne, James	Solomon
Bowen	de la Garza	
Brown (CA)	Goodling	

□ 1550

Mr. WILSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAN DANIEL

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAN DANIEL: Page 11, strike out line 8 and all that follows down through line 25 on page 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 301. (a) ARMY.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 in the total amount of \$16,697,100,000

for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the operation and maintenance of the Army as follows:

(1) For general purpose forces, \$6,129,145,000.

(2) For intelligence and communications, \$911,868,000.

(3) For central supply and maintenance, \$4,906,339,000.

(4) For training, medical, and other general personnel activities, \$3,587,108,000.

(5) For administration, \$1,039,204,000.

(6) For support of other nations, \$123,436,000.

(b) NAVY.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 in the total amount of \$21,545,000,000 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps as follows:

(1) For strategic forces, \$1,775,212,000.

(2) For general purpose forces, \$10,604,659,000.

(3) For intelligence and communications, \$930,902,000.

(4) For central supply and maintenance, \$5,942,966,000.

(5) For training, medical, and other general personnel activities, \$1,806,858,000.

(6) For administration, \$484,208,000.

(7) For support of other nations, \$195,000.

(c) MARINE CORPS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 in the total amount of \$1,481,500,000 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps as follows:

(1) For general purpose forces, \$864,292,000.

(2) For central supply and maintenance, \$359,561,000.

(3) For training, medical, and other general personnel activities, \$186,669,000.

(4) For administration, \$70,978,000.

(d) AIR FORCE.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 in the total amount of \$17,278,100,000 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force as follows:

(1) For strategic forces, \$3,085,928,000.

(2) For general purpose forces, \$3,745,598,000.

(3) For intelligence and communications, \$1,418,292,000.

(4) For airlift and sealift, \$1,205,813,000.

(5) For central supply and maintenance, \$5,458,958,000.

(6) For training, medical, and other general personnel activities, \$1,968,882,000.

(7) For administration, \$387,822,000.

(8) For support of other nations, \$6,807,000.

(e) DEFENSE AGENCIES.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 in the total amount of \$5,673,640,000 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) as follows:

(1) For general purpose forces, \$343,208,000.

(2) For intelligence and communications, \$1,903,274,000.

(3) For central supply and maintenance, \$1,377,576,000.

(4) For training, medical, and other general personnel activities, \$1,699,005,000.

(5) For administration, \$350,577,000.

Mr. DAN DANIEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be con-

sidered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Mr. WHITEHURST and myself, I am offering an amendment to title III that would reduce the Department of Defense fiscal year operation and maintenance (O. & M.) authorization \$398.5 million below the amount earlier approved by the Armed Services Committee and \$1.5 billion below the President's request.

Yesterday I cautioned against further reductions in O. & M. that were not accompanied by a careful rebalancing of procurement, manpower, and O. & M. requirements. However, in view of the amendments offered by Mr. STRATTON and Mrs. HOLT and Mr. BENNETT and Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. NICHOLS' forthcoming recommendations on further military personnel savings, Mr. WHITEHURST and I believe that additional O. & M. cuts are possible. The Daniel-Whitehurst amendment represents a fair and proportional share of this balanced approach to bring H.R. 6030 in line with the budget resolution enacted by Congress.

Briefly, the reductions contained in the Daniel-Whitehurst amendment fall into two categories. The first is force structure reductions and delayed unit activations totaling \$337.9 million. The bulk of the force structure changes are adjustments in timing. They reflect service preferences on how to absorb additional cuts in O. & M. I believe strongly that it is better to have a slightly smaller force that is ready, than to allow overall force readiness to suffer.

The remaining reductions involve revised economic assumptions, \$9.9 million; additional cutbacks in recruiting and advertising in view of the continuing success by all services to meet and exceed accession goals, \$30.1 million; and other minor programmatic cuts, \$20.6 million.

In sum, the Daniel-Whitehurst amendment offers the best way of making further reductions in O. & M. that will have the least impact on readiness, or the quality of life of our military personnel and their families yet provide the Department of Defense the greatest possible latitude in absorbing these cuts. This amendment is an integral part of a comprehensive effort to make responsible adjustments in H.R. 6030 in the face of extraordinary economic conditions and budgetary realities.

It is with some misgivings that I ask your support of this amendment.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Virginia and for which I am a cosponsor. As he has so ably pointed out, the amendment represents a responsible and responsive approach to further reductions in the defense authorization bill now under consideration.

It is responsible because it clearly reflects priorities acceptable to the Department of Defense and the great majority in the Congress. At the expense of minor alterations in force structure, the amendment preserves readiness increases and sustains the momentum generated by increased congressional support of O. & M. over the past 2 years. It is also responsible because it does not touch "people programs" or committee quality-of-life initiatives. Despite the considerable pressure to effect further reductions in O. & M., Mr. DANIEL and I were in full agreement that we would not support any additional cuts that would sacrifice readiness or the well-being of our service personnel and their families.

The amendment is responsible because it recognizes existing budgetary realities and the requirement to align H.R. 6030 with the budget resolution recently enacted. It further recognizes that Secretary Weinberger has already identified some \$340 million of the reductions contained in the amendment in previous congressional testimony. As these have been identified as potential cuts, their survival during the remainder of the authorization/appropriation process is problematical at best.

In closing, I want to emphasize that the amendment has been crafted to be a responsible and bipartisan effort within an overall approach to balanced reductions in the fiscal year 1983 defense request. These O. & M. reductions have been examined carefully to insure that readiness and "people programs" remain intact.

I join with Mr. DANIEL in urging your support.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAN DANIEL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 386, noes 19, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—386

Addabbo	Anthony	Atkinson
Alexander	Applegate	AuCoin
Anderson	Archer	Badham
Andrews	Ashbrook	Bafalis
Annunzio	Aspin	Bailey (MO)

Barnard	Fascell	Lewis
Barnes	Fazio	Livingston
Beard	Fenwick	Loeffler
Bedell	Ferraro	Long (LA)
Beilenson	Fiedler	Long (MD)
Benedict	Fields	Lott
Benjamin	Findley	Lowery (CA)
Bennett	Fish	Lowry (WA)
Bereuter	Fithian	Lundine
Bethune	Flippo	Lungren
Bevill	Florio	Madigan
Biaggi	Foglietta	Markey
Bingham	Foley	Marks
Billey	Ford (TN)	Marlenee
Boggs	Forsythe	Marriott
Boland	Fountain	Martin (IL)
Boner	Frank	Martin (NC)
Bonior	Frenzel	Martinez
Bonker	Frost	Matsui
Bouquard	Fruqua	Mattox
Breaux	Garcia	Mavroules
Brinkley	Gaydos	Mazzoli
Brodhead	Gephardt	McClary
Brooks	Gibbons	McCloskey
Broomfield	Gilman	McCollum
Brown (CO)	Gingrich	McCurdy
Broyhill	Ginn	McDade
Burgener	Glickman	McDonald
Burton, Phillip	Goldwater	McEwen
Butler	Gonzalez	McGrath
Byron	Goodling	McHugh
Campbell	Gore	McKinney
Carman	Gradison	Mica
Carney	Gramm	Michel
Chappie	Gray	Mikulski
Cheney	Gregg	Miller (CA)
Clausen	Grisham	Miller (OH)
Clinger	Guarini	Minish
Coats	Gundersen	Mitchell (MD)
Coelho	Hagedorn	Mitchell (NY)
Coleman	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Collins (IL)	Hall, Ralph	Mollinari
Collins (TX)	Hall, Sam	Montgomery
Conable	Hamilton	Moore
Conte	Hammerschmidt	Moorhead
Conyers	Hance	Morrison
Corcoran	Hansen (ID)	Mottl
Coughlin	Hansen (UT)	Murphy
Courter	Harkin	Murtha
Coyne, William	Hartnett	Myers
Craig	Hatcher	Napier
Crane, Daniel	Hawkins	Natcher
Crane, Phillip	Heckler	Neal
Crockett	Hefner	Nelligan
D'Amours	Hendon	Nelson
Daniel, Dan	Hightower	Nichols
Daniel, R. W.	Hiler	Nowak
Dannemeyer	Hillis	O'Brien
Daschle	Holland	Oakar
Daub	Hollenbeck	Ottinger
Davis	Holt	Oxley
DeKard	Hopkins	Panetta
Dellums	Howard	Pashayan
DeNardis	Hoyer	Patman
Derrick	Hubbard	Patterson
Derwinski	Huckaby	Paul
Dickinson	Hughes	Pease
Dicks	Hunter	Pepper
Dixon	Hutto	Perkins
Donnelly	Hyde	Petri
Dorgan	Ireland	Pickle
Dornan	Jacobs	Porter
Dougherty	Jeffords	Price
Dowdy	Jeffries	Pritchard
Downey	Jenkins	Pursell
Dreier	Johnston	Quillen
Duncan	Jones (NC)	Rahall
Dunn	Jones (OK)	Rallsback
Dwyer	Kastenmeier	Rangel
Dymally	Kazen	Ratchford
Dyson	Kennelly	Regula
Early	Kildee	Reuss
Edgar	Kindness	Rhodes
Edwards (AL)	Kogovsek	Richmond
Edwards (CA)	Kramer	Rinaldo
Edwards (OK)	LaFalce	Ritter
Emerson	Lagomarsino	Roberts (KS)
Emery	Lantos	Roberts (SD)
English	Latta	Robinson
Erdahl	Leach	Rodino
Erlenborn	Leath	Roe
Ertel	LeBoutillier	Roemer
Evans (DE)	Lee	Rogers
Evans (GA)	Lehman	Rosenthal
Evans (IN)	Leland	Rostenkowski
Fary	Levitas	Roth

Roukema	Smith (PA)	Watkins
Roybal	Snowe	Waxman
Rudd	Snyder	Weaver
Russo	Solarz	Weber (MN)
Santini	Spence	Weber (OH)
Savage	St Germain	Weiss
Sawyer	Stangeland	White
Scheuer	Staton	Whitehurst
Schneider	Stenholm	Whitley
Schulze	Stokes	Whittaker
Schumer	Stratton	Whitten
Seiberling	Stump	Williams (MT)
Sensenbrenner	Swift	Williams (OH)
Shamansky	Synar	Wilson
Shannon	Tauke	Winn
Sharp	Tauzin	Wolf
Shaw	Taylor	Wolpe
Shelby	Thomas	Wolter
Shumway	Traxler	Wright
Shuster	Tribble	Wyden
Siljander	Udall	Wylie
Skeen	Vander Jagt	Yatron
Skelton	Vento	Young (AK)
Smith (AL)	Volkmer	Young (FL)
Smith (IA)	Walgren	Young (MO)
Smith (NE)	Walker	Zablocki
Smith (NJ)	Wampler	Zeftertti
Smith (OR)	Washington	

NOES—19

Dingell	Hertel	Schroeder
Eckart	Kemp	Simon
Evans (IA)	Mineta	Stark
Ford (MI)	Moffett	Studds
Fowler	Oberstar	Wirth
Gejdenson	Obey	
Green	Sabo	

NOT VOTING—29

Akaka	Chisholm	Martin (NY)
Albosta	Clay	Mollohan
Bailey (PA)	Coyne, James	Parris
Blanchard	de la Garza	Peyster
Bolling	Hefelt	Rose
Bowen	Horton	Rousselot
Brown (CA)	Jones (TN)	Solomon
Brown (OH)	Lent	Stanton
Burton, John	Lujan	Yates
Chappell	Luken	

□ 1610

Messrs. SABO, WIRTH, GREEN, and SIMON changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 525, further amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are in order as if the substitute as so perfected were the original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. It is in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute to said substitute consisting of the text of the bill, H.R. 6696, by, and if offered by, Congressman DELLUMS.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DELLUMS. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1983".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purposes of this Act are—

- (1) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1983 at levels consistent with a strong national defense and a sound national economy;
- (2) to minimize the risk of nuclear confrontation;
- (3) to eliminate areas of waste and abuse in the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1983;
- (4) to provide for improved military personnel policies designed to enhance readiness and morale; and
- (5) to make other improvements in the management of the Department of Defense.

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for the military functions of the Department of Defense for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, other weapons, ammunition, and other procurement in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: for the Army, \$1,682,200,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, \$6,250,000,000; for the Air Force, \$8,177,850,000.

MISSILES

For missiles: for the Army, \$655,443,000; for the Navy, \$1,854,180,000; for the Marine Corps, \$246,959,000; for the Air Force, \$3,210,900,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: for the Navy, \$3,397,700,000.

TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES

For tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, \$2,050,350,000; for the Marine Corps, \$325,409,000.

TORPEDOES

For torpedoes and related support equipment: for the Navy, \$499,964,000.

OTHER WEAPONS

For other weapons: for the Army, \$234,400,000; for the Navy, \$167,800,000; for the Marine Corps \$157,477,000.

AMMUNITION

For ammunition: the Army, \$2,375,100,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT

For other procurement: for the Army, \$3,673,445,000; for the Navy, \$3,573,180,000; for the Air Force, \$5,260,700,000; for the Marine Corps, \$1,246,887,000.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

For capital equipment for the defense agencies: \$539,632,000.

(b) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this section for aircraft for the Air Force, the sum of \$186,100,000 is available only for contribution by the United States as its share of the cost for fiscal year 1983 of acquisition by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS).

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 102. Effective on October 1, 1982, section 103(a) of the Department of Defense

Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100), is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1982" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1983".

PROHIBITION OF ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN WEAPON SYSTEMS

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 101 may be obligated or expended for the MX missile program, the B-1B bomber program, the CVN nuclear aircraft carrier program, the Pershing II missile program, the Tomahawk sealunched cruise missile program, or the ground-launched cruise missile program.

PROHIBITION OF ACQUISITION OF BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 101 may be obligated or expended to purchase binary chemical weapons.

PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS

SEC. 105. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 101 may be obligated or expended for the construction or conversion of a naval vessel, or a major component of the hull or superstructure of a naval vessel, in a foreign shipyard.

PROHIBITION OF ACQUISITION OF 9-MILLIMETER HANDGUN

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this Act may be obligated or expended in connection with the purchase of a 9-millimeter handgun for the Armed Forces or to carry out any activity concerned with evaluating the feasibility or desirability of purchasing a 9-millimeter handgun for the Armed Forces.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for the military functions of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation in the amount of \$18,200,000,000.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 such additional sums as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in such subsection.

PROHIBITION OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION OF CERTAIN WEAPON SYSTEMS

SEC. 202. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 201 may be obligated or expended for the MX missile program, the B-1B bomber program, the Trident II missile program, the Pershing II missile program, or the ballistic missile defense program.

PROHIBITION OF DEVELOPMENT OF BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 201 may be obligated or expended for research, development, test, or evaluation of binary chemical weapons.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for the military functions of the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance in the amount of \$62,267,000,000.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 such additional sums as may be necessary (1) for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in such subsection, and (2) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs and for increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a).

ELIMINATION OF NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

SEC. 302. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 301 may be obligated or expended for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice.

TITLE IV—ACTIVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS

SEC. 401. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1983, as follows:

- (1) The Army, 751,285.
- (2) The Navy, 541,050.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 152,495.
- (4) The Air Force, 565,845.

TITLE V—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF AVERAGE STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 501. (a) For fiscal year 1983, the Selected Reserve of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programed to attain average strengths of not less than the following:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 398,016.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 351,849.
- (3) The Naval Reserve, 94,000.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 38,540.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 100,100.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 63,736.
- (7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 10,700.

(b) The average strength prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any Reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such Reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES

SEC. 502. (a) Within the average strengths prescribed in section 501, the Reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1983, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the Reserve components:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 11,782.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 6,474.
- (3) The Naval Reserve, 214.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 460.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 3,411.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 479.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 per centum of the total of the end strength prescribed.

TITLE VI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH

SEC. 601. (a) The Department of Defense is authorized 813,313 permanent positions for civilian employment as of September 30, 1983, of which no more than 31 shall be in the Executive Schedule, as provided in sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, of which no more than 1,415 shall be in the Senior Executive Service, as established in section 3131 of such title, and of which no more than 56,000 shall be at Grade GS-13 (or comparable level) or higher.

(b) The positions authorized in subsection (a) shall be apportioned among the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy (including the Marine Corps), the Department of the Air Force, and the agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) in such numbers as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress within sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the manner in which the initial allocation of such positions is made among the military departments and the agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) and shall include the rationale for each allocation.

(c) In computing the strength for civilian personnel, there shall be included all direct-hire and indirect-hire civilian personnel employed to perform military functions administered by the Department of Defense (other than those performed by the National Security Agency) whether employed on a full-time, part-time, or intermittent basis, but excluding special employment categories for students and disadvantaged youth such as the stay-in-school campaign, the temporary summer aid program and the Federal junior fellowship program and personnel participating in the worker-trainee opportunity program. Personnel employed under a part-time career employment program established by section 3402 of title 5, United States Code, shall be counted as prescribed by section 3404 of that title. Whenever a function, power, or duty, or activity is transferred or assigned to a department or agency of the Department of Defense from a department or agency outside of the Department of Defense, or from another department or agency within the Department of Defense, the civilian personnel end strength authorized for such departments

or agencies of the Department of Defense affected shall be adjusted to reflect any increases or decreases in civilian personnel required as a result of such transfer or assignment.

TITLE VII—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 701. (a) For fiscal year 1983, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as follows:

- (1) The Army, 57,996.
- (2) The Navy, 65,133.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 18,311.
- (4) The Air Force, 46,389.
- (5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 7,467.
- (6) The Army Reserve, 8,456.
- (7) The Naval Reserve, 1,041.
- (8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,835.
- (9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 2,377.
- (10) The Air Force Reserve, 1,405.

(b) In addition to the number authorized in subsection (a), the following components of the Armed Forces are authorized a military training student load to be utilized solely for one station unit training of not less than the following:

- (1) The Army, 17,732.
- (2) The Army National Guard of the United States, 7,070.
- (3) The Army Reserve, 2,374.

(c) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the Reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1983 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles IV and V of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the Reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

TITLE VIII—CIVIL DEFENSE

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 801. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 to carry out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.) the sum of \$136,095,000.

PROHIBITION OF CRISIS RELOCATION PLANNING

SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 801 may be obligated or expended for planning for population relocation in time of crisis.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

REPORT ON EFFECT OF DEFENSE SPENDING ON ECONOMIC GROWTH

SEC. 901. Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to Congress a report on the effect of the current and projected levels of defense spending on the economy, including the effect on rates of growth in the economy, the rate of inflation, interest rates, and the availability of capital for private productivity enhancement investment.

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, before the consider-

ation of amendments, the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Rules Committee made in order H.R. 6696, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Armed Services Committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, back on January 29 of this year, as I have indicated earlier on the floor, I sent the chairperson of the Armed Services Committee a communication suggesting that we expand the parameters of the discussion in the debate in the Armed Services Committee in light of the fact that this administration has proposed a military budget in excess of \$1.6 trillion in the first 5 years of the decade of the 1980's, and with the fact that millions of American people and millions of people around the world are raising significant questions with respect to our locked-step effort toward thermal nuclear war, I felt that we had a profound obligation to go beyond the parameters of the Armed Services Committee to hear from other witnesses who had a positive and constructive alternative to our present military policies in this country and around the world.

The Chair sent back a polite letter indicating that for a number of bureaucratic reasons they had an obligation to go forward with the military budget. I understood that and responded to the Chair by indicating that it was my belief that it is a moral imperative that we establish a platform to provide an opportunity for brilliant minds to come together to pose an alternative to America's present military and nuclear policy.

Therefore, in April of this year we held 6 days of hearings to look at the full implications of the military budget. We looked at the national security and foreign policy implications of the military budget, the tactical and strategic implications of the military budget, and arms escalation versus arms control. We looked at the economic implications and the moral implications of the military budget, we looked at the economic implications of America's global arms sales, and finally we looked at citizen responsibility in ending the absurdity and the insanity of our nuclear arms race and our rapidly escalating military budget.

Mr. Chairman, a number of brilliant witnesses came to Washington from all around the country to testify at these hearings. I would like briefly to give a few highlights that a number of the witnesses presented during those hearings in April.

The first witness was former Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, former Chairperson of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from 1959 to 1975. Senator Fulbright led off the hearings. He stated as follows, and I quote:

This budget, together with the propaganda to sell it to the public and the Congress, has the effect of shifting the focus of our policy from that of deterrence of nuclear war to the waging and the winning of a nuclear war.

Further quoting, he said:

This military budget is so large and the emphasis upon nuclear weapons so strong, and the rhetoric about the Soviet threat is so extreme, that one cannot resist the feeling that we are preparing to fight and win a nuclear war. . . . I believe if this is the case, that it is a dangerous game, and could easily get out of control and lead to a disaster. It is not only dangerous, it is costly and it threatens the stability and the soundness of our domestic economy. . . .

Mr. Paul Warnke, former Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified as follows:

There is no basis in fact for the assertion that the Soviet Union has strategic nuclear superiority. We lead in strategic warheads. Again, it really doesn't matter, but we have a lead. We also lead, when it comes to survivable forces.

Mr. Paul Warnke, former Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

There is no credible scenario in which we and the Soviet Union could fight a nuclear war and have either one of us be declared the winner. Either one of us might come out somewhat better than the other, but we would be worse off than Uganda or Bangladesh. We would no longer be recognized as superpowers. In fact, the question is, would we be recognizable as a national entity.

Ms. Randy Forsberg, president and executive director of the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies:

Pulling the nuclear tripwire ever tighter by improving first strike capabilities is extremely risky and dangerous. If we continue to make nuclear escalation in a first strike format easier and more likely, then, in a crisis, it will become inevitable. Clearly the stakes in the Third World are not worth the risk to the whole of humanity. . . .

What is the extraordinary is the hubris, the arrogance, the almost criminal carelessness of the men who pursue this policy in their confidence that they can play nuclear chicken forever without ever losing control of the situation once.

Dr. Paul F. Walker, charter member of the Boston Study Group, and coauthor of "The Price of Defense":

The Defense Department states boldly that this naval plan is based on the determination "to restore and maintain maritime superiority over the Soviets in order to wage several wars worldwide against the Soviet military empire".

Such planning is based on several false assumptions: one, that we have somehow lost naval supremacy; two, that overwhelming maritime superiority enhances national security; and three, that aircraft carriers around which the current fleet is designed continue to be the most effective way to build and deploy navies. . . .

We can continue to fulfill our real national security goals with a no growth Navy, maintaining approximately a 400-ship fleet. By escalating to the proposed 640-ship fleet, I suggest we will undermine security in the following ways: the heavy expense will be damaging economically, although, of course, keeping shipyards at peak capacity, the fleet will all the more portray a Pax Americana-type military and political image abroad—something I think we can ill-afford today—and a widespread interventional force I would argue, may very well encourage U.S. interventions in the Third World.

Mr. William P. Winpisinger, president of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM):

The economic consequences of buying more weapons will be substantial. Job, investment and economic growth absolutely will be sacrificed. Technological progress will be distorted and social programs aimed at decreasing human suffering will be cut."

Bishop Walter F. Sullivan, Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Richmond, Va.:

Are we really secure as a Nation if, because of our defense spending, the most defenseless of our own are made to suffer? . . . When resources are transferred from welfare to warfare, our country casts aside millions of people who have a right to share in this Nation's blessings. What message do we give to the world when we opt for the privileged at the expense of the powerless?

□ 1620

Mr. Chairman, after these hearings we then assembled a number of witnesses, military analysts, budget analysts, in a number of working sessions to help us discuss the policy considerations upon which we could develop an enlightened and intelligent and responsible military budget.

We engaged in a number of discussions but first we looked at the proposal of the House Armed Services Committee and the administration of this country.

We raised a number of arguments against the proposal presented by the President and by the committee.

No. 1, regarding national security and foreign policy, this budget is based on incorrect policy assumptions, faulty analysis and improper budget priorities.

It is also internally inconsistent in military, political and economic terms.

No. 2, unlimited military buildup does not increase national security. It may in fact lessen it because of the uncontrollable aspects of new weapons technology.

No. 3, true national security can be obtained and preserved through an efficient defense establishment, complemented by serious arms control and disarmament initiatives.

No. 4, we face a greater danger from the internal disruption of the national economy through an unwarranted arms buildup than from any foreign foe, real or imagined.

This budget offers a constructive alternative, Mr. Chairman, based on the true elements of national security which I would submit include the following:

A noninterventional foreign and military policy, a doctrine of sufficiency rather than superiority, which in a nuclear age is a contradiction in terms.

The whole notion of superiority is a fleeting concept that in my estimation has no intellectual, political, or military substance to it.

Three, it preserves sufficient deterrence in both nuclear and conventional forces on land, sea, and in the air.

It is a first step, Mr. Chairman, toward mutual, balanced force reductions. It is not a move to unilateral disarmament.

As to some of the policy considerations in establishing this budget, we first said we have a profound obligation to ourselves and future generations to reduce, if not remove the risk of nuclear war.

We agreed that it was our responsibility, and in order to do that we challenged the weapons that we referred to as crisis destabilizing weaponry.

We believe that weapons that we referred to as crisis destabilizing are weapons that make the world more dangerous, that bring greater insecurity rather than security, and weapons that provide the basis for the Soviet Union to put their weapons in a launch on warning capacity because our weapons become so powerful that we thwart the Soviets' capacity to establish a credible deterrence.

First strike, hard target, time urgent weapons are the weapons we chose to challenge in this category.

The MX missile, Mr. Chairman, is a crisis destabilizing weapon. It is one of the most accurate, powerful weapons that has ever been devised.

I have asked this question on a number of occasions. Why do we want to build a new and powerful weapon to put it in the ground? To absorb the Soviet strike?

The Soviet and the rational answer is no, we have this weapon or we want this weapon because it gives us a first strike capability, in my estimation, bringing destabilization and insecurity to the world.

The Trident II missile is a hard target, time urgent, first strike weapon. It is highly accurate. It is a very powerful weapon.

Why do we want this weapon? For the purposes of deterrence? No. For the purposes of first strike.

Mr. Chairman, the cruise missile, the sea-launched cruise missile and ground-launched cruise missile are very dangerous because they begin to defy verifiability. Remember, the basis upon which we have established an arms control environment is based on

the notion that we can verify an agreement.

I would suggest that cruise missiles begin to defy verifiability. You can place a cruise missile virtually anywhere, land, sea, and in the air.

If we are committed to verifiability, then why are we going forward with technology that in many ways defies accountability and defies verifiability?

Mr. Chairman, the Pershing II missile that the President proposes to deploy in Europe is a crisis destabilizing weapon. This is a cheap way to buy an ICBM and place it in Western Europe 4 to 6 minutes from the Soviet Union.

How do my colleagues believe the Soviet Union will react when there are nuclear weapons between 4 and 6 minutes from them providing the capacity to create great danger?

Remember, this Nation, the United States, was prepared to risk thermonuclear war because of missiles in Cuba. What makes us believe that the Soviets will respond to the Pershing II missile deployment in West Germany in some peaceful way?

This is a provocative thing.

I defy any mind on the floor of this Congress to be able to make an intelligent and rational decision based upon the deployment of a weapon that may strike or a weapon that can strike the Soviet Union in between 4 to 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the B-1 bomber and the last Trident submarine in this bill are unnecessary and wasteful weapons. The B-1 bomber is a political weapon. There is no military value.

□ 1630

By the time we develop 100 B-1 bombers at an approximate cost of between \$30 billion and \$40 billion, it will be an irrelevant weapon. Some have said that maybe in a thermonuclear war the safest place to be is in a B-1 bomber because by the time the bomber gets there, the whole thing is over anyway. This is an irrelevant weapon. A manned penetrating bomber in the 1980's, given the incredible level of our technology, is an absurdity and a waste, particularly at a time when we are forcing millions of American people to pay desperately in this country as we build this massive monument to military madness.

Mr. Chairman, when we threaten the Soviet deterrence, we force their defense to become offensive. When they perceive their deterrence to be threatened, then they begin to place their weapons in a launch-on-warning mode. That is an insane thing to happen, and it would seem to me that all of us in this Congress should work diligently not to put ourselves or the world in the position where these kinds of crisis destabilizing situations can occur.

Mr. Chairman, the only role of nuclear weapons in our lives is for deter-

rence. In that regard, I make two comments. As I have said on a number of occasions on this floor, when McNamara was Secretary of Defense, he defined deterrence as when you develop a nuclear capacity to destroy 30 percent of another nation's population and 70 percent of their economic infrastructure. We achieve that when we develop 400 nuclear weapons. We have 10,000 strategic nuclear weapons, to say nothing of the 15,000 or more nuclear weapons that have the capacity to wreak great havoc upon the world.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we are far beyond deterrence at this moment. This bill proposes to fight to survive and win a nuclear war. I would suggest that anyone believing that we can fight, survive, and win a nuclear war is living in a never-never-land. This is a very frightening and a very dangerous thought.

I would again like to quote Lord Mountbatten, who made the statement in 1979, after a long military career. He said, "I have come to the conclusion that nuclear weapons cannot be used in war, and any person who believes that we can use nuclear weapons in the same way we can use rifles and tanks are committed to a day gone by, and that what imperils life on the face of this Earth is in the illusion that in some way we can use these weapons."

I believe that that was a magnificent statement, suggesting that the only role for nuclear weapons in our lives is not the insanity of using them, but to deter nuclear war. We are far beyond the capacity to deter. The danger in this bill is twofold. No. 1, we are talking about going beyond deterrence to a war-fighting capability, which is a major policy shift in this country and, No. 2, we are developing weapon technology that goes beyond our ability to verify, when verifiability has been at the cornerstone of all of our arms control negotiations.

But these are the sexy, big ticket items, the B-1, the Pershing, the Trident, the MX. But if you want to significantly reduce the military budget, if you really want to bring cost savings, it is not just these big ticket items. Nuclear weapons and forces comprise less than 20 percent of our total budget authority. Seventy-nine percent of our budget authority is in land divisions, tactical airwings, surface Navy units, and airlifts; \$204 billion, 79 percent, of our total budget. So if you want to make cuts, then we have got to move beyond the nuclear arsenal and look also at the conventional arsenal. The real budget must come in conventional force and personnel systems. To do so requires a rethinking of America's role in the world regarding our NATO alliance system, Third World interventionism, forced projections in the Pacific Ocean, what constitutes proper and adequate Amer-

ican conventional force systems, and policy. The remainder that any conventional force, Mr. Chairman, in confrontation between the superpowers or their alliance surrogates would almost automatically escalate the theater nuclear war exchanges, and ultimately strategic nuclear war, is something that ought to cause us to begin to rethink the nature of our role in the world.

Escalation of nuclear weaponry further escalates the arms race throughout the Third World, thereby increasing the possibility of superpower intervention directly or indirectly. The drain on resources and brainpower further threatens the domestic economic situation here at home.

With respect to conventional forces, what is a defense budget? It has the purpose of amassing dollars to buy forces. Forces are related to missions. Missions are related to regions of the world. Therefore, we ought to look at the various regions of the world, look at the missions, to determine whether our troop deployment around the world is appropriate. We cannot cut the budget without reducing conventional forces significantly. This means, as I said earlier, a rethinking of our commitment.

With respect to NATO, over 50 percent of our defense budget, \$130 billion, is committed to our involvement in NATO. I raise two questions: How much for NATO? Is this enough, or is this too much? And who should pay? Why is it that NATO countries are paying a disproportionately lower amount than us? Is it because their perception of the threat is less significant than ours? I would suggest that they have a responsibility to pay, and if their perceptions are not as threatening as ours, then maybe that says something about the nature of our perceptions.

With respect to Asia, we spend \$40 billion per annum. Why? To defend dictatorships in the Philippines and in Korea? This needs to be rethought. How can you justify this to American people?

Mr. Chairman, 500,000 troops are outside the United States acting as tripwires, and there is a potential of involving us in Third World adventurism. If anyone on this floor thinks that these troops in some way are going to engage in some long-term, massive confrontation with the Soviet Union, they are living in an absurd world. These troops are there, providing the basis for our involvement in Third World countries, and I think that is dangerous.

With respect to our surface Navy, I make the following comments: The surface Navy will not function in a nuclear war environment. In a nuclear war environment this surface Navy is the first thing that goes out. There

will be no major Soviet-United States naval confrontation. If it is, these ships are going right out of the water in a nuclear bomb blast. The fleet should not be shaped for United States-Soviet conflicts. This is the absurdity of this present approach. This is one of the faulty assumptions upon which we rest our case to build a 640-ship surface Navy. It is too large for any other mission. We should wean the Navy from its reliance on aircraft carriers. We build an aircraft carrier, then we have to have more planes to protect it, more ships to protect it, more ships to protect them. If we get away from aircraft carriers and begin to apply our presence in the ocean with small, much cheaper submarines, we do not have to spend these billions of dollars in this large surface Navy.

With respect to our rapid deployment force, our rapid deployment force speaks to an interventionist policy. Why do we need 30,000 troops able to make a response somewhere in the world? If the response is significant, 30,000 troops are not going to do anything. Thirty thousand troops only brings us closer to war. If it is 30,000 troops, why do we not use the Marine Corps? That was their function in the first place. But a rapid deployment force, Mr. Chairman, is interventionist for use in the Third World, and I think that is dangerous and a serious mistake. Its limited size would not allow us to bring stabilization and, as I said earlier, the Marine Corps can more than adequately address that problem.

With respect to civil defense, the crisis relocation program, in my estimation, is absurd for a variety of reasons. We can discuss that further in this debate.

With respect to the economic arguments, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, it takes money away from other spending. As I said earlier, when I first came to Congress in 1971, our military budget was below \$80 billion. This year it is 250-some-odd billion dollars. By the end of this decade it is conceivable that it could exceed \$500 billion.

Many people suggest that we are going to spend somewhere in the neighborhood of \$4 trillion to \$4.5 trillion in the 10 years of the 1980's. It destroys the civilian economy. Seymour Melman called it "looting the means of production." It has an inflationary impact. It means that more money is chasing no increase in goods, totally nonproductive. Where will the money go, and from whence will it come? New taxes? No. New deficits? No. We will continue to cut social programs to fan the flames of this budget.

The job argument is false. Many more jobs per dollar are spent when we spend money in the civilian sector of our economy.

I will, finally, with respect to the economic arguments, end with a quote from Prof. Seymour Melman:

The viability of the United States as an industrial society is threatened by the concentration of capital in a fund that yields no product useful for consumption or further production. A nation with a crumbling infrastructure, skyrocketing unemployment, increasing poverty and declining economy can ill-afford the cost of such a massive military buildup. The nation's security and strength are not defined only through military power but also through the vitality of our domestic economy and society.

Mr. Chairman, in the remaining few moments, we have offered a bill that we have worked diligently upon. We tried to bring the most capable minds that we could around this country to look at our alternative approach. I recognize significantly that this is a minority point of view, but at one time America's involvement in Vietnam was challenged by the minority point of view. Finally, the majority of people in this Congress saw the insanity and the absurdity and the cruelty of continued prosecution of the Vietnam war. The American people are beginning to awaken to the trade-off of big military budgets against their lives, escalating lockstep toward nuclear war, finding it frightening, registering and potentially drafting their children, and they are raising significant questions. America is on the threshold of transition, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that we begin to look at a positive and constructive alternative to this present approach that I perceive to be a recipe for ultimate disaster. If we are going to survive in this country and in the world, let us move beyond confrontation to negotiation, let us move beyond nuclear weapons and war to peace in this country and peace in the world. That is the greatest security that we can bring.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1640

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. Holt), representing the minority of the committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister V. V. Kuznetsov agreed in 1962 to remove Soviet missiles and bombers from Cuba, but warned: "Never will we be caught like this again." There are those who believe that in the close Moscow circles, nuclear war is unthinkable only if it is unwinnable.

It can be argued that an American failure to develop and maintain a deterrent capability to convince the occupants of the Kremlin that a nuclear war is unwinnable might provide the Soviets with an incentive that nuclear

war is, in fact, thinkable. The Congress, therefore, must resist the call for massive defense reductions, abandonment of major strategic systems, and freezing of our present developments that lead the Soviet leaders to think about the unthinkable.

Winston Churchill wrote of the events that led to World War II, "multitudes remained plunged in ignorance" about the Nazi threat while most Western leaders "did not dare to un deceive them." We cannot engage in self-deception, as the statistics on the Soviet military buildup are available to any member. Playing semantics about the Kremlin's military might and intentions are counter to the responsibility that our fellow citizens have entrusted in us. For some years, our intelligence experts have warned the Congress in the gravest tones that the "window of vulnerability" for the United States would be wide open in the mideighties. Their dismal predictions have unfortunately come to fruition and the temptation for the Soviet Union to exploit its vast military power is more than just slight.

We, in the Congress, have received intelligence that clearly shows that the Soviet margin of military superiority is substantial and continuing unabated to grow. This military buildup could lead to a mind-set that increases the incentives for the Soviet leadership to launch the first strike against the United States. The Soviets have increased the hardness of their missile silos, diminishing their vulnerability to existing U.S. ICBM warheads; and MIRV'ing has increased the number of Soviet warheads which would survive a nuclear attack. More than half of the 1,398 Soviet ICBM launchers have been rebuilt to house ICBM's in vastly more survivable, hardened silos. These weapons, all of which are MIRV'd, are in the forefront of ICBM technology and certain versions of the SS-18 and SS-19 are among the most accurate ICBM's operational anywhere. Together, these systems have the capability to destroy a large percentage of the U.S. ICBM force, using only part of their total numbers. In the last 10 years, the Soviets have introduced an unprecedented array of new strategic systems into their arsenal, including the SS-17, SS-18, and SS-19 ICBM's, the Backfire bomber, the Typhoon submarine, and several new types of submarine-launched missiles, and the SS-20 intermediate range missile. The United States, on the other hand, exercised restraint and introduced only the Trident submarine and the cruise missile.

During the past decade, the Soviet Union has built up its forces across the board. During the same period, the U.S. defense expenditures declined in real terms. This year, the Armed Services Committee has taken steps to

assist the Armed Forces in their recovery from that decade of neglect. The Soviets already have more than four times as many ICBM warheads as the U.S. Strategic Air Command (SAC) has missile silos which are static targets. Most of Moscow's arms are in the megaton range, and the Soviet hard target capabilities place the undefended U.S. fixed site ICBM's at risk. General Ellis, the SAC commander, said the increased yield and accuracy of Soviet ICBM's "have put our Minuteman at risk to a point where . . . we could not respond effectively in a coherent manner." Statements that the United States and the Soviet Union are at parity in warheads discounts the fact that figures on Soviet warheads are estimates which do not take into account probably concealed or rapidly reloadable missiles—such as the SS-17's and SS-18's. Soviet strategic operational employment plans, based on Soviet doctrine and writings, point to seizing the initiative through preemptive attack. Such attack would effectively reduce the impact of a retaliatory strike, limiting damage to the U.S.S.R.

Existing U.S. ICBM and heavy bomber forces are the 1960's era and face technological obsolescence as well as severe aging problems. Our ICBM force is at total risk; one-half of our SLBM force which is in port at any given time present the Soviets with lucrative and vulnerable target objectives. Further, it has been stated that most of our B-52 bombers—even those on alert status—would be destroyed by a Soviet first strike. Soviet targeting objectives are U.S. strategic offensive assets that would place American population centers under the terrible threat of annihilation. Could the President order surviving U.S. strategic nuclear weapons to be launched against the Soviet heartland under this coercion?

The Soviets currently maintain a significantly greater proportion than NATO of their equivalent throw-weight capability (a rough measure of the ability to deliver large warheads) in ICBM's—about 62 percent compared to 31 percent for NATO. The Soviets maintain a greater proportion than NATO of their megatonnage in ICBM's. Moreover, the sustained Soviet modernization of its ICBM's has given rise to particular concern as the newer warheads—new versions of the SS-18 and SS-19—are large and accurate enough to destroy U.S. ICBM silos. NATO by contrast does not have a corresponding capability against Soviet ICBM silos because of the relatively limited amount of highly accurate ICBM warheads and the hardness of the Soviet silos.

It is very prudent to assume that the Soviet Union would attempt to win any military war by denying the United States the physical ability to

continue to wage it. The United States must reverse the shift toward Soviet nuclear superiority and forestall any notion that the Soviet Union could fight, survive and win a nuclear war. Blackmail is a tactic that is being used now by the Kremlin. The Soviets have offered to guarantee not to use nuclear weapons against countries in Northern Europe, the Balkans, and Mediterranean which would declare a freeze on deployment of nuclear weapons in their territories. This simply says we will use nuclear weapons against you if you allow the United States to base the Pershing II or the ground-launched cruise missile systems in your country.

There is a moral issue linked to nuclear weapons. If nuclear weapons are the only deterrent to Soviet blackmail, there are those who argue that we should submit rather than pose the risk of nuclear conflict. We, in the Congress, cannot accept this false choice, as it would be the surrender of our survival as a people and civilization. Deterrence is not automatic and certainly does not come cheaply. Our objective in this nuclear era is to reduce the risk of war and to establish a stable military balance at lower levels of risk and effort.

Unless one subscribes to the "better Red than dead" approach, we must maintain nuclear stability and capability with the Soviet Union. While it is not necessary for the United States to match the Soviets missile for missile, megaton for megaton, it is necessary that our military forces have the capability to make the Soviets pay an unacceptably high price for aggression. Whatever impact nuclear freeze advocates have in our own society, there is no like force within the Soviet Union. Unilateral American constraints on nuclear weapons would receive a warm welcome by the Soviet leadership, both civilian and military, as the Soviet advantage would be solidified. It is strange that the thesis of the advocates of the nuclear freeze movement is that the United States forced the Soviets into the nuclear arms race and thus must now take the risks involved in nuclear disarmament.

It must be pointed out that an unequal nuclear freeze would halt U.S. weapons production lines, but do nothing to Soviet defense production outputs.

The freeze proposal is indeed politically attractive and unfortunately irresponsible.

We believe that it is essential to get some agreement with the Soviets, as only with a verifiable pact can the hair trigger in Central Europe be taken off its hair trigger and can the massive cost of defense be reduced. Lessen the threat, and the need for more defense is reduced proportionately. This reality holds true for both the Soviet Union and the United

States. Defense Secretary Weinberger said in May that:

An unequal freeze would only perpetuate and exacerbate existing military imbalances, decrease our deterrent capability, and eliminate any incentive for the Soviets to agree to real reductions. Only by demonstrating a commitment to maintain our deterrent capability, with or without arms control, will we convince the Soviets that it is their best interest to join us at the negotiating table.

There is a critical need to maintain the Soviet incentive to negotiate arms reductions, that would be undermined by endorsement of many of the weapons reduction proposals before us. Most proposals would freeze the existing instabilities and condone and approve of current Soviet advantages. They would effectively eliminate the incentives for the Kremlin to negotiate toward the even lower levels of nuclear arms. It is imperative that we try to achieve real reductions and thus lessen the risk of war.

Richard Burt, Director of Politico-Military Affairs of the Department of State testified:

It is apparent to all that we have little hope for substantial reductions in weapons if we begin negotiations from anything less than a confident military position and the certainty that we will not allow continued Soviet growth to go unchallenged. We must pursue a vigorous, balanced modernization program if the Soviets are to have any incentive to negotiate toward the agreements we seek.

Why should the Soviet Union make any concrete concessions in the START negotiations, if they can accept offers of a freeze that will cost them nothing and could yield them eventual nuclear superiority?

Nuclear weapons raise profound moral, political, and strategic problems that concern thoughtful people within our democracy. Yet, only through the power of the United States and its policy of deterrence has Europe been spared from repeating the tragic loss of 50 million of its citizens who died in this century. The United States has signed numerous treaties with the Soviet Union over the past 20 years, but the sad fact is that the Kremlin has yet to fully comply with any significant pact. For example, use of chemicals in both Southeast Asia and Afghanistan, violation of the Helsinki human rights accords and the Cuban missile agreement of 1962. The Soviets' word is clearly not good enough, and certainly not good enough to allow the ultimate security of the United States to be lost to the vows of the Soviet leadership.

The United States has attempted through a course of self-restraint and unilateral arms reduction to convince the Soviets to do the same. The Kremlin never reciprocated. We must, therefore, place primary reliance on our national strength and be willing to negotiate. We must avoid the delu-

sions and self-deceptions of the past 12 years. Moscow has acted with force to expand its influence. In Vietnam, in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, and soon, perhaps, in Central America, we have reaped the grim harvest of self-delusion. We need a foundation upon which to build an arms control agreement that the American people can trust as being the best possible result of successful diplomacy—not empty promises, but verifiable procedures that would insure that the Soviets would not exploit our trust.

Realities of the nuclear threat impose the requirement on the Soviets and the United States to impose equal limits and obligations on both sides with reductions of strategic weapons.

The Armed Services Committee is concerned that the present substitute could frustrate American attempts to achieve stability and a military balance in the world. Détente did not alter Soviet priorities and while the West sought to ease tensions, the Soviet Union greatly expanded its military forces. There are those who would exploit the anxieties of the public that have been building up since the deterioration of America's superiority over the Soviet Union was so clearly demonstrated during the previous administration.

It is odd that the timing of the seemingly national cry for the so-called nuclear freeze fell in line just as the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament took place.

There are thousands of well-intentioned Americans who support the "freeze-now" concept. But a complex of professional organizers has followed a carefully designed scenario in pushing the oversimplified idea of a freeze. Nuclear weapons have, for over 30 years, helped deter Soviet aggression. Tragically, the answer to how much defense is enough does not rest in the pulpits or town halls of America, but rather in the nuclear planning bureaus of the Kremlin.

The painful negotiations that face our START specialists are just beginning and we pray that they can achieve some success, but there is little prospect that the Soviet Union will ever agree to reduce its heavy, multiwarheaded intercontinental missiles unless it can be persuaded that the United States will respond by deploying comparable systems itself.

Soviet leaders, as of now, understand that without some acquiescence to U.S. demands in arms control, the United States will launch into a military building program that could place the U.S.S.R. in a militarily and politically inferior position relative to its current position. Thus, to strengthen the concept of arms control within the halls of the Kremlin, the United States must reject unilateral conciliatory gestures toward the Soviet Union and emphasize its military capability

and determination to pursue its own military advantages. This is the stuff that the Soviets understand. We must negotiate from strength not a weakness brought on by unilateral cutbacks.

It is time that we took a page out of the Soviet textbook and talk parity while planning and working to be second to none.

A survivable strategic U.S. arsenal acts as a direct credible deterrent against any Soviet threat to launch these nuclear weapons and it supports the deterrent capacity of American conventional combat Forces.

No sane man could ever advocate nuclear war. No responsible individual has ever attempted to minimize the horrors of a nuclear confrontation between the superpowers. America's leaders have recognized that the sole nuclear strategy that was consistent with our values and survival was the strategy of deterrence and that is our highest objective.

Deterrence has been supported by most Americans because it works. It is nuclear deterrence and collective defense that has preserved the peace in Europe.

There have been over 130 international and civil wars since World War II and yet it was deterrence that kept nuclear conflict from the Russian and American homelands. We must sustain our national security in a changing international environment and in the face of an expanding Soviet force. This can only be accomplished with close cooperation with our allies, and with an arms agreement based on the principle of equality which is demonstrably fair, mutually beneficial and realistic.

□ 1650

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to ask the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California, a question about the amendment if he would engage in a colloquy with me here.

Is it true, the gentleman did not get into any specifics in the amendment, the gentleman dealt in generalities, but is it true that this would effectively terminate the carriers, the MX, the B-1, the Pershing II, the GLCM and the Trident II?

Mr. DELLUMS. Yes. The answer is yes.

Mrs. HOLT. That is what I wanted to know.

Then the amount of the reduction is 31 percent less than the Reagan proposal. The committee has reduced that amount from \$183 billion to about \$177 billion; but that of the gentleman would be a 31-percent reduction from the Reagan proposal?

Mr. DELLUMS. To be more specific, our bill calls for \$126.1 billion. If that is 31 percent, that is what it is. That is the specific figure, as against the Armed Services Committee of \$177.03 billion.

Mrs. HOLT. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the prime determinant of what we should spend for defense has to be based on what our potential adversary is spending. We have to evaluate how strong he is. We have to figure out how we can counter that strength if we want to have peace.

I do not begin to propose that the Soviets are 10 feet tall. Except for defense, they are not doing anything very well. Their agricultural economy is in a shambles. Their consumer goods are in scarce supply. Their average income is far below our poverty level; but they have built the god-awfullest war machine that have ever been assembled by any nation in the world in history. They are spending about \$40 billion more than we are on defense and they have for about the last 10 years and it really shows.

The common wisdom in preventing war is to be as strong as your potential adversary. That is the way to preserve peace. When people say it costs a great deal of money to support this defense budget, when they say that there is some waste in it, I would agree on both counts. There obviously almost assuredly is waste and it certainly is a huge amount of money, nearly \$300 billion; but I would suggest that the only situation with far more waste and that costs a great deal more not only in dollars and materials, but also in people, is a condition of war. We have to spend enough to prevent that from happening. I do not feel the gentleman's amendment provides adequate funds to prevent that situation from occurring.

Those who want to cut defense often want to spend what is left over for social programs, certainly a worthy goal; but we have already done this for the last 10 years. We have cut defense over the past 25 years, in fact, compared to what we used to spend for defense.

Some round numbers, Mr. Chairman: In 1955 we spent almost 55 percent of our budget on defense.

In 1965, we dropped down to around 45 percent.

In 1975, way down to 25 percent.

In 1978 was the lowest, 22 percent.

In 1981, we went back up to 25 percent.

Then the 1983 budget will provide almost 30 percent of our entire expenditure for defense.

Most of those dollars that we have not been spending for defense through the years have been spent for social programs, spent for good causes; but there just never will be enough money to do all the things we would like to do for all the people that are unable to care for themselves at the level we think they should.

□ 1700

I also would like to point out, in line with social responsibility, that the first responsibility of a nation to its people is to keep them alive and free. That is the primary purpose for defense spending, to keep them, in America, alive and free.

Another argument for cutting the defense budget is that the Soviets are afraid of the United States because of our awesome strength; if we just cut back in a unilateral way that they will follow.

Well, we have cut back since the Vietnam war, as I pointed out, in proportion to what our overall expenditures had been. Did they cut back? Obviously not.

Mr. WHITE, the gentleman from Texas, brought that out thoroughly earlier.

Instead, as I said, they increased defense spending nearly \$40 billion a year for the past 10 years.

To bring some meaning to this, I intend to quantify, Mr. Chairman, the situation, just what weapons we have in comparison to what the Soviet Union has in certain key areas. I am talking about ships, planes, tanks, people, missiles, just to find out how we do rate with them, just how equal are we, what kind of parity do we have according to these numbers.

I admit at the outset that there are a lot of qualitative differences in weapons. We have more loyal allies than the Soviets do; our technology is far superior; we are a much wealthier nation. I admit also that we have different defense requirements than the Soviets have.

We are not ringed with enemy nations as they are; we have oceans on both sides of us that they do not have.

Let us look at the numbers to see how they do compare with us.

These are the various categories that I selected that would be important to forwarding a war: Military investment includes procurement, R.D.T. & E. military construction. The Soviet Union is in the first column, the United States is in the second column. In that category it is 1.85 to 1.

ICBM's, 1.3 to 1; SLBM's, 1.5 to 1.

ICBM MIRV warheads, 2 to 1; throwweight, 2.8 to 1, almost 3 to 1; equivalent megatonnage, 1.4 to 1; tanks, both heavy and medium, 4.6 to 1; ICBM reentry vehicles, 2 to 1; per-

sonnel carriers, 4.2 to 1; artillery, 5 to 1; bombers, strategic bombers, and here we do lead the Soviets, 1 to 1.8, but our planes are 25 years old.

Planes other than strategic, 1.7 to 1; attack submarines, 4 to 1; major combatant ships, 1.4 to 1; helicopter gunships, 1 to 1.1. We are slightly ahead in helicopters also. That is a second area.

In strategic spending, it is 3 to 1; in R.D.T. & E. it is 2 to 1.

If we add in civil defense, the money spent is 20 to 1, the people involved in civil defense is almost 20 to 1, and the nuclear war casualties—and here is where we lead—it is 10 to 1.

The point I am making is that in the 17 categories listed, the Soviets are ahead in 15. If we factor in civil defense, in 19 categories they are ahead 17 to our 2 categories. It is a very, very poor ratio, under any sort of comparison. The tragedy is, ladies and gentlemen, that we used to be ahead in nearly all these areas.

The trend until the Reagan administration came to power was alarming.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I am going to vote against this amendment. I would urge all my colleagues to vote against it. I want to help restore the imbalance that already exists in our defense comparison. Even if we voted for the budget that we have cut already today, it still would not close the gap in defense spending but, Mr. Chairman, it would keep us in the game.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DYSON).

Mr. DYSON. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California. The sponsor is a very fine member of our committee and is sincere, I am certain, in his efforts to bring Federal spending under control.

I wish we could afford to strike over \$50 billion from the Federal budget and not jeopardize the defense needs of the United States. One aspect of this substitute especially disturbs me. The gentleman from California brings the shipbuilding program of the Navy down to about \$3 billion in comparison to the \$18 billion which we have in the authorization. I think this is unacceptable.

Today the members of the Maryland delegation were approached by the president and executive secretary of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Sparrows Point Local 33. They pointed out that over 3,000 workers at the Sparrows Point Shipyard depend heavily on the future of the Navy shipbuilding program. They are deeply concerned that if this program in its present form, does not pass, or is radically altered in any way, that the Sparrows Point Shipyard will close down completely and place these 3,000 workers on the growing list of the Nation's unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit to the Members of this House a letter from Mr. Spence Shiflett and Mr. James C. Harmon, their views of this serious situation:

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, SPARROWS POINT LOCAL NO. 33,

Baltimore, Md., July 19, 1982.

Hon. ROY DYSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DYSON: The 3000 workers at the Sparrows Point Shipyard are presently experiencing the highest rate of unemployment in the long history of the Sparrows Point Shipyard.

The only hope that we as Shipyard workers have for our future employment is the Navy Shipbuilding. If Navy contracts aren't obtained soon the possibility of the Sparrows Point Shipyard closing will become a reality, and my 3000 Members plus the 1000 or so non-represented workers will lose their jobs permanently.

Therefore, we strongly request that you and the other members of the Maryland Delegation support H.R. 6030 for the Defense Budget. This budget, in our opinion, will mean thousands of jobs in the Maryland area.

My Members are highly productive workers who want to work. I am sure we can build U.S. Navy ships at below cost and in advance of delivery dates, if given the opportunity.

We appreciate the help you have given us in the past, and hope that you can help us in this present crisis.

Yours truly,

SPENCE SHIFLETT,
President, Local No. 33.

JAMES C. HARMON,
Executive Secretary, Local No. 33.

Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged that the defense authorization bill before us is a positive step toward building a stronger national defense and particularly, that the shipbuilding programs authorized by the bill will take the Nation a step closer to achieving a 600-ship Navy. There should be no doubt that attainment of a larger and more capable Navy is essential if we are to have a Navy that can carry out the missions assigned to it. There certainly is no question that building a 600-ship Navy will require continuing large shipbuilding programs. But support

for large naval ship construction programs to build a strong Navy is not sufficient to maintain the United States as a strong maritime nation. The maritime interests of our country require that we maintain a strong merchant marine, with modern ships manned by skilled American crews, and a strong shipbuilding and repair industry to support both the Navy and the merchant marine.

In previous conflicts—World War II, Korea, and Vietnam—there were as many or more merchant ships involved in direct support of the war effort than naval ships. It is reasonable to expect that this would be true in future conflicts as well.

The naval shipbuilding program authorized by this bill does not maintain the essential shipbuilding industrial base that would be essential in a future conflict. Nearly three-fourths of the \$18 billion for naval shipbuilding will go to only four shipyards that build aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, and Aegis guided missile cruisers.

Yet the present shipbuilding industrial base is composed of 26 shipyards that have the facilities and work force to construct ships. Less than one-half of these yards are currently constructing naval vessels. There is little prospect that many additional yards will be employed in the naval shipbuilding program.

The prospects for commercial work for the Nation's shipyards is even more bleak. In testimony before the committee earlier this year, Mr. Edwin Hood, president of the Shipbuilder's Council of America, stated that by the end of the year the backlog of commercial ships under contract in U.S. shipyards would total eight. He further stated that employment in merchant ship construction was declining from 35,000 in 1976 to a projected employment of less than 10,000 by the end of the year.

The administration's maritime policies have done nothing to reverse this alarming trend. Construction differential subsidies have been suspended indefinitely. Operating differential subsidies are being paid for ships built in foreign yards, and policies are being proposed that will move virtually all repair work of U.S.-flag merchant ships to foreign yards.

The maintenance of a strong maritime capability is not solely a military interest and the importance goes beyond the defense needs of our country. The maritime sector of the economy contributes to the general welfare of the American people. Ocean borne commerce brings one-third of our daily use of petroleum products from distant parts of the globe. It also brings many strategic and critical materials that are essential to both the civilian economy and to the maintenance of our national defense.

I would hope that this Congress will act to maintain the shipbuilding base and rebuild a strong and competitive merchant marine. In the interim the only business available to sustain the shipbuilding industry is the naval construction and repair programs. It is essential that we approve it in its entirety.

There are a number of naval programs, including the maritime prepositioning ships, fast logistics ships, hospital ship, oilers, salvage ships, and ship overhauls and repairs that offer the opportunity for work to shipyards not currently engaged in combatant ship work. The award of one of these programs to a yard could well sustain a shipyard that would otherwise close its doors.

I believe that the Navy should reexamine its so-called home port policy which tends to give preference for contracts for repair and overhaul work to yards in areas where naval ships are home ported. In the past decade naval ship home ports have been increasingly concentrated. The home port policy for repair and overhaul work will lead to a similar concentration of industrial facilities. I believe that this is shortsighted policy and that its logical consequences are not in our national security interests.

In summary, I urge my colleagues' support for the naval shipbuilding and repair programs authorized in H.R. 6030. But the action we take on this legislation is only a portion of that necessary to maintain the maritime sector of our economy. The maintenance of U.S. maritime interests requires a strong merchant marine and a strong ship construction and repair industry.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California, my good friend, is concerned about war. I think we are all concerned about war. He suggests that anything we do to defend ourselves is provocative, is destabilizing, and could upset our adversaries to the extent that they might want to have some kind of a confrontation with us.

I yield to no one in my determination to do all those things we can do to prevent war. You have got to be crazy to want to fight a war.

However, sincere, honest, dedicated people can disagree on the method, the best method to accomplish what we all seek, and that is to prevent a war.

To my way of thinking there are two ways to prevent a war: You can give in to the other side voluntarily and have peace, the kind of peace that I do not think any of us would want to live under. The other way is to be so strong that no potential adversary would risk a confrontation with us.

In that connection, I would like to quote also from someone who was very much in the news until 2 years ago when he retired as Secretary of Defense. On leaving that office, Harold Brown uttered some words which I very much agree with, when he said:

Critical turning points in the histories of nations are difficult to recognize at the time. Usually, they become clear only in retrospect. Nonetheless, the United States may well be at such a turning point today. We face a decision that we have been deferring for too long; we can defer it no longer. We must decide now whether we intend to remain the strongest nation in the world. The alternative is to let ourselves slip into inferiority, into a position of weakness in a harsh world where principles unsupported by power are victimized, and to become a nation with more of a past than a future.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, does the gentleman on this side have any more time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me say I would like to rise in opposition to the amendment. While no one can doubt the sincerity of the proponent and the gentleman offering the amendment, his views are well known; for many years he has espoused these views both on and off the floor.

We have had many conversations in and out of committee.

What this amendment would do would totally denude the United States so far as its military posture is concerned. We would strip ourselves unilaterally, receiving nothing in benefit; all our major weapons systems, prospective in nature, the B-1, the Trident, the MX, all of the very things that General Rowley is addressing in the START talks now in Europe, trying to come to agreement with our potential adversary, the Soviet Union, trying to come to a reasoning with them, a mutual balanced reduction of forces, a deescalation of the arms race.

We have seen in the past that any unilateral action on our part does not evoke a similar response on the part of the Soviets.

□ 1710

When our former administration very foolishly announced unilaterally that they would cancel production of the B-1 bomber, shortly thereafter I, as a delegate to the Disarmament Conference, was in Geneva and heard some of our negotiators laughing and saying, "Well, we really have embarrassed the Soviets now. We have the lads in a tough position because we have shown our good faith and they are embarrassed because they are going to have to make a similar response."

The fact is, their response was to go forward with a follow-on to the Back-

fire bomber. So, whatever good intentions we show, whatever unilateral disarmament we might engage in, evokes no similar response from the Soviets. As a matter of fact, I think it probably causes them to redouble their efforts.

So, I think it would be shortsighted in the extreme to strip ourselves of our capabilities, both present and in the future. I think there is nothing we could do that would show a greater sign of weakness, which in turn will invite aggression and attack, and I think the House should reject the amendment out of hand.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) cannot be serious when he proposes to virtually kill every strategic improvement proposed by the past three administrations and supported by the Congress. He must be jesting when he proposes to kill both offensive and defensive naval weapons. He cannot be serious when he proposes to kill the Army's M-1 tank and Apache helicopter.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that the gentleman would have us kill the Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles and force our Government to renege on its solemn agreement with NATO. In the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) negotiations we propose, with our allies' concurrence, to forgo Pershing II and GLCM deployment if the Soviets will take out the powerful SS-20's that threaten Europe. If we scrap plans for those new systems what incentive is there for the Soviets to agree to take out their SS-20's?

By cutting the defense procurement request in half, from \$89 billion to \$44 billion, the gentleman defeats his substitute's stated purposes.

The first of these is to provide authorizations consistent with a strong national defense. Yet, the substitute would gut national defense.

The second stated purpose is to "minimize the risk of nuclear confrontation." Yet, by gutting all new strategic programs, the substitute would actually invite nuclear blackmail.

The third stated purpose of the substitute is to "eliminate areas of waste and abuse in this budget." Yet, the substitute would create massive waste by closing down large segments of the defense industrial base sending thousands of skilled workers to the unemployment lines.

Finally, the substitute seeks to "enhance readiness and morale." Yet, the amendment would deny defensive and offensive missiles to the Navy, prevent the modernization of the Navy and Marine Corps air arms, deny equipment to the Rapid Deployment Force, and decrease the defensive and offensive power of Navy surface forces.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, in summary I would like to begin by quoting again from Paul Warnke, a partial quote:

The Soviet Union regrettably has something like 80 percent of its strategic resources in that vulnerable system * * *

Meaning land-based missiles.

That is too bad. I would rather that they have a greater percentage in survivable forces, because the survivability of deterrents on both sides is what gives us the only security that we have in the nuclear age. But the concept that somehow we have let them get ahead of us is really a criticism of this country having made the right decisions. We have made the correct decisions, and we ought to be proud rather than poor-mouthing our capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that we need defense in this unstable world at this unstable moment. The question is, What constitutes an appropriate and adequate defense? What are our realistic defense needs? I agree with these persons who raise the question of deterrence. What I am simply suggesting is that H.R. 6030 threatens deterrence.

I would ask America, Mr. Chairman, to be logical. These are very complicated issues, but they have a certain kind of simplistic logic. No. 1, the Soviets have over the years demonstrated their intellectual capability, their scientific capability, their military and political will to build whatever they have to build in response to us. Simply stated, whatever heinous weapon we build, within some relatively short space of time we are looking down the barrel of the same weapon that we developed. At some point the logic of continuing down that road escapes me.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot use nuclear weapons. The only use is for deterrence. Deterrence works. If it did not work, why are we not throwing weapons at each other at this moment? To go beyond deterrence is what creates danger. To talk about a war fighting capability is what I am challenging here. Deterrence works. We are not throwing bombs at the Soviet Union; they are not throwing bombs at us because those big, dirty bombs on either side act as deterrence weapons.

But once we develop the capacity to threaten the Soviet's credible deterrent capability, the only way they can defend themselves is to go on offense. Do you want to give that to yourselves and your children and your children's children?

This is what I am challenging. We need defense, we need deterrence. What we do not need is war fighting capability and what we do not need is nuclear technology that goes beyond our ability to verify.

Be logical, America. We cannot use these weapons. A surface Navy in a nuclear age is an irrational effort. Be logical, America.

I would finally conclude with this, Mr. Chairman: Dr. Jack Geiger, in testimony before our ad hoc committee, told a story that he thought characterizes the absurdity of the nature of the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. He likened it to two men standing in a room up to their necks in gasoline, one with 7 matches in his hand and the other with 10 matches in his hand. The one with 10 matches said, "I will not enter into an agreement not to strike a match in this room until I have 15 matches," when we all know that one match not only destroys the room, the building, but the community and world within which it finds itself. That is exactly where we are. The Soviet Union has 7,000 strategic weapons. We have 10,000, and we are sitting there saying that we need 15,000 strategic weapons before we can sit down and begin the process of backing away from the insanity, the cruelty, the absurdity, of nuclear weapons.

I am not antidefense or the reality of the real world, but what I am anti is defense that makes no sense, building monuments to madness that we do not need. We do not need war fighting capability. If deterrence is the reality then let it go forward.

On the one hand we have those persons advocating MAD, mutual assured destruction. On the other side we have those persons advocating NUTS. The problem is, the NUTS are leading. We need to come back to the concept of deterrence and get away from the war fighting capability.

I appreciate this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to try to open the parameters of this discussion. I realize it is a minority view at this moment, but I believe America is awakening and we need each opportunity we have to grapple with each other. I appreciate the sincerity and the respect that has transpired in this debate.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join in this debate and, first of all, extend to my colleague from California (Mr. DELLUMS) the gratitude of many Members of the Congress who have listened to him, and in their heart of hearts subscribe to the positions that he has articulated. And more, to the millions of Americans, hundreds of millions of Americans, who are fervently hoping that his position will be supported by more Members in the Congress than ever before. I thank you, sir.

I do not subscribe to the notion that this is a minority view, but would posit for this debate that there are more people in America that want a \$50 bil-

lion reduction of the defense budget today, right now, in each of the 435 districts, then there are people who do not want a \$50 billion reduction. And if I am wrong, it is still a very, very close question.

This debate is a signal one that has been followed by a series of reductions unanimously agreed to by the membership in this body, some four or five. I voted on them in a state of semi-shock. Some of my dearest colleagues, supporters of a strong defense, of a larger budget authority for the Pentagon, were the introducers of these amendments. How many billions we have cut now I have no idea, but it has been a shocking slice from the Pentagon pie.

Over in the Pentagon there are generals laying on the floor in shock that some of their best friends in the Congress would desert them in this moment of crisis in American political and military history. I said to one of the subcommittee chairmen of the Armed Services Committee and author of one of the amendments, "How could you do this without me on the floor? All these years I have begged for modest reductions and today they went through this Chamber like a hot knife through butter. Before we could get back to our offices there was another cut and another cut and another cut."

□ 1720

Why? How come? I will yield to anyone in this Chamber for enlightenment on this point.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague.

First of all, just in order to recap history, may I just say first to my colleague I appreciate his comments. No. 2, when I mentioned the minority point of view I agree with the gentleman, out there beyond the confines of these Chambers I think it is a majority opinion. I am talking about within the confines of these Chambers.

In order to answer the gentleman's question, back several weeks ago the Armed Services Committee, in a 4 hour and 40 minute meeting, passed a military budget authority figure of \$255.1 billion. This action was taken prior to the time that this body worked its will on a budget resolution for fiscal year 1983.

In the budget resolution for fiscal year 1983 worked out between the House and the other body it required that the Armed Services figure come in at \$253.8 billion. So the Armed Services Committee was required to make up the difference between \$253.6 billion and \$255.1 billion in order to reconcile the budget with the budget process.

So they came in with a lower figure. That is why you saw a number of our colleagues who opposed cuts having to bring cuts to the floor, because the Armed Services Committee bill had to correspond to the budget resolution. That is why we had this rather uncan-ny and interesting moment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. CONYERS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman's response I am sure is as correct as it is technical. But could the gentleman just tell me again in perhaps less complicated language why leaders on the Armed Services Committee led in a brief but welcome round of military reductions. Permit me to be direct: Is this an order from the administration? Do the Pentagon warlords themselves seek these reductions? Is there some hidden motive behind this unexpected behavior on the part of congressional militarists? Is it the people that are demanding this? Where does it come from?

Mr. DELLUMS. Is this an order from the House and the other body; or is it a grass roots demand coming from the people themselves that require this action?

Mr. CONYERS. It is a reconciliation, a set of reconciliation cuts?

Mr. DELLUMS. This is reconciliation; the gentleman is perfectly correct. We are reconciling the Armed Services original \$255.1 billion with the budget resolution which said you better come in with \$253.6 billion. If you are over the budget you are a budget-buster and, as you know, a lot of my colleagues really challenge being budget-busters.

Mr. CONYERS. Let me ask the floor manager, my distinguished friend from Texas, how much did we cut today, total, aggregate amount?

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. Before this was reported the committee had already cut \$3.2 billion. On the floor today I am advised that the total was \$3.2 billion, an additional \$3.2 billion, which makes, of course, \$6.4 billion that has been cut out.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the distinguished chairman for those figures.

I am hoping that those who voted for these cuts will continue. This cut I think tracks the Congressional Black Caucus defense budget from the budget debates.

I think it is supportable on the grounds that it will not impair our national security. It will, as a matter of fact, take, I think, into consideration a number of nuclear developments.

But I think we can argue, and it has been argued rather cogently, that we will not impair national security.

I repeat: we will not impair our national security capability if this amendment is agreed to by the House of Representatives and the other body and signed into law.

If there is some disagreement from any of my colleagues on that it should be spread upon the record at this point.

My support for this amendment is predicated upon a premise that I yield to no man or woman in this Chamber that our Nation should be as secure as we can in a dangerous world, a world we have made more dangerous.

I yield to no one on the question of the importance of military security and the national defense of the United States of America.

So I support this amendment in perfectly good conscience. I think anybody else that wants to, can, too.

But there is another premise that dogs this debate, and that premise was summed up by a distinguished professor of physics who said: "Several members of the Government have stated repeatedly that we are inferior to the Soviet Union in strategic weapons and that we need to build up our weapons."

In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 2 months ago he said there is no such inferiority because, among other things, we have more nuclear warheads than the Russians, and this he considers to be the most important measure of relative strength.

In addition, and he refers to Dr. Kissinger's comments of several years back, "At the present level of strategic armaments, superiority in numbers of megatons has no meaning."

I am going to put this detailed comment into the RECORD.

The article referred to follows:

THE INFERIORITY COMPLEX

I have been a Professor of Physics at Cornell University since 1935. In 1967 I was awarded the Nobel Prize for studies of nuclear reactions in the stars. I was leader of the Theoretical Division of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory from 1943 to 1945 when that laboratory developed the first atomic bomb. I have consulted for the Los Alamos Laboratory at least once a year. I was a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1957 to 1960, and remained a member of its Strategic Military Panel until 1969 when the panel was dissolved. In 1958 I participated in the Experts Conference in Geneva which discussed the verification of a ban on nuclear weapons tests, and led to the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963. I am testifying on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists of Cambridge, Massachusetts, but the ideas expressed in my testimony are my own.

Several members of the government have stated repeatedly that we are inferior to the Soviet Union in strategic weapons, and that we need to build up our weapons. In my opinion there is no such inferiority. We

have more nuclear warheads than the Russians, and I consider this to be the most important measure of relative strength. In addition, as Dr. Kissinger stressed many years ago, at the present level of strategic armaments superiority in numbers or megatons has no meaning.

We are told that there is a window of vulnerability because the Russians might use their large ICBMs to destroy our land-based ICBMs. It is generally agreed that this is not possible now, but with the improving accuracy of Russian missiles it might become possible in a few years. Leaving the question of the technical feasibility aside, I claim that such a first strike would give no significant military advantage to the Russians.

The reason is that ICBMs make up only one-fourth of our strategic nuclear forces, as measured by the number of warheads. One-half of our force is on invulnerable nuclear-powered submarines, and another one-fourth is on bombers, many of which can take off from their widely dispersed airfields in case of an alert. We would therefore have ample striking force left even if all our ICBMs were destroyed.

An attack on our ICBMs would surely arouse the will to fight in the American people. The fallout from such an attack would kill millions of Americans. This would have an even more profound psychological effect than Pearl Harbor, but would have fewer military consequences than Pearl Harbor did.

It is sometimes argued that our submarine-based nuclear missiles do not have sufficient accuracy. However, if a Russian attack on our ICBMs is to make any sense at all, it would be accompanied by a massive invasion of Western Europe. The military installations for such an attack (airfields, munitions, and fuel storage depots), and the staging areas for an invasion, are all soft targets for which our submarine-based missiles would have plenty of accuracy. Therefore, a hypothetical first-strike against our ICBMs would have practically no effect on our war-fighting ability. Therefore the window of vulnerability does not exist.

It is also often claimed that the Russians have introduced many new weapons of great power, such as the SS-18, SS-19, and SS-20, while we have done nothing. The latter statement is not true. While the outer envelope of our Minuteman ICBM has remained the same, we have progressed from Minuteman 1 to 2 to 3, and in the latter we have introduced MIRV, a development which the Russians imitated, and which led them to their great striking capability. More important, on our submarines we have progressed from the Polaris warhead to the Poseidon, and then to Trident I. The latter represents very significant progress. The range of Trident I is 4,000 miles, compared to about 2,000 for Poseidon. This permits our submarines to operate over most of the North Atlantic, and to still hit Russia. Submarines at sea are very difficult to find. Now that they can roam over such a vast area of ocean, they are far more elusive. This greatly enhances their invulnerability. The US has not stood still in nuclear weapons deployment.

The most important addition to our arsenal is the cruise missile, which is being deployed on our B-52 bombers. The cruise missile can penetrate into the Soviet Union. No defense system against it exists. The elaborate and costly Russian air defense system has been made obsolete by the cruise missile, 3,000 of which are to be installed on our bombers. In short we have, and will con-

tinue to have into the foreseeable future, two completely independent and essentially invulnerable strategic forces.

Because the cruise missile can penetrate the Soviet Union as no bomber can, and because it has extreme accuracy, we do not need a new bomber, the B-1, and even less its follow-up, the Stealth. Perhaps the B-52 will eventually have to be replaced, but I cannot see why this replacement should have elaborate electronic equipment to penetrate into Russia, equipment which accounts for the enormous cost of the B-1 and the Stealth. Penetration can be achieved much more effectively and cheaply by the cruise missile.

The government has stated that we need parity in strategic forces in every category. If this means that we need parity also in ICBMs, I disagree. With the increasing accuracy of missiles, on both sides, all land-based weapons will become vulnerable. I cannot think of any deployment on land that will be secure, and in my opinion the deployment of MX is a futile expenditure of money. We should maintain the emphasis on submarine and bomber forces; this makes our forces largely invulnerable, and thereby superior to those of the Soviets. If anyone has a window of vulnerability, it is the Soviet Union.

As I have said, several of our weapons programs are unnecessary: the B-1, the STEALTH, and the MX. But the submarine program deserves our full support, especially the further improvement of secure communication links to our submarines, as has been rightly emphasized by this administration. Also, if we wish to decrease our dependence on nuclear weapons in Europe, a goal which I strongly support, our conventional forces must be built up, especially by exploring our available high-technology in anti-tank weapons.

We are not inferior to the Russians in strategic armaments. But we, the Russians, and Western Europe are severely threatened by the possibility that the enormous arsenal of nuclear weapons on both sides may some day be used. Our only hope lies in substantial reduction of these armaments. A good first step would be the ratification of the SALT II agreement by the Senate. The advantages of doing so have been persuasively demonstrated by Senator Gary Hart in *The New York Times* of May 2. Among other things, if SALT II had been ratified in 1980, the Russians would now have 250 fewer strategic missiles than they actually have, and they could not continue their buildup.

Obviously we must do more. I was happy to see that President Reagan has now proposed a plan for negotiating arms reduction with the Soviet Union. The first phase of this plan calls for a reduction of the nuclear warheads on each side from about 7,500 to about 5,000, and significant (but apparently not specified) reduction in the number of missiles. This seems to me a reasonable and equitable plan. The proposed second phase, to equalize the throw-weight of the missiles, may be very difficult to negotiate because it requires greater sacrifices from the Soviet Union than from the U.S. It will be vitally important to choose an American negotiator who combines flexibility with firmness and is devoted to the goals of arms reduction and reaching an agreement with the Soviets.

Negotiations with the Russians are difficult and lengthy in any case. The SALT II treaty took six years to negotiate. We cannot wait that long. We must stop the

arms race by measures which are not subject to such long delay. I find most attractive the proposal by George Kennan, the famous expert in the Soviet Union, which has recently been revived by Admiral Noel Gayler in *The New York Times Magazine* of April 25. The plan calls for similar reductions by both superpowers, let's assume by 5 percent of the existing force per year. Each side would choose the weapons it wants to retire, and compliance could easily be verified by our satellites. This plan is so simple that it might be agreed on with very brief negotiation, like the Limited Test Ban in 1963. But it would, in fact, not require any agreement; we could make such a reduction, and challenge the Russians to do the same. If they do so, we would make another similar reduction the following year, and so on. This would not require any treaty, and it would enhance our security.

Such mutual reductions could not replace a negotiated treaty, which has a permanence far beyond the bilateral reductions that I just proposed. Furthermore, a treaty could optimize the balance and invulnerability of the two strategic forces. This would remove the threat of pre-emptive strikes, and the current hairtrigger readiness that could lead to nuclear war by accident or miscalculation.

To summarize:

Our strategic forces are, if anything, superior to the Soviets';

Our national security, and that of our allies, is most threatened by the grotesque size and continuing growth of both nuclear arsenals.

These are the basic facts. Once they are recognized, the essential features of a sound national security policy become apparent.

Mr. CONYERS. It seems to me that before we can determine whether we support or oppose this amendment we have to determine whether we are militarily inferior to the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. CONYERS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONYERS. It seems to me that we are at an incredible flashpoint in our decisions on the magnitude of American military power. I urge that anyone in this Chamber who can add to my intelligence on this subject to please take the floor and proceed to do that.

If they do not choose to debate me on the floor I would invite them to mail me written communications.

If they do not choose to mail me written communications, I would urge, plead with them, to give me the citations or references on which they rely.

A question of this magnitude is very important and I respect the disagreements that may obtain, not only between my position and anyone else's but between positions among those who believe in a strong national defense. But out of the differences can come a new understanding so desperately needed.

I urge that this amendment be given the full consideration to which it is entitled.

I will now yield to anyone who may want to enter into this discussion.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate my colleague yielding.

At this point I would like to enter into the RECORD a brief colloquy on this matter between myself and Dr. Jeremy Stone, executive director of the Federation of American Scientists. This is a question I posed to the gentleman:

Can you respond to whether or not you believe that the United States is in some way at risk from the Soviet Union regarding our comparative nuclear strength?

This was his response:

The two sides are equal in the most fundamental method of measurement. That is this: each side can destroy the other after absorbing the attack from the other.

So each side can retaliate devastatingly to the other side. And in that sense, they are both equal and remain equal. And this is the only measure of equality that I consider to have much importance.

I would say, if you have to ask who is behind, that both super powers are behind, and the reason they are behind is that if a nuclear war occurred, these two super powers would be blown to bits, but Bolivia wouldn't be blown to bits and neither would Australia. The whole planet may suffer, but we know that we are in the line of fire and that the Soviet Union is in the line of fire, so these two super powers have gotten themselves into a unique fix.

□ 1730

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DELLUMS and by unanimous consent, Mr. CONYERS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Therein lies where we are at this point. My colleagues talk about superiority and inferiority. The main category of superiority and inferiority is whether you can blow the other one off the face of the Earth. Both sides can do that. It seems to me that the whole notion of superiority is absurd.

Back when we had one weapon and we dropped it, we could be superior. In the 1950's, when there was only a handful of warheads in the world and we had most if not all of them, we could be superior. But what is superiority in 1983, when the world has thousands and thousands and thousands of nuclear weapons? This is an absurdity. It is like counting matches, it is like counting marbles or counting baseballs. When you have the kind of accuracy, megatonnage, kill capability on both sides, to talk about superiority is absurd. And even if we develop a so-called superior weapon for a moment, it will only be for a moment, and then the Soviets will develop their weapon, and somebody from the Pentagon will

run into the Armed Services Committee and say, "See, they caught up with us, let us build a new weapon." And it keeps going ad infinitum. The point I make is that superiority breeds danger.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman. I, as one Member who will have an opportunity to cast his vote on this and other military questions, am convinced more than I have ever been in my career in the Congress that we must decrease our military buildup, particularly with reference to nuclear weapons.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Dellums substitute.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama for a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like the Chair, if it would, to advise the Committee and this Member exactly what the parliamentary situation is, because this was an unusual rule.

In addition to the general 3 hours of debate, the gentleman from California was given an additional 1 hour, which would be divided.

Now, in addition to that, is there any limitation of debate under the 5-minute rule? Are we under the 5-minute rule as to that? And is there any limitation on the 1 hour?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman that we are now under the 5-minute rule, under normal and regular consideration, and that all Members will be recognized who wish to be recognized under the 5-minute rule. But because of the procedure specified in the rule, those Members who controlled the time for debate and used their time will have to now ask for unanimous consent to be recognized to extend that time.

Mr. DICKINSON. There is no amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, but each Member who desires to be recognized for a pro forma amendment would then be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Each Member would then be recognized.

Mr. DICKINSON. Or to strike the requisite number of words?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Or to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DICKINSON. There is no limitation on the number of Members to be recognized or how many can be recognized for that purpose; is that right?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is right.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the Chair.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dellums substitute. Back in February, after President Reagan submitted his huge and unwarranted defense budget request, both the gentleman from California and I decided separately to formulate our own alternative defense budgets, aimed at providing a sound and adequate defense without bankrupting our Nation. We each found that billions of dollars could be saved by eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse.

I fully support the Dellums proposal. Nevertheless, I feel it would be useful to my colleagues to read into the RECORD the text of the narrative summary of my substitute, entitled, "Building a Strong America: A Progressive Defense Policy":

BUILDING A STRONG AMERICA: A PROGRESSIVE DEFENSE POLICY

(By Representative PATRICIA SCHROEDER)

President Reagan and Defense Secretary Weinberger, in their budget presentations to Congress, have argued that administrations and congresses controlled by Democrats have weakened the defense posture of the United States. The Reagan Administration tries to show that defense spending, new weapon procurement, and strategic defenses all fell under hard times during the Carter Administration. Actually, real defense spending (other than Vietnam-related expenditures) declined in the late sixties and early seventies but increased during the late seventies. Both Carter and Reagan agreed that defense spending should account for a larger share of total economic activity during the next five years. What they disagree on is how much larger.

The Reagan Administration has endorsed the deceptively simple notions that more is better and there's no such thing as too much. Unexpended balances, a good indication of what's too much, are much larger under the Reagan budget than under Carter's. It's clear the President's 1983 budget request and the Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense both rely, exclusively, on the level of spending as a determination of strength. Neither analyzes what is really needed for a strong nation. Neither questions the assumption that numerical parity with the Soviet Union is the best strategy on which to base defense spending. Neither is willing to prune economically unsound projects for fear the Soviets will have the numerical advantage. And, neither looks at our defense policy in the broad and cross cutting way that is necessary.

This paper offers basic tenets on which to build a stronger defense, and then applies these tenets, in numerical form, to Reagan's proposed defense budget. This exercise results in savings of \$30 billion in the 1983 defense budget; surely, additional areas of savings could be found by experts in the Pentagon, if they had the incentive to pare, rather than pad. But, when the President announces that there will be a huge increase in defense spending before anyone has ascertained what the real military needs are, it is understandable that no one in the Pentagon comes forward with cost cutting suggestions. This proposal is one individual's effort to come to grips with \$245 billion worth of Federal spending. Someone with greater expertise and more advanced equipment could arrive at greater reduc-

tions. The point is that many of Reagan's spending priorities are misplaced and that, just as David Stockman suggested, there is a great deal of waste within the defense sector. Approaching the defense budget with the idea of eliminating unnecessary expenditures which do not help our national defense, this paper does not analyze the pros and cons of specific weapon systems like the MX, F-18, or B-1B, although rational defense policy would dictate terminating funding for all three.

I. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

World history shows military might comes from economic strength. Ancient Rome fell more because of internal economic failure than invasions by the Visigoths. To support a strong military machine a country needs a robust economy, a supply of skilled labor, and a sophisticated infrastructure of manufacturing, supply, communications, and distribution. A nation with high unemployment, high interest rates, an aging inventory of capital equipment, stagnant research and development, and huge government deficits cannot field a strong military force no matter how much it spends on arms.

Conversely, spending on defense alone cannot prop up a sagging economy. A recent report by the Reagan-appointed Council of Economic Advisers raises the spectre that too rapid escalation of defense spending will crowd out private investment, excite inflation, and reduce productivity. Rather than spurring economic recovery, the Reagan defense budget will probably harm the economy.

The first government priority for defense must be reversing our economic decline. A reduction in the Federal deficit, through higher tax revenues, and a reduction in Federal borrowing, thereby reducing interest rates, is a far better way to spur economic growth than spending a quarter of a trillion dollars on arms. Long-term defense planning argues for government efforts to provide new incentives for invention and innovation to spur technological advances, particularly through funding of education and research. Our defense industrial base can best be expanded by providing job training to the unemployed. The domestic social programs which have been treated so adversely by the Reagan Administration are precisely the type of programs which lead to a strong defense in the future. Vocational education, scientific research, and social insurance programs do more to build and preserve the industrial base of the United States than does spending \$18 billion on a mobile missile system. During World War II, shockingly low scores on physical and mental tests of draftees led to the enactment of new educational and nutritional programs by the Federal government. Perhaps, the recent Department of Defense data on recruitment test scores should lead to a similar governmental initiative.

Defense planners maintain that economic revitalization is outside their bailiwick. Traditionally, defense spending and economic growth have been separate issues. Nevertheless, for each additional dollar which has to be borrowed to spend on defense, there is one less dollar available for private investment. One fewer machine is replaced. One less invention is made. Excessive defense spending weakens a nation's industrial base and, therefore, weakens national defense.

A related economic consideration also bears on the strength of a nation. When a nation goes to war, all its resources are devoted to that war effort. But now the United States has decided to build a mili-

tary machine entirely separate from the basic economy. Instead of negotiating with the private sector to use surplus property, such as wide-bodied aircraft, in time of war, the Reagan budget proposes building an entirely duplicative set of resources for rapid deployment. This is economically wasteful. Airplanes, ships, trucks, computers exist throughout the country. Instead of maintaining a redundant inventory of equipment to be used only in a crisis, the military must work out ways to use the resources of the economy to build a strong defense. The attached budget reflects savings that could be achieved in that way.

Military bodies to work out ways to share the country's resources do exist. The Department of Defense's Industrial Preparedness Planning Program, first formulated in the 1950s, plans with private industry to meet potential wartime needs. However, GAO claims this program remains in a state of disarray (May 27, 1981). Restructuring and improving programs like this should be of highest priority.

This same concept should be applied to personnel as well. Right now, we are registering, for possible induction, all 18 year old males. It is hard to conceive of a class of citizens with fewer skills or less experience. Modern war requires highly skilled individuals. Currently, there are severe shortages of doctors, other medical personnel, computer technicians, and other skilled personnel. GAO shows the demand for medical personnel in war, for example, will far outstrip the supply unless corrective action is taken (June 24, 1981). If our country truly needs peacetime draft registration to show the Soviets we mean business, a proposition which is dubious, we should be registering citizens with needed skills to call up in case of war. Pilots, navigators, electrical engineers, radio repairers, and the like exist in great number in our society. Under the theory advanced to justify peacetime draft registration, the government should know where to find these people in case of an emergency. Indeed, if registration is needed to supply foot soldiers, hunters and target shooters would probably make better soldiers than 18 year olds after three months of basic training.

II. FOREIGN POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

President Reagan's view to the contrary notwithstanding, the United States cannot stand alone in protecting democracy and freedom in the modern world. Our defense policy is inextricably linked to our foreign policy in a myriad of ways. The United States has signed a variety of mutual defense treaties with other nations. Our defense decisions affect other nations. And our national defense is strengthened or weakened by which national leaders we befriend.

Past treaty alliances of the United States emerged as cooperative ways to guard against Soviet expansion and aggression. NATO continues to be the biggest and most highly budgeted of these organizations. Others exist in the South Pacific (ANZUS) and in South East Asia (SEATO). More recently, military alliances have been formed in Israel, with Japan, and with South Korea. Under the auspices of our treaty alliance obligations, we pour enormous resources into West Germany, Italy, South Korea, and Japan.

Although the cost of these commitments has skyrocketed since the end of World War II, the share the United States pays for these commitments had not been reduced. Indeed, although Japan and West Germany

are now two of the most successful industrial democracies in the world, the United States continues to pay for most of their defense needs. Our commitments to NATO account for over one-third of our defense expenditures. Our defense budget is really a budget for the defense of Western Europe. Costs of the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force should be allocated to our NATO partners because the primary mission of the task force is to protect oil resources in the Persian Gulf. This goal is of equal or greater interest to Western Europe than to the United States.

Now is the time to revamp the proportionate shares paid by the partners in NATO and other treaty alliances. It makes no sense, given the current balance of wealth and industrial growth in the world, for the United States to continue to shoulder the entire burden of mutual defense. Canada chips in only 1.6 percent of its GNP for NATO. West Germany coughs up only 3.2 percent. The U.S., on the other hand, gives close to 6 percent. Changes in gross national products ought to be the basic factor in computing new shares. While new allocations should be phased in, the readjustment must start immediately. The attached budget reflects some readjustment.

Another foreign policy issue concerns the development of chemical and biological weapons, including binary weapons. The Reagan Administration claims to have strong evidence of Soviet use of such devices. We would be less than prudent if we did not develop protective equipment for our soldiers, detection devices and methods to neutralize lethal gasses. The attached budget reflects this.

Yet, the Reagan Administration, caught in the numerical parity rut, is about to start the development of our own biological and chemical weapons to serve as a deterrent. We do not need lethal weapons to deter the use of Soviet lethal weapons. We have conventional and nuclear weapons which continue to provide a strong deterrence. By building our own chemical weapons, we are sending a message throughout the world that other countries should start building the same weapons. While many countries cannot afford the technology to produce nuclear weapons of their own, they can afford chemical weapons. Only the force of world opinion has kept them from doing so. Once the United States commences its buildup of chemical weapons, international opprobrium vanishes.

The last three Presidents have all been committed to the process of negotiating arms limitations with the Soviets. While the process has been difficult and lengthy, some success has been achieved. Ronald Reagan won campaign points from the Right Wing in rejecting the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II). His campaign was marked by Cold War rhetoric about the Soviet threat. His performance in the White House has carried on that tradition. This belligerent rhetoric has retarded the arms control process. His recent public statements expressing his willingness to hold the Geneva talks hostage to Soviet concessions in Poland set the negotiations back months. It has made the Soviets extra wary of the President's proposal to terminate deployment of cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe in exchange for Soviet dismantling of SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 medium range ballistic missiles.

This rhetoric must be shelved at the insistence of both Congress and the general public. An excellent vehicle to do this with

is the nationwide Nuclear Arms Freeze Campaign, a grass roots, church-supported effort to force the Administration into serious nuclear nonproliferation negotiations. Congress should help this campaign by assisting in the education and awareness of the effects of nuclear war and the prospects for peace taught to the general population.

One last foreign policy issue is worthy of note. The role played by the United States in the Third World is crucial. Revolts, coups, brushfire wars, wars of national liberation all can affect the basic interests of the United States. Even without direct United States involvement, a civil war in Nicaragua, a clash in Angola, or a terrorist attack in Israel will have repercussions for our country. It is, undoubtedly, in the interest of the United States to reduce hostilities throughout the world diplomatically.

Our ability to do so is a direct product of whether we are trusted throughout the world. Allying ourselves with unpopular dictators like Somoza in Nicaragua and with the Shah in Iran undermines that level of trust and respect. Further, unpopular dictators seem to have a nasty habit of being overthrown. When this happens, the cost to the United States are often severe. Our foreign policy should take into account the advantages of allying ourselves with popular and democratically elected regimes, rather than repressive ones.

III. WEAPONS ISSUES

There are a number of tenets about weapons policy which are too often forgotten by defense planners:

First, weapons should be designed so the average soldier can use them. In the name of technological advances we have been building systems which are extremely complex to use and difficult to maintain. This results in numerous weapons being unavailable when needed. Readiness is subverted. Other countries, like the Soviets and the Israelis, develop rifles which are cheap to produce, easy to maintain, and simple to fire. Our rifles have grown in complexity. The M-16, for example, often misfired during use in Vietnam.

The situation gets more serious as the weapons get more sophisticated. The F/A-18, originally designed as a low cost attack aircraft, contains such complex and expensive navigational equipment that it is often out of commission and the training time for its use is long. The Bradley Fighting Vehicle System and the M1 Abrams tank have faced gigantic cost overruns because the complexity of their specifications led to unexpected costs and delays. Letters recently released by the Services, mandated by the Nunn-Schroeder Amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act for 1982, point to ten weapon systems that have incurred cost overruns of more than 25 percent directly because of unforeseen complexity. Clearly, the weapons trend goes the wrong way. The attached budget reflects support for R&D of simple weapons and scrutiny for complex weapons.

Second, too much attention is paid to the new and splashy. Existing weapon systems can be modified rather than investing in new systems which are likely to look better on paper than in production. The decision to build the B1-B bomber is an obvious example. The B-52, with appropriate retrofitting can serve the interim strategic bombing needs of this country, as CBO points out. The Air Force proposal to install brand new CFM-56 engines on existing KC-135 tanker planes, rather than retrofitting them with existing and more cost efficient JT3D en-

gines, as CBO recommends, is another example of the mentality of the military to buy something new rather than modify something which exists. Defense savings by recycling are realized in the attached budget.

Third, overlap and duplication among the services result in added costs and useless effort. Joint Chief of Staff Chairman David Jones recently criticized the intramural scramble for resources which spills over into weapons procurement. Because of parochial interests, the Navy must have its own Phoenix, the Army its own Stinger, the Air Force its own Sparrow. The Defense Department should establish a standard missile design to be modified for the individual needs of the services or the mission involved. Helicopters, radio, aircraft, ships, and numerous other systems items could also be standardized, if interservice rivalries did not interfere. Further, training on each of these weapon systems should be more unified to avoid the duplication that currently exists.

Fourth, we should not pursue weapons systems and strategies which make little sense. The most obvious example of this is the strategic manned bomber. Missiles, both land-based and submarine-based, have made such a bomber an anachronism. Land-based missiles can provide extremely accurate attacks on enemy targets. Submarine-based missiles can survive a first attack. The third leg of our triad strategy is in reality, a fifth wheel. Yet, research, development, and production of the B1-B continues. Indeed, if a bomber leg of the triad is truly essential, virtually any jumbo jet could be fitted with the capacity to fire cruise missiles, rather than building a new bomber capable of penetrating Soviet detection devices. Further, we still spend considerable resources on developing a manned bomber strategic defense. The Soviets are as well aware of the limitations of manned bombers as we are. We should reduce our efforts in the manned bomber defense area as well and redirect those resources to more useful purposes.

Fifth, spare parts, an undervalued budget item, have been cut to the bone, because they involve immediate outlays and, therefore, instant savings in the eyes of budget cutters. As a result, weapon systems fall into disrepair and remain out of commission, to the detriment of our readiness. Weapons repair shops fall behind schedule and become less economically run. And we lose a chance both to stimulate our industrial base, which produces these parts, and to stimulate the economy. Good management and wise use of our resources dictates that we must maintain proper funding for spare parts. This is reflected in the attached budget.

Sixth, too much of the budget goes for nuclear war. The move away from a strategy of mutual assured destruction to one of limited nuclear war offers a blank check for defense spenders. The ludicrous notion of civil defense evacuation, that we can safely and orderly escape a nuclear attack, springs from the limited nuclear war strategy. Limited, survivable nuclear war is not, however, a proven concept. It is probable that no nuclear exchange will be limited and that massive destruction will result. Continuing the development of clean bombs, neutron bombs, and other weapons of limited nuclear war is dreadfully expensive and only increases the chance to confirm our suspicions. We cannot abandon the development of all weapons of nuclear war, without a similar commitment from other nuclear powers. However, it makes abundant good

sense to reduce our procurement of new nuclear weapons and actively pursue meaningful arms reduction negotiations.

IV. MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The management of our defense establishment has grown slack due to the windfall of resources in the Pentagon. Despite this windfall, management must maintain an atmosphere of austerity to ensure that the best and most efficient decisions are made enhancing management effectiveness, program efficiency, and productivity. Better management among supply depot managers, for example, is one way for DoD to increase productivity and decrease costs. Serious mismanagement exists now at these depots, according to GAO and the House Armed Services Committee.

Not all management problems, however, deal with hardware. For many years, the Army has maintained the morale-destroying, and budget-consuming personnel management policy of soldier rotation. The effect of this policy on morale was evident in Vietnam. On an average day, one out of five soldiers is on the road, moving between assignments. Again, morale and readiness suffers. An experimental Army program of training soldiers as a permanent fighting unit is underway which will help solve the problem. The idea is not new. In ancient Greece, Spartans boys grew up together and learned to fight as a team, to the fear and respect of all. Army Chief of Staff Edward Meyer points to this unit training (called COHORT) as the prelude to the Army of the future. He may be right.

Rotation is a serious problem for officers as well. Rotation leaves them at posts or installations for two or three years. Often, just as they learn their job, they are transferred. As a result, the productivity of Army installations, like hospitals and depots, is reduced. This rotation policy hampers the weapons acquisition process, too. Program managers, those military officers responsible for the timely and economic procurement of a weapon system, are transferred every three years. No one takes a maternal attitude to a weapon to see it through to a cost-effective, reliable conclusion. It has been suggested each weapon system be named after the Secretary of Defense who started it, so that he (or she) would be encouraged to get it built on time.

Procurement contracting has traditionally been an area fraught with abuse. Although numerous laws to correct the abuse have been passed, what is really needed is better management. Sole source contracting continues unabated, cost overruns come in at unprecedented levels, as seen from the "Nunn-Schroeder" letters, and the contractor is rarely held responsible. Specifications continue to be modified, and the competitive bidding procedures, when they are used, do not always result in the best performance at the lowest price. Multiple layers of management also bog down the procurement process. Time is money applies to the public sector too. For example, the Department of Defense has an Acquisition Review Council to review and approve decisions on weapon systems already made by parallel boards in each of the services. Such duplication is time-consuming and costly. The attached budget makes sizable reductions in the procurement appropriations to underscore the need for better management.

Increasingly, the Department of Defense is top heavy, both with civilian managers and with military brass. Reagan's proposed budget calls for a 4.7 percent increase in the

number of officers and only a 2.7 percent increase in the number of enlisted personnel, since 1981. An arithmetic increase in the number of officers produces a geometric increase in the number of staff. Now, the Reagan Administration wants five new Assistant Secretaries, a move which will result in more layering at all levels in the Pentagon. Admiral Rickover was right when he suggested splitting the Department of Defense in three. Groups one and two would write memos to one another, while group three would do all the work. Again, in the weapons acquisition process, too many decisions are made at or close to the top. Many of these decisions can be made can be delegated to lower levels, as suggested by a Special Navy Advisory Group.

Finally, the defense budget has paid little attention to the Nation's best defense resource, the men and women in the military, both in the active and reserve forces. Until recently, pay and benefits have been too low, especially in the enlisted ranks, while a self-survival mentality has replaced teamwork as the functional ethos. It's shocking that a separate appropriation appears in the defense budget for the apprehension of deserters. This illustrates that poor morale is not only tolerated but budgeted for. There is no mention of desertion prevention. Military personnel is a valuable resource that must be preserved and nurtured through policies which are sensitive to the needs of military men, women and spouses. Increases for health, housing, and human services, reflected in the attached budget, will help retention, morale and, ultimately, the readiness of America's fighting force.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

□ 1740

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank my colleague from California (Mr. DELLUMS) for providing the House this opportunity to discuss his amendment, but in a more fundamental way to discuss the role of military spending in our economy, the role of military spending keeping or destroying the peace, and the role of military spending in preparing this country to defend itself.

In the past as this legislation has come to the floor from time to time it has had specific narrow amendments based upon a single weapon system, a single piece of military equipment, based upon cost overruns or ineffectiveness or what have you; but this is one of the few times in the 8 years in which I have served in the Congress in which we have been presented with the opportunity to make a fundamental evaluation of the role of the military in the American society.

It is very interesting that those who have spoken against the amendment have suggested that you could only support this amendment if you thought that you were better red than dead; you could only support this amendment if you did not care about jobs; or you could only support this amendment if you were in favor of unilaterally denuding the United States.

All of those statements are in fact false and all of those statements fail to contend with the meaningfulness of this amendment.

Because if in fact they want to stand before the American people and this committee and tell you that we are going to spend in excess of \$200 billion, based upon a jobs policy, they cannot substantiate the systems in this bill.

We cannot build ships because of 3,000 people at Sparrows Point. What the people at Sparrows Point need is to help the economy, not the ships that fail to meet our defense needs.

Those who would suggest this would unilaterally denude the United States I think are wrong because that is not what this amendment says. What this amendment does is in fact realize and recognize in an honest fashion that there are simply some weapons systems under production in our arsenal, there are weapons systems that have already been procured in our arsenal that simply do not live up to their advance billing, they simply do not work in a productive fashion, they do not provide us the margin of defense, the margin of security, that the American people have been led to believe that she should.

We have seen the arguments over the MX and we have seen this administration cancel the basing mode. Was it somehow all right in the first 8 or 9 years of debate that went on on this floor against that basing mode? Was that debate for nothing?

We have seen the B-1 brought into serious question by military experts, by the people who are supposed to fly it. That debate is valid. We see a tank now that has very questionable battlefield capabilities, that may have been built on assumptions about Soviet tanks that have not proven to be true in the last several weeks in the Middle East. That debate is important. But it must be all encompassing, and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS), has provided that all encompassing amendment.

I think it is tragic that more Members are not on the floor to debate this amendment because what must be understood is that he also attacks those weapons systems that he believes lend to the destabilization of the military and the peaceful situation in the world today, those weapons that pose a greater conceivability of war in the world tomorrow than they do of stabilizing the situation today.

I think that we must understand that that is what this amendment provides us, the opportunity to debate on the floor of the House and hopefully Members will support it.

Because it is very clear not simply because the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) seeks to bring forth his list of amendments, I would hope that others would have other amend-

ments either to knock out, if they do not agree with what he has done, or to add to that list, because in fact they have other ideas about destabilization.

But most importantly, what that amendment does is it presents to us an opportunity to take not what is a minority view but to present to the American people a discussion of grave concern to them, because if you are going home to your district and talking to individuals you will see that for the first time they are starting to understand the tradeoffs that are taking place in our economic system because of military spending, you will hear their expressions of fear and concern about the edging toward greater possibility of war and destabilization in our society.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Finally, let me suggest that it has been suggested on this floor today that the support of this amendment is somehow wrapped up in the support for the freeze movement and the sliding of that movement, but let us all remember, all 435 of us who are elected to this body, the freeze movement in this country, the freeze movement in Europe, did not come from this body, it came from the American people, it came from the European people, and the Members may not like it, the Members may think it is simple, the Members may not think it is the answer, but it is the reason that the superpowers are sitting down and discussing the reduction of arms, because without that mass movement of the people who are concerned about the buildup of nuclear weapons in the world today, those arms talks would have never been undertaken at this early date. But it came from the homes of your constituents, it came from the concerns of mothers and fathers about the future of their children and that amendment and that movement is so fundamental that it is calling into question the basic notions of military spending in this country.

If the Dellums amendment does not succeed today then let me beseech my colleague from California that this amendment must continue to be a landmark amendment for the discussion of military spending in this Congress. We can no longer go after that budget because we read an article or "60 Minutes" produced a show that showed us various military weapons and systems were not working, that the cost overruns were embarrassing, that they could not carry out their mission, that they were awarded because of political power instead of military and defense policy. This

amendment provides for the full discussion of those issues and it must be this amendment that the Congress must come to grips with because it underlies the fundamental notions of what is security for this country and what is foolishness and what is the waste of money for this country that brings us no closer to a peaceful world.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I am going to support this amendment and I am going to ask the gentleman from California in a moment to relate to some specific questions. But it is curious that 2 days ago the President was on the west front of the Capitol arguing for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and there is no possible way to balance the budget without either some tax increases or some meaningful reduction on the defense side of the picture, and I do think that the gentleman from California has given us at least an option to discuss meaningful reductions on the defense side of the picture, discussions on important things, like weapons systems, where we have to vote on it, as opposed to abstractly removing "the waste from the Defense Department." Unfortunately, there is no line item in the Defense Department called waste that we can reduce or eliminate by amendment. And so we have to deal on this kind of picture when we talk about specific procurement items.

My real concern as it relates to the Dellums amendment goes not to the MX or the Trident missile but relates to force reductions particularly in Western Europe.

In the gentleman's amendment I think that he calls for a 5-percent reduction in our forces, perhaps in Western Europe, maybe throughout the world, and at this stage reducing our conventional forces in the world worries me because it might cause some instability with respect to some of our allies.

I would ask the gentleman from California to discuss this matter.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his kind opening remarks.

What we are attempting to do in this bill is broaden the parameters of the discussion and the debate. It is terribly important that we begin to come to grips with many of those complex and vital issues of our time and I thought that this bill would provide that opportunity.

One thing that keeps the body politic honest is when there are countervailing analysis and countervailing proposal based on those different analysis, when we all start thinking in the same direction what keeps the process, what keeps creative tension in the process, and so we are proposing

an alternative to provide an opportunity for our colleagues to think and to be analytical.

□ 1750

With respect to the troop reduction issue, what we have done in this bill for fiscal year 1983 is to mandate what we perceive to be a token 5-percent force reduction, 5 percent across the board in troop reduction. What we are hoping that this will do is trigger our colleagues to begin to rethink the nature of our role in the world, what budget dollars buy or troops. Those troops are deployed for purposes of certain missions and missions are carried out in various regions of the world.

We think that it is time now for our colleagues to begin to rethink these issues.

With respect to NATO, it is very difficult to calculate, but when you try to bring together the cost expenditures, both direct and indirect, for our forces directed at NATO, you come out with a figure somewhere in the neighborhood of \$130 billion, or roughly 50 percent of our budget directly and indirectly related to American involvement in NATO. Now, that ought to raise several questions. First, what is our appropriate role in NATO; second, should we be paying at this level? Why is it that our other NATO allies are not paying such a high percentage as we are? Is it because their perception of the threat is much lower than our perception of the threat, and if that is the case, then I think we ought to think those things through.

No. 2, when you look at the issue of NATO and you ask my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, all of them responding to you honestly will say that the probability of the United States and the Soviet Union going to war in Europe on a scale of 1 to 10 is somewhere between 0 and 1. So there is no high order of magnitude in terms of the risk and the threat in Europe. The potential threat in Europe is miniscule.

The second thing that they will tell you is that on a number of occasions where we have raised the question, if a war started in Europe, even a conventional war, could that war be contained as a conventional war? The best thinking in this country at this moment is that within a relatively short period of time that war would escalate into global strategic nuclear war, raising the following questions: Why do we need to amass a whole number of land-based troops in Europe? Why do we need all these prepositions of forces in Europe?

We need to rethink the mission statement.

In looking at NATO, I raise the following questions, I make this observation: I think the problems in NATO are political and economic under the

umbrella of NATO. They are not military problems. You cannot apply a military solution to what are ostensibly political, social, and economic realities. If you are going to solve the problems in Europe, you have got to do it within that context.

Finally, as I said, to summarize, all we have attempted to do in this bill was to suggest that our colleagues cut 5 percent overall force levels to force us to begin to rethink the nature of our role in the world. A military budget is a statement about how you perceive your role in the world and what threats you perceive.

I think it is time for us now to begin to rethink these kinds of things. This is a very modest and token effort.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(At the request of Mr. CONYERS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GLICKMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on tying the real world into our budget dilemma with the very excellent possibility of reducing the military budget.

I think the gentleman's question about conventional weapons is very important.

May I deduce from that that the nuclear halt in technological development is one which the gentleman has no quarrel about?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would say on an item by item basis I have less of a quarrel with the nuclear reductions than I do on the conventional weapons side. That is a fair statement.

I do think, you know, there seems to be unanimity of thought in this body, particularly from the authorizing committee on many of these issues and it is refreshing, while I do not agree with the gentleman from California very often, but it is refreshing to come down here periodically and hear some constructive, thoughtful policy debate on the defense of this Nation. I do not hear very much of it and I am glad to have participated in this.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield further to me?

Mr. GLICKMAN. Yes, I would be glad to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I think it is imperative that we begin to look at our conventional forces is because approximately 20 percent of our budget resources, weapons and forces, surround our nuclear capabilities. Seventy-nine percent of our budget is on personnel issues. Therefore, if you are going to cut the budget, you have got to look at conventional issues and personnel

issues. Here I think we ought to begin to look at the nature of our role in the world if there are going to be any substantial cuts. All the sexy big ticket items, even if you cut all of them out, are not going to cut an incredible amount of money. We need to cut them in order to preserve the integrity of life on this planet for ourselves and for our children and their children; but if you are talking about greater economic impact, you have got to go to the conventional forces. You have got to go to the personnel issues. This is a matter that we very seldom discuss on this floor. I think it is terribly important that we begin to rethink these matters within the framework of the evolving realities of the 1980's.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California. I do so with the belief that our Nation will be very well defended if the amendment passes, because I want, as the other people who have spoken on behalf of the Dellums substitute amendment have said, they want our Nation to be very well defended. I enlisted in the Navy at the age of 17 and served at the end of the Second World War on an aircraft carrier. I would go again if my Nation was threatened. I want the strongest possible defense, but I would like to assure myself and other Members of the House that we will be adequately defended, and when I heard the comments of my dear friend, the gentleman from Alabama, the ranking member on the committee, say that this would be unilateral disarmament, or that we would be totally denuded, I became worried; so I would like to ask my friend if he would not mind answering a question. If the Dellums amendment passes, how many nuclear warheads would the U.S. military still have available to it?

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, I do not know. I will if the gentleman really wants it, furnish it for the RECORD, the total number that will be available.

Mr. WEAVER. Roughly the total number of nuclear warheads; I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, it would be in the range of 9,000 and decreasing gradually.

Mr. WEAVER. We would have around 9,000, that is strategic nuclear warheads, correct?

Mr. DICKINSON. That is total nuclear warheads.

Mr. WEAVER. Do we not have more tactical nuclear warheads?

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, let me see, we have 1,000 Minuteman III's, each of which, as I recall, has 3 warheads.

Mr. WEAVER. The Minuteman III has three nuclear warheads, right.

Mr. DICKINSON. I am corrected. We only have 550 of those. The others

are older, but it is in the neighborhood of 9,000 strategic.

Mr. WEAVER. Do we know many nuclear warheads of this kind the Soviet Union has?

Mr. DICKINSON. About 8,000.

Mr. WEAVER. Roughly the same, although I understand the Soviets are larger megatonnage; but how many of those 9,000 warheads if delivered would it take to pretty much do away with the Soviet Union?

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, assuming that they all impacted on target, I would think certainly considerably less than half would take out all effective targets.

Mr. WEAVER. I have heard the figure that 500 would pretty much pulverize and destroy the Soviet Union. Does that make any sense?

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, possibly so; the theory being that we have always announced that we would not have a first strike capability, that we would want an effective credible deterrent, but we would have sufficient capability to absorb a first strike and still have a sufficient inventory to retaliate with what Mr. McNamara used to describe as an "unacceptable destructive residual capability."

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman, and I have also been told that one Trident submarine, if the gentleman would not mind answering this question, one Trident submarine equipped with the new Trident II missiles would be able to destroy every single city of the Soviet Union over the size of 50,000 people, just the one submarine with its 196 nuclear warheads.

Mr. DICKINSON. Now, I do not think that is correct. In the first place, you do not have the range from one submarine, nor am I convinced that you could target that many from a single submarine and, of course, if the gentleman is talking about the D-5, and I think the gentleman is, this is very prospective in nature. We do not have that capability now; it is something like 10 years from now.

Mr. WEAVER. But I have been told that one Trident submarine today with its present equipment that is going on line now could destroy up to 150 major Soviet cities, just this one submarine, because it does have 196 warheads on it.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is not my understanding. I do not think one submarine could target that many viable targets.

Mr. WEAVER. In other words, we run out of targets is really what the gentleman is saying. We have got the capability, but there would not be the people there.

I thank the gentleman very much.

□ 1800

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from California, because I strongly oppose the defense authorization bill—a bill to provide authorizations for the massive military buildup planned by the Reagan administration to the tune of some \$1.7 trillion between fiscal years 1983 and 1987, authorizing purchase of 50 C-5B aircraft, for the rapid deployment of Armed Forces, 100 B-1B bombers to penetrate Soviet air space with nuclear bombs; 91 Pershing II missiles, a nerve gas program, and the development and procurement of the MX missile, among other items.

I am fed up with the President's upside-down priorities, providing for the development and procurement of super means for killing, at the expense of the greater need for healing.

The Falkland, Iran, and Iraq, the Israeli invasion of Lebanon—tens of thousands of fellow human beings killed this summer alone, with war weapons of destructive efficiency unknown before, produced and supplied by the American Government with tax revenues that are needed to aid our retirees, aid our jobless, aid our students, and aid our mothers and children.

How insane it will all seem in the history books of the future. Why, as of this very moment, the United States has the nuclear capability to kill every man, woman, and child on the face of this Earth, many times over—as if annihilating all of us once is not enough!

Sure, we should strive to remain the greatest nation on Earth—the greatest not in might but in right. Nazi Germany was powerful, but it was wrong—and its power led to war. We have made Israel the most powerful nation in the Middle East, but this has not produced peace.

Indeed, the United States needs to immediately reduce its production and distribution of arms by ceasing all military aid to Israel and any other military aggressor-nation.

The implements and weapons systems of death and destruction proposed for authorization today will heighten the already tense relations between the superpowers and will do nothing to improve constructive dialog to contain nuclear proliferation. They will violate the agreement we have with the Soviet Union to abide by the interim strategic arms agreement which bans building of new ICBM launchers. I submit to you that we cannot afford to predicate the world's survival on a childish game of let us see who can put together the world's biggest nuclear arsenal.

Mr. Chairman, the worst thing of all is that these weapons, especially the MX missile, are symbolic of the immoral policy of the "reverse Robin Hood" who occupies the White House.

Surely, we need to inject an element of rationality into our defense spending. We can begin by passing this amendment offered by my colleague of courage and conscience, the Honorable RONALD V. DELLUMS. This substitute provides a comprehensive and rational alternative to the lunacy of spending more than \$2.5 trillion before the end of this decade on military madness.

National security begins at home—it begins in our cities and in our towns and in servicing the needs of our citizens—because national security is best served by a country that best serves its' people.

Because the amendment before us, now, lessens the risks of nuclear war, eliminates areas of waste and abuse, eliminates spending for impractical and unnecessary weapons systems; yet, it still provides for a sufficiently strong national defense more importantly, it reduces war expenditures to a more proper balance with our domestic needs.

Finally, this amendment offers us a timely opportunity to express our moral outrage in protection of the sanctity of human life, the moral outrage this body has been unable to properly muster regarding the present American-backed slaughter in Lebanon. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SAVAGE) has expired.

(On request of Mr. CONYERS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SAVAGE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate my colleague, because it is not easy to come to the floor and ask for a debate on the question of the military buildup. To be popular, it would be better perhaps to submit a statement and "Keep on stepping," as it is said.

So I feel very encouraged by my colleague's response.

I would like to say further to my colleagues here that this Member is calling for a record vote on the substitute. I want to tell everybody that now so that if there is any attempt to mask from the American people what our real views are about this modest proposal, I want to ask Members to please reconsider.

The least we can do under these circumstances is to have every man and woman recorded as to what his or her position may be on it.

I just wanted to let that be known, if this debate is, by any chance winding down.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SAVAGE) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DELLUMS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SAVAGE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. First I would like to thank the gentleman and congratulate him for taking the well in support of this effort.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree with my colleague that this effort is modest. We cut \$50.8 billion from what we conceive to be a monument to military madness, death, and destruction.

I would like to quote for a moment from the proceedings of the hearings that were the underpinnings of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which is presently before the body at this time, from Rear Adm. Gene R. LaRocque, U.S. Navy, retired, Director of the Center for Defense Information. I quote:

But I submit that any war with the Soviet Union is going to be a nuclear war. Once started, it is almost inevitable that a small nuclear war will rapidly become a big nuclear war. Neither we nor the Russians will permit the other side to get the upper hand in battle, so escalation is inevitable. General Rogers, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, recently said he believes there can be no such thing as a "limited" nuclear war; that "the use of theater nuclear weapons would, in fact, escalate to the strategic level, and very quickly." In the nuclear area, we could quite safely adopt a freeze on the production of nuclear weapons. . . . A freeze could be negotiated mutually with the Soviet Union. The United States today has upwards of 30,000 nuclear weapons, about 12,000 of which can be exploded on the Soviet Union. This is far more than sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union, even if they strike us first. If all the nuclear weapons the President has requested are produced, we will be able to explode 20,000 nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union by 1990. We simply have no offensive or defensive need for all these very expensive weapons.

The admiral finally ends with this statement, and this is a retired rear admiral of the Navy of this country:

"I would at the minimum eliminate the MX missile"—which we do in this substitute—"the B-1 bomber"—which we do in this substitute—"the Trident II missile"—which we do in this substitute—"the sea-launched cruise missiles, the Pershing II and the ground-launched cruise missiles"—which we do.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SAVAGE) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. DELLUMS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SAVAGE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

□ 1810

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman—

The sea-launched cruise missiles, the Pershing II and the ground-launched cruise missiles for Europe, Continental Air Defense Bombers, expanded A.B.M. programs, expanded civil defense programs and the new effort to acquire antisatellite capability.

All of these we do in this proposal. Here is a retired naval officer looking at the realities of what we are doing and saying that there is extraordinary room for us to cut these weapons.

A number of my colleagues suggest that this is in some way unilateral action. It is not unilateral action. What we are saying is, let us not develop new weapons that take us beyond deterrence to war-fighting capability, and let us not develop nuclear technology that gets beyond our ability to control. This is dangerous. This is what we are doing.

This is no modest effort. This is a clear rethinking of American foreign policy, a policy the assumptions upon which we have established a multibillion defense establishment in this country.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could reach an agreement as to the time of voting on the Dellums amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we commence voting at 6:45 p.m.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEAVER TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEAVER to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. DELLUMS: On page 14, after line 21, insert a new section 902:

The Secretary is hereby authorized to establish a military preparedness grain reserve. The sum of \$2,000,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 1983 to purchase corn, wheat, and soybeans and to construct storage facilities. The Secretary may use for guidance in such purchases the amounts of corn, wheat, and soybeans purchased by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in calendar year 1982.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DICKINSON. Does the gentleman insist on being heard on the amendment?

Mr. WEAVER. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DICKINSON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is not germane to the authorization bill now under discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I can hardly add to that. This authorizes the Secretary to establish a grain reserve of some \$2 billion for the purchase of grain. As a matter of fact, if the soybeans are bought from the Second District of Alabama, it might improve our economy, but I think this is not germane to the authorization matters under discussion, and I make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oregon wish to be heard?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I simply say that the amendment in the nature of a substitute contains, as does the bill before us, authorization to purchase food supplies for the military. This is just an additional procurement, a reserve of food supplies for the military.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule on the gentleman's point of order.

The Chair views the amendment as described by its author as an additional fiscal year 1983 military procurement amendment which does not affect any law or program within another committee's jurisdiction. The amendment is germane, the point of order is overruled, and the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleagues that what the gentleman from California has done in his substitute is to cut \$50 billion from the committee bill, and that my amendment adds \$2 billion. So, therefore, the net reduction would be a \$48 billion cut.

I would like to submit that this \$2 billion expenditure for military preparedness grain reserve would add more to the security of the United States than all the other entire \$50 billion that has been cut. If we really talk sense about our national security, we would see that food and food supply is a far more important thing to the security of this Nation within the entire world than are these weapons of holocaust and madness that simply jeopardize our security and do not enhance it.

Now, I would like to point out to my colleagues the farce—the farce and absurdity of our policy today. We spend billions and billions of dollars defending ourselves against the Soviet Union, and at the same time turn around and

sell the Soviet Union the single most important thing there is in the world, and that is food. We sell it to the Soviet Union at less than it costs our farmers to produce. We are presently selling billions of dollars worth of grain, millions of tons of grain, to the Soviet Union at a subsidy, at a billion-dollar subsidy. We are giving it away. As one Member has said, we are giving food stamps to the Soviet Union while cutting food stamps for our people here at home.

Now, what kind of sense does this make? Why, on the one hand, do we arm ourselves against the Soviet Union, and then on the other hand give them grain, needed grain? The Soviet Union has had three major crop failures now in the last 3 years. They are in trouble. Their invasion of Afghanistan has completely gone asunder, and they cannot even win that little war. Their major satellite nations, like Poland, are up in arms against them, and they are having trouble keeping them quiet. Forty-five of their greatest and crack divisions are on the Chinese border. They are in trouble, and what is our response but to help them, to help them, to give them our precious grain.

How can I vote for this bill? How can I vote my constituents tax money for any weapons when we are turning around and selling the Soviet Union grain at below the cost of production, and bankrupting our farmers? I do not see how I can do it, so I am saying, let us have the military buy this grain instead of the Soviet Union. Let us have our military have the grain and not give it to the Soviet Union. That is what my amendment does. It says \$2 billion, and our military can buy the grain.

Perhaps then I can go ahead with the Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, and offer an amendment that says, sell the Soviet Union grain at these base prices. If we can pass this amendment to this bill, then I think we can pass the amendment in the Agriculture Committee to stop selling the Soviet Union, or giving, in effect, the Soviet Union this grain.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) and all amendments thereto cease at 6:45 p.m., and that a vote be taken at that time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONYERS) there were—ayes 32, noes 8.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

□ 1820

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Members standing at the time the motion was agreed to will be recognized for 3 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this perhaps is the most embarrassing and extraordinary procedure of a floor manager on a bill of this magnitude that I have ever witnessed in my career.

For what reason, not even given, should this House terminate debate on the question of nuclear buildup for which we have been duly elected to decide on behalf of 275 million Americans?

Why, at this totally arbitrary moment in the evening, should we be told by the manager of this bill, who I have come to Congress with, served with, supported and worked with in the course of our careers, without even the courtesy of an explanation much less a discussion that we have tarried too long, necessitating this procedural gag rule which is worst of all sustained by a majority of the handful of Members on the floor?

I am embarrassed, sir. I resent and reject the manner in which you determined that the interests of the American people will best be served by the lack of debate.

I suggest that you do the gravest disservice to your views and to the American people for whom we have all been sent here to speak.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I will not yield to the gentleman because he has 3 minutes in which to respond, just like I have.

This is an outrage. I do not mind anybody in this floor disagreeing with this Member. I do not mind being voted down, as I have been, or supported, as I have been, in the course of my career.

But for a committee to come to the floor to discuss that unique subject that combines the questions of the future of the human race, our national security, and the possibility of nuclear holocaust; that begs the interests of our citizens from one end of this Nation to the other; in every city and town, this question is being debated, asked about, prayed over, marched over—and we have a chairman, a floor manager who has the arrogance to tell the Congress and the American people, "You have talked enough. I have got all the votes anyway, so what difference does it make if anybody disagrees? We are running this show. If we want to vote for more nuclear, more military, we not only will do it but we will do it without debate."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor the last hour and I did not notice anything arrogant and I did not notice anything over which somebody should be upset.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE) made the motion. By a careful count of the Chairman, the motion was sustained. That, I take it, is standard parliamentary procedure—the side with the majority prevails.

I see nothing about which anybody should be upset. In fact, I was a little worried since what we are really debating is not matters of temper between two normally gentle people. What we are debating is an amendment by the gentleman from Oregon, one of the great scholars of this body.

Yet I was afraid that when the gentleman offered his amendment that somebody might yield to temptation and call it mischievous, call it frivolous, call it irrelevant, because it could be that someone would have thought that.

But having the great regard that every Member does have for the gentleman from Oregon, we would merely say, that it is a very erroneous, ill-timed, impractical, unnecessary, and unworkable amendment.

The facts are that given the tremendous, tremendous surplus that we have in the agricultural area, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment and forced on the military the business of storing further agricultural products, the gentleman from Oregon, in his zeal for the well-being of the taxpayer, would be the first to accuse the military of letting the food in storage go to rot.

Certainly, we do not want that blame to be placed on the military. They are being accused of enough.

The next thing the gentleman from Oregon would want to do is to strip the silos of their necessary weapons to defend the country and store them with this surplus farm product that the military really does not want.

So I would say, given the nature of the debate which suddenly may have deteriorated, given the long hours, given the end of a tough day, that perhaps, as the Members who are watching in their offices come to the floor, just remember that the issue before us is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WEAVER) normally a very thoughtful, placid, responsible Member. But he has an amendment which I earnestly urge you to reject overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, when I first sought time I had not intended to address the issue of Israel and Lebanon, but my distinguished friend and colleague from Illinois who had taken the well in the interim chose the occasion to do so.

Just for the record, I want to say that it is my understanding that the Dellums substitute amendment has no mention at all about Israel or Lebanon. I know that all of us grieve and mourn for the lives of all lost in Lebanon, whether they be Israelis or Lebanese or Palestinians or Syrians, but to attack Israel as an aggressor when for the entire length of its existence it has been subject to the bitter enmity of her neighbors which have wanted to destroy her and drive her into the sea and, indeed, the people whom she is fighting currently have to this moment refused to recognize her existence is I think totally unfair, totally wrong, and totally out of place in this discussion.

□ 1830

As to the particular issue which we are debating, the Dellums substitute, my constituents constantly ask me, "When are you people going to do something about that awful military budget?" And they are talking about "that awful military budget" in two contexts—one, which I think the gentleman from California has brilliantly demonstrated, is the rush toward nuclear confrontation and nuclear holocaust. The American people are demanding of us that we do something to slow down that nuclear race. The gentleman from California, by his substitute, offers to do something about it. Second, they are asking of us: How can it be fair, when the social programs of this country are being cut to smithereens, to bloat even further an already bloated military budget, which in the 4 years of the Reagan administration is expected to more than double? At the same time that we are cutting so much out of the domestic programs, the President comes forward with a balanced budget constitutional amendment that he favors, which would take even more out of the hides of those who cannot afford it.

So I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California because he has done a great service to this body, more important, to the American public and to the cause of world peace.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, the projections for the Reagan military budget for the next 5 years come to \$1.7 trillion. I understand that inside the Pentagon that is viewed as a conservative estimate. Whether it is conservative or not, the fact is that if

you do the arithmetic, it amounts to approximately \$1 billion a day for every day of the next 5 years.

Now, the President likes to talk about how the Russian economy is a basket case. What do you think is happening to our economy? And what do you think is the reason? For every billion dollars that we spend on the Pentagon, we lose 9,000 jobs. On my reckoning, \$100 billion works out at about 900,000 jobs less, and a \$200-billion military budget works out at about 1.8 million jobs less in our economy.

Incidentally, \$1 billion a day is \$40 million an hour. You can use that as a yardstick in measuring some of the other spending bills we will be considering.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) has highlighted some egregiously wasteful and unnecessary military expenditures which his amendment would curtail. But even then, if you take the last 3 fiscal years, plus his amendment for fiscal 1983, you would still have approximately 3-percent real growth in defense spending which is what our country and NATO agreed to several years ago.

So I submit to you that his substitute would still result in a very, very large military budget.

Now, the solution, of course, to all of this would be if we could negotiate disarmament, not only nuclear disarmament but general disarmament. In that connection I would like to read one sentence from a recent letter that the President sent to the minority leader of the House. Here is what it says:

While it is my intention that MX not be a bargaining chip in the START negotiations, we need to secure the powerful leverage that a commitment to produce the MX would provide as we begin effective arms reduction talks with the Soviets.

Now, that is a non sequitur. Either it is a bargaining chip, in which case it gives us leverage in the negotiations, or it is not a bargaining chip, in which case it does not give us leverage. But that is the kind of thinking that we seem to be faced with on this whole subject of military spending, the Nation's economy, and the public's demand for an end to this wasteful, endlessly expanding weapons race that, if it is not soon brought under control, will inevitably destroy us all.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WEAVER).

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, the first vote that will occur upon the conclusion of the debate will be on the Weaver amendment, which creates a military preparedness grain reserve. And for those—and my beloved friend from Illinois, who is a scholar also—who think that that is mischievous, may I point out that a close reading of history will show that far more wars

have been won by those who controlled the food supply than those who had the weapons. Food is the essential for any kind of security and strength of the Nation. And we continue to give away our grain to the very nation considered our primary adversary and for whose benefit we are voting all of these billions of dollars in defensive weapons. We are giving the grain to the Soviet Union.

My amendment says that instead of giving our grain to the Soviet Union—and the Soviet Union has had three major crop failures in the last 3 years and it is in real trouble, and we are rushing to aid them by selling them and giving them grain at below the cost of production, bankrupting our farmers to boot—my amendment says our military will keep this grain, it will buy it from the farmers and keep it for our security. And let me tell you, that is true security, when you have that kind of strength. That is the kind of security that wins, in the long run, and keeps the Nation whole and intact.

I urge the Members to vote for the creation of a military preparedness grain reserve. It makes the most sense of anything, in my estimation, in the entire bill we have before us.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to extend my congratulations to the gentleman from California for his carefully prepared and carefully reasoned statement. I had wanted to comment on one part of it, but I did not want to interrupt the gentleman from California in the middle of his presentation. But one of the points that I noted with respect to the gentleman's comment was that he said that we had enough military capability for deterrence, but he did not want to have any more for fighting nuclear war. I think the fact of the matter is that, in order to have a credible deterrent, it is necessary for any potential adversary or enemy to recognize that if the deterrent does not deter, you have a capability of fighting whatever engagement it is you want to deter. The fellow who has bulging muscles but no real strength behind them is not going to deter the bully on the block. It is only the recognition that you really have not only what appears to look like a strong physique but you have got to have that physique itself. So I do not think the gentleman can make that kind of division. We have got to have nuclear weapons that represent a real assurance to the Soviet Union that if they attack they are going to get something back from us. Just where you draw that line is something that I do not think many people are prepared to say. It is not an easy question to answer.

Let me just say, if my time has not expired, that I urge the defeat of the Weaver amendment, and I reluctantly oppose the substitute of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the membership that we have counted at least 50 amendments that are pending or will be pending and probably will be offered. It was the desire to try to rise at approximately 7 o'clock; therefore, we selected 6:45. The gentleman from Michigan seems to be the only one who is exercised. The gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) certainly was not exercised. We started at about 4 o'clock, we have had about 2½ hours of time. I think a good part of that time the gentleman from Michigan had, too.

Now, as to the Weaver amendment itself, it is a totally new program without guidance as to how the funds would be allocated. It calls for expenditures of \$2 billion, when they are talking about trying to save money, and it also does not provide any guidance as to whom the purchases would be made. It says "for any purchases made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the calendar year 1982," which could be from anyone, Argentina, and the whole world. So I say that really the amendment itself gives no guidance, if you are talking about the amendment itself.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

□ 1840

Mr. DICKINSON. I have done my best to understand it. The amendment says the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish a military preparedness grain reserve.

Could the gentleman tell me—and I was going to ask the author but he would not yield—does this refer to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Army?

Mr. WHITE. It says the Secretary. It does not indicate. I am not sure whether by reference it would indicate the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. DICKINSON. Or perhaps the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITE. It could have been. It is hard to say. I do not know whether the author could enlighten us or not.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, since this is

something of an unusual procedure and we have all had an opportunity to speak, may I ask, is the gentleman speaking on the amendment pending or on his own amendment on which he has already spoken?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I simply want to conclude by thanking my colleagues.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, we are now at the end of the debate on the substitute, the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the committee print, H.R. 6030.

I join my colleague from Michigan in the desire and hope that we could have extended the nature of this debate but I understand the realities that are taking place.

I simply want to take the well to thank all of my colleagues who provided an opportunity for this discussion and debate to occur. I thank all of my colleagues who participated in this debate and I would finally say to the Chairman and members of the Committee, that this is not where it ends. We brought this substitute to the floor in order to broaden the parameters of the debate. We need to continue to challenge each other to think and to act and to be analytical. I feel part of my responsibility is to pose an alternative that I believe is appropriate and significant given the incredible dangers to our Nation and our world at this particular moment.

I thank all of my colleagues for their generosity and for the opportunity to engage in this debate.

As I said, we will be back next year and the year after that and the year after that until we right the wrongs in this madness.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The questions on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WEAVER) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 55, noes 348, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—55

Addabbo	Edwards (CA)	Rodino
AuCoin	Ford (TN)	Rosenthal
Bedell	Forsythe	Roybal
Bellenson	Frank	Sabo
Biaggi	Garcia	Savage
Bingham	Goldwater	Schroeder
Bonior	Gray	Schumer
Bonker	Harkin	Seiberling
Brodhead	Kastenmeyer	Stark
Burton, Phillip	Lehman	Stokes
Chisholm	Leland	Studds
Conyers	Lowry (WA)	Washington
Coyne, William	Markey	Weaver
Crockett	McKinney	Weiss
Dellums	Miller (CA)	Wolpe
Dixon	Oberstar	Wyden
Donnelly	Ottinger	Yates
Dymally	Rangel	
Edgar	Reuss	

NOES—348

Anderson	Dicks	Hall, Sam
Andrews	Dingell	Hamilton
Annunzio	Dorgan	Hammerschmidt
Anthony	Dornan	Hance
Applegate	Dougherty	Hansen (ID)
Archer	Dowdy	Hansen (UT)
Ashbrook	Downey	Hartnett
Aspin	Dreier	Hatcher
Atkinson	Duncan	Heckler
Badham	Dunn	Hefner
Bafalis	Dwyer	Heftel
Bailey (MO)	Dyson	Hendon
Barnard	Early	Hertel
Barnes	Eckart	Hightower
Beard	Edwards (AL)	Hiler
Benedict	Edwards (OK)	Hillis
Benjamin	Emerson	Holland
Bennett	Emery	Hollenbeck
Bereuter	English	Holt
Bethune	Erdahl	Hopkins
Bevill	Erlenborn	Horton
Bliley	Ertel	Howard
Boggs	Evans (GA)	Hoyer
Boland	Evans (IA)	Hubbard
Boner	Evans (IN)	Huckaby
Bouquard	Fary	Hughes
Breaux	Fascell	Hunter
Brinkley	Fazio	Hutto
Brooks	Fenwick	Hyde
Broomfield	Ferraro	Ireland
Brown (CA)	Fiedler	Jacobs
Brown (CO)	Fields	Jeffords
Broyhill	Findley	Jeffries
Butler	Fish	Jenkins
Byron	Fithian	Johnston
Campbell	Flippo	Jones (NC)
Carman	Florio	Jones (OK)
Carney	Foglietta	Kazen
Chappie	Foley	Kemp
Cheney	Ford (MI)	Kennelly
Clausen	Fountain	Kildee
Clinger	Fowler	Kindness
Coats	Frenzel	Kogovsek
Coelho	Frost	Kramer
Coleman	Fuqua	LaFalce
Collins (TX)	Gaydos	Lagamarsino
Conable	Gejdenson	Lantos
Conte	Gephardt	Latta
Corcoran	Gibbons	Leach
Coughlin	Gilman	Leath
Courter	Gingrich	LeBoutillier
Craig	Ginn	Lee
Crane, Daniel	Glickman	Lent
Crane, Phillip	Gonzalez	Levitas
D'Amours	Goodling	Lewis
Daniel, Dan	Gore	Livingston
Daniel, R. W.	Gradison	Loeffler
Dannemeyer	Gramm	Long (LA)
Daschle	Green	Long (MD)
Daub	Gregg	Lott
Davis	Grisham	Lowery (CA)
Deckard	Guarini	Lujan
DeNardis	Gunderson	Luken
Derrick	Hagedorn	Lungren
Derwinski	Hall (OH)	Madigan
Dickinson	Hall, Ralph	Marienee

Marriott	Patterson	Smith (NJ)
Martin (IL)	Paul	Smith (OR)
Martin (NC)	Pease	Smith (PA)
Martinez	Pepper	Snowe
Matsui	Perkins	Snyder
Mattox	Petri	Solarz
Mavroules	Pickle	Spence
Mazzoli	Porter	St Germain
McClory	Price	Stangeland
McCloskey	Pritchard	Staton
McCollum	Pursell	Stenholm
McCurdy	Quillen	Stratton
McDade	Rahall	Stump
McDonald	Railsback	Swift
McEwen	Ratchford	Synar
McGrath	Regula	Tauke
McHugh	Rhodes	Tauzin
Mica	Rinaldo	Taylor
Michel	Ritter	Thomas
Mikulski	Roberts (KS)	Traxler
Miller (OH)	Roberts (SD)	Udall
Mineta	Robinson	Vento
Minish	Roe	Volkmer
Mitchell (NY)	Roemer	Walgren
Moakley	Rogers	Walker
Moffett	Rostenkowski	Wampler
Molinari	Roth	Watkins
Montgomery	Roukema	Waxman
Moore	Rudd	Weber (MN)
Moorhead	Russo	Weber (OH)
Morrison	Santini	White
Mottl	Sawyer	Whitehurst
Murphy	Scheuer	Whitley
Murtha	Schneider	Whittaker
Myers	Schulze	Whitten
Napier	Sensenbrenner	Williams (MT)
Natcher	Shamansky	Williams (OH)
Neal	Shannon	Wilson
Nelligan	Sharp	Winn
Nelson	Shaw	Wirth
Nichols	Shelby	Wolf
Nowak	Shumway	Wortley
O'Brien	Shuster	Wright
Oakar	Siljander	Wylie
Obey	Simon	Yatron
Oxley	Skeen	Young (AK)
Panetta	Skelton	Young (FL)
Parris	Smith (AL)	Young (MO)
Pashayan	Smith (IA)	Zablocki
Patman	Smith (NE)	Zeferetti

NOT VOTING—31

Akaka	Clay	Mollohan
Albosta	Collins (IL)	Peyster
Alexander	Coyne, James	Richmond
Bailey (PA)	de la Garza	Rose
Blanchard	Evans (DE)	Rousselot
Bolling	Hawkins	Solomon
Bowen	Jones (TN)	Stanton
Brown (OH)	Lundine	Trible
Burgener	Marks	Vander Jagt
Burton, John	Martin (NY)	
Chappell	Mitchell (MD)	

□ 1900

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Richmond for, with Mr. Akaka against.

Mr. Mitchell of Maryland for, with Mr. Jones of Tennessee against.

Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Chappell against.

Mr. RUSSO changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate title I.

Title I reads as follows:

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons and tracked combat vehicles, and ammunition

and for other procurement for the Army as follows:

For aircraft, \$2,541,600,000.
 For missiles, \$2,898,500,000.
 For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, \$4,707,700,000.
 For ammunition \$2,439,000,000.
 For other procurement, \$4,509,500,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 102. (a) AIRCRAFT.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for procurement of aircraft for the Navy in the amount of \$11,424,500,000.

(b) WEAPONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for procurement of weapons (including missiles and torpedoes) for the Navy as follows:

For missile programs, \$3,068,600,000.
 For the MK-48 torpedo program, \$144,300,000.
 For the MK-46 torpedo program, \$141,200,000.
 For the MK-60 torpedo program, \$151,400,000.
 For the MK-30 mobile target program, \$19,400,000.

For the MK-38 mini-mobile target program, \$2,300,000.

For the anti-submarine rocket (ASROC) program, \$10,100,000.

For the modification of torpedoes, \$89,300,000.

For the torpedo support equipment program, \$66,900,000.

For the MK-15 close-in weapons system program, \$118,700,000.

For the MK-75 76-millimeter gun mount program, \$10,700,000.

For the MK-19 gun mount program, \$400,000.

For the 25-millimeter gun mount program, \$400,000.

For the modification of guns and gun mounts, \$19,700,000.

For the guns and gun mounts support equipment program, \$17,500,000.

(c) SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for shipbuilding and conversion for the Navy as follows:

For the Trident submarine program, \$1,786,000,000.

For the CVN nuclear aircraft carrier program, \$6,795,300,000.

For the SSN-688 nuclear attack submarine program, \$1,443,400,000.

For the battleship reactivation program, \$417,400,000.

For the aircraft carrier service life extension program, \$699,500,000.

For the CG-47 Aegis cruiser program, \$3,134,400,000.

For the LSD-41 landing ship dock program, \$417,000,000.

For the LHD-1 air-capable amphibious ship program, \$55,000,000.

For the FFG-7 guided missile frigate program, \$706,400,000, of which \$40,000,000 is available only for the installation of an X-band phased array radar.

For the mine countermeasures (MCM) ship program, \$371,600,000.

For the T-AO fleet oiler ship program, \$320,000,000.

For the ARS salvage ship program, \$84,000,000.

For the TAKRX fast logistic ship program, \$322,600,000.

For the TAHX hospital ship program, \$300,000,000.

For service craft and landing craft, \$162,100,000.

For outfitting, post delivery, cost growth, and escalation on prior year programs, \$1,091,500,000.

For ship contract design, \$97,200,000.

For the manufacturing technology program, \$25,000,000.

(d) OTHER.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for other procurement for the Navy in the amount of \$3,959,000,000, of which—

(1) the sum of \$568,900,000 is available only for the ship support equipment program;

(2) the sum of \$1,477,600,000 is available only for the communications and electronics equipment program; and

(3) the sum of \$787,200,000 is available only for the ordnance support equipment program.

(e) PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, track combat vehicles, and other weapons) in the amount of \$1,984,900,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 103. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force as follows:

For aircraft, \$17,243,400,000.

For missiles, \$6,333,300,000.

For other procurement, \$5,656,700,000.

(b) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated in this section for aircraft for the Air Force, the sum of \$186,100,000 is available only for contribution by the United States as its share of the cost for fiscal year 1983 of acquisition by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1983 for procurement by the Defense agencies in the amount of \$863,400,000.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 105. Effective on October 1, 1982, section 103(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100), is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1982" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1983".

PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 101 may be obligated or expended for the construction or conversion of a naval vessel, or a major component of the hull or superstructure of a naval vessel, in a foreign shipyard.

CONSTRUCTION OR CONVERSION OF NEW HOSPITAL SHIP IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARD

SEC. 107. The T-AH hospital ship for which funds are authorized to be appropriated by section 101 shall be constructed in a United States shipyard or, if such ship is converted from an existing ship, shall be converted in a United States shipyard from a ship built in a United States shipyard.

PROHIBITION OF ACQUISITION OF 9-MILLIMETER HANDGUN

SEC. 108. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this Act may be obligated or ex-

pended in connection with the purchase of a 9-millimeter handgun for the Armed Forces or to carry out any activity concerned with evaluating the feasibility or desirability of purchasing a 9-millimeter handgun for the Armed Forces.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAVROULES

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAVROULES: Page 6, line 14, strike out "\$6,333,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,191,400,000".

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely concerned with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) which proposes spending cuts of \$2.1 billion including cuts in aircraft systems that are vital to our Nation's conventional defenses. I fail to see merit in a proposal to cut funding for the F-14, our Navy's primary fleet defense weapons system; the F-15 and the F-16, the Air Force's air superiority fighters; and the AWACS system, our primary early-warning aircraft system. These systems are critical for our conventional strength, and I cannot support proposals to cut these programs in the face of a constantly increasing threat to our forces' air superiority capabilities.

Too often we are reminded by tragic world events of the vital need for a strong conventional defense. Already we have seen our Nation with all its sophisticated nuclear might unable to protect a credible stabilizing military posture when it was vitally needed. Despite this, we are once again being asked to cut back our conventional strength. We must ask ourselves, can we truly afford this reduction? I do not think we should be considering reductions in systems of proven capability and which are vitally needed while we are asked to fund nuclear systems of questionable capability, questionable value, questionable need, and outrageous cost.

I believe the people of this country demand a strong defense, and I believe this body is obligated to soundly and wisely provide that defense. I do not believe the defense of this country is best served by funding cuts from our Nation's best and most capable systems.●

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 6696 because it provides Congress with an opportunity to provide for a strong national defense and, at the same time, recognize the constraints of an unhealthy economy, apply much-needed standards of efficiency and cost effectiveness to the military budget, and address the growing risk of a nuclear confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Careful examination of this bill makes it abundantly clear that we do not seek to hamstring our Armed Forces or send provocative signals to

our adversaries by irresponsibly slashing defense spending. H.R. 6696 provides for levels of defense expenditures which substantially exceed levels sought by the Carter and Reagan administrations and approved by the Congress. At the same time, this bill recognizes the need for restraint in the increases in defense spending proposed in the committee bill, H.R. 6030. Restraint is clearly called for, Mr. Chairman, not only because we are in a period of economic austerity that calls for belt tightening—and that means everybody's belt, the Pentagon included—but because the committee bill does not deal adequately with a clear pattern of waste and inefficiency in defense spending.

The catalog of wasteful and unessential defense spending runs from unscrutinized and often duplicative procurement procedures, which waste millions of taxpayer dollars and result in unneeded or obsolete weapons development, to millions for military bands and expenditures for veterinary services for the pets of military personnel.

Let there be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, the debate here is not on whether or not we provide for the national defense. The debate is, or should be, over whether in providing for a strong national defense we are willing to apply the same standards of economy and efficiency that are wheeled out whenever there is an opportunity to salvage a nonmilitary expenditure.

If we are unwilling to apply the budget-cutter's scalpel to the defense budget; if we are unwilling to trim defense spending at a time when other programs essential to the health and safety and survival of millions of Americans are slashed; if we seek out waste and inefficiency only where it is politically convenient—we have confirmed the darkest suspicions of those who view the budget-cutting mentality of the Congress with deep alarm. They believe that the debate is a matter of guns or butter, rather than a question of how to provide both guns and butter in an equitable manner during a time of fiscal austerity. If we fail to force the Pentagon to seek out waste and inefficiency by trimming its budget, we will have proved the critics right. We will have demonstrated that rather than cutting the budget, we simply transferred funds from essential social programs to defense.

There is, however, a reason to approve H.R. 6696 that transcends the economic concerns I have raised here. A clear thrust of this bill is the systematic reduction in procurement and research and development of weapons systems that represent a threat to peace, rather than an enhancement of our national security. An increase in the number and sophistication of non-verifiable and invulnerable systems like the MX missile and the Trident

II, Pershing II, and cruise missiles can only result in a speedup in the arms race by the Soviet Union. Moscow is not likely to view such weapons in a context that will enhance our ability to secure meaningful reductions in the levels of nuclear weapons on both sides. It is one thing to debate the relative levels of nuclear preparedness—ours and theirs—and the best means for achieving reasonable and meaningful reductions in those levels. It is another matter entirely to embark on a clear escalation of the arms race through the development of destabilizing weapons and then cite the Soviet response as an indication of their lack of commitment to arms reduction. I am deeply concerned about the impact the development of such weapons will have on world peace.

There is, in H.R. 6696, nothing that should give pause to those who are committed to a strong national defense. There is nothing in H.R. 6696 that should trouble those of you whose first concern is a realistic and equitable reduction in Federal spending. There is, in this bill, an opportunity for this body to apply standards of economy and efficiency which are in real danger of being discredited by those who see the need for fiscal restraint as a golden opportunity to destroy programs which are essential sources of assistance and protection for millions of America's most needy citizens.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill gives us an opportunity to speak out on the danger to world peace which an unbridled arms race represents. Our substitute to the committee bill represents a step forward in our recognition of the fact that we are responsible for the consequences of our actions with regard to nuclear weapons development and that the consequences of the unrestrained development of destabilizing weapons are frightening indeed.●

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. AuCOIN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6030) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1983 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, and for operation and maintenance, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for civilian employees of the Department of Defense, to authorize appropriations for such fiscal year for civil defense, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO SIT TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to sit tomorrow morning, July 21, during proceedings under the 5-minute rule for the purpose of considering its reconciliation proposals.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5320, JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 97-647) on the resolution (H. Res. 527) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5320) to establish a community public-private training and employment assistance system and to provide employment and training services, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5203, INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1982

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 97-648) on the resolution (H. Res. 528) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5203) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5427, RADIO BROADCASTING TO CUBA ACT

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 97-649) on the resolution (H. Res. 529) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5427) to authorize support to Radio Broadcasting to Cuba, Incorporated, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2329, JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN COURTS TO RENDER JUDGMENT ON CERTAIN CLAIMS OF THE CHEROKEE INDIANS

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 97-650) on the resolution (H. Res. 530) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2329) conferring jurisdiction on certain courts of the United States to hear and render judgment in connection with certain claims of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANTAGONISM TOWARD AMERICAN MILITARY PRESENCE IN GERMANY

(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, I must report to you and my other colleagues that a crude and unwarranted insult has been heaped upon the United States by our allies the West Germans. It has come to my attention that private requests have been made that we send fewer black soldiers to units stationed in Germany. Disregarding any statement on the present composition of our Armed Forces, I must say that in my whole life I have never heard a more ungrateful or objectional request. America has 300,000 of our best troops stationed in Europe to deter or defend that area from attack. For the main host nation to attempt to tell us which members of our Army or our society we can defend them with is outrageous.

In looking into this matter I have learned that there have been a growing number of violent incidents inflicted on American servicemen in Germany. Apparently these attacks have been directed against troops in uniform and against our black troops even in civilian dress because those men and women are assumed to be servicemen. The problem indicates a growing antagonism toward American military presence in Germany. There are Members of this body who have been advocating a reduction of our forces in Europe. I must say that an action like this will win more converts to that cause. I have been a proponent of our allies sharing more of the burden of their own defense, but these incidents leave me with the feeling that if they do not like our troops in their country then maybe we should just let them do it all by themselves.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTION IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 6530, ESTABLISHING THE MOUNT ST. HELENS NATIONAL VOLCANIC AREA

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 6530) to establish the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Area, and for other purposes, as amended, as passed yesterday, the Clerk be authorized to make a technical correction in section 4(c)(3)(B)(i) to change "Township 4" to "Township 14."

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is purely technical; is that correct?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a typographical error.

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

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order speech today by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BEDELL).

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

There was no objection.

CYPRUS AFTER 8 YEARS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the 8th year of the Turkish occupation of the sovereign nation of Cyprus. Unfortunately, an end to the occupation does not seem as if it will occur in the near future. Yesterday, we debated House Concurrent Resolution 310 relating to Cyprus, and this afternoon we will vote on the resolution.

All of us are probably familiar with the tragic statistics which have become synonymous with Cyprus in our lexicon. Because of the very magnitude of those statistics, however, and because they have remained virtually unchanged for 8 years, I fear that we may lose sight of their significance. It is sometimes easier to relate to individual tragedies than to massive tragedies whose magnitude numbs our minds.

It is easy to understand the grief of the mother of Andrew Kassapis, an American citizen and native of Michigan who disappeared during the inva-

sion 8 years ago. Almost every one of us knows the pain we would incur if one of our own children disappeared under similar circumstances. It is more difficult to fathom the grief, though, when we realize that Mr. Kassapis is one of about 2,000 people for whom there has never been an accounting; 2,000 families share the grief of the Kassapis family.

Similarly, we can relate to the tragedy of a small number of families being forced to leave their homes because of a natural disaster. We know how difficult it is for them to resume a normal life. Try to conceive, however, the dimensions of the tragedy on Cyprus where 200,000 Greek and Turkish Cypriots have become displaced persons and not only lost their homes and possessions but also lost their jobs and the very communities around which their lives had been structured. Imagine the trauma each of them has experienced and try to multiply that by 200,000.

I fear that with the passage of time, these tragedies will lose their full significance, and the present situation will assume a degree of permanence. We cannot permit that to happen. Yesterday, I spoke of the lessons which the youth of Cyprus must be learning and the resentment fostered by current conditions. The thoughts shaping the character of the next generation of Cypriots are not thoughts of love and toleration.

We should be compelled by the tragic circumstances in Cyprus to find a just solution. We have a moral responsibility not to turn our heads and ignore the suffering. A failure to act will only make the task more difficult in the years to come. I appeal to our friends on both sides to be more yielding in their positions and to put less emphasis on political considerations and more emphasis on what may be done to end the suffering of thousands of individuals and to help them resume a normal life. Finally, I would ask our own Government to place a higher priority on finding a solution and encouraging the parties to take actions that will benefit all Cypriots in the future.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICA

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I believe it is important for all of us to step back and look at the great privileges and awesome responsibilities we share as Americans. Rarely have I seen these rights and privileges more clearly and forcefully expressed than in the essay by Amanda Miller entitled "My Responsi-

bility to America." Amanda, 11 years old, from Chula Vista is this year's winner of the highly competitive essay contest sponsored by the Lions Club of Chula Vista.

Amanda has a wealth of insight on what it means to be an American. She says in part:

When my ancestors from Russia, Scotland, and Ireland, came to this country, they were given the right to be free and they accepted the responsibility of protecting and defending that freedom. This responsibility has been passed to me. I accept it proudly. I must ask myself what I can do to earn the right to call myself an American.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the entire text of Amanda's essay into the RECORD. I believe my colleagues can benefit, as I have, by reading the thought-provoking words of this young American leader, Amanda Miller.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICA

(By Amanda Miller)

"My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:"

America is my country. Every time I stand to salute the flag the words "democracy" and "liberty" sing in my heart. I am proud to say that I am an American.

This country is a true "original," one of a kind. Made up of all nationalities, America has sheltered, for more than 200 years, every man and woman who has sought freedom.

The inscription on the Statue of Liberty, which stands proudly in New York Harbor, reads: "Give me your tired, your poor. Your huddled masses yearning to be free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

When my ancestors from Russia, Scotland, and Ireland came to this country, they were given the right to be free, and they accepted the responsibility of protecting and defending that freedom. This responsibility has been passed to me. I accept it proudly. I must ask myself what I can do to earn the right to call myself an American.

I can exercise my right to vote whenever possible. I can work hard and pay taxes to support the country. Conserving and protecting natural resources is another way in which I can be a responsible American. Working to have a strong and loving family is important because the strength of America is in the family.

I believe that education is a cornerstone of America, and that new ideas and progress come from people who have had the opportunity to learn and to share their thoughts.

"Land where my Fathers died
Land of the Pilgrim's pride"

I call myself an American by birth, but that does not mean I can take the rights set in the Declaration of Independence for granted.

I can have a good life and it is my responsibility to try to make others lives hopeful, safe and secure. If I am a good friend and neighbor, kind and thoughtful, then I will have earned some right to call myself an American.

The Constitution of the United States, written by visionary men has guaranteed us freedom for almost 200 years. Each Ameri-

can citizen should realize what a precious guarantee it is. When we realize what the Constitution stands for—liberty and justice—only then will we understand how much freedom in America is worth and that it is worth defending and dying for.

"from every mountainside
let freedom ring!"

The great frontiersman, Daniel Boone, was my seventh great-grandfather. As the nation moved westward he led pioneers to new settlements in Kentucky and Tennessee. He was part of the land and treated it with respect. The pioneer spirit has been passed down through our family. To endure hardships, to try new ideas, and to love, nurture, and defend the soil—this is part of our heritage.

As America leads the world into the future, I hope for peace. I hope I can be a part of contributing to that peace. In the words of John Donne, "No man is an island, intire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the maine . . . any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind . . ."

I am an American and I am responsible.

□ 1910

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF ACTIVITY FOR IDA NUDEL

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

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the warm response I have had from my colleagues to our request for a special order today to recognize the importance of this day, an International Day of Activity for Ida Nudel. Individuals and organizations all over the world are sending telegrams to the Soviet authorities reading, "Stop harassing Ida Nudel! Allow her to join her sister in Israel!"

What has prompted this international cry? It is another of a series of episodes that have characterized Ida Nudel's 11-year struggle to leave the oppression of the Soviet Union and be reunited with her sister in Israel.

I would like to read to you excerpts from a letter I received this week from Elena Friedman, Ida Nudel's sister. The letter is dated June 27. She says:

Ida's release from Siberian exile and her return to her Moscow apartment on March 26 sparked hope and anticipation in my heart. I thought it might be the first step toward our long-awaited reunion in Israel. Instead, it turned out to be the beginning of a new round of the Soviet authorities' campaign to further embitter her life. This time they have evidently decided to throw her into a bureaucratic maze which seems to provide no way out and is obviously designed to strangle her hope and spirit.

Since this letter was written, events in the Soviet Union seem to prove that Elena Friedman is correct. Ida Nudel's first step upon returning to Moscow was to get an ID from the Moscow Police. Her second step was to fill out a new application for an exit visa, re-

newing her efforts to leave the Soviet Union for Israel.

At the visa office she was told that applications were accepted only from residents and she must apply for a residence permit. She did this, and was turned down. Forced out of Moscow for her determination in seeking a visa, she tried to join friends in Riga, the capital city of Latvia. Denied permission to reside there, she spent the night on a bench in the Riga train station.

This courageous woman, who has suffered so much at the hands of the Soviet authorities, is again the focus of their attention. For 11 years she has been harassed, arrested, beaten, tortured, and starved—all because she wants to join her sister in Israel and has tried to buoy the spirits of others who also would like to go to Israel.

These years have taken their toll on this woman. She has numerous ailments, including a heart condition that went untreated during her 4-year Siberian exile. During her stay in Moscow, she was unable to get medical help, as the hospitals are reserved for residents.

Throughout Ida Nudel's struggle, I have supported her. I have sent telegrams and letters to the Soviet authorities, and most recently, last week, when I first learned that she had been forced to leave Moscow. I have corresponded with her sister in Israel, Elena Fridman. We have signed, many of us in this House, many letters, many resolutions, and spoken out on her behalf.

I urge my colleagues and all concerned people all over the world of every religion to join in protesting the treatment Ida Nudel has received.

In 1980, I adopted Ida Nudel, thereby signifying that I would consistently and continuously work for her cause until such time as we, together with her sister in Israel, would be able to secure her release. The work is not done, and those colleagues who have fought on her behalf are fighting again. What we say to the Soviet authorities is that we will continue to work, and we will be here again and again and again until her freedom is secured and justice is achieved.

This month I was joined by many in this House in a message to President Reagan urging that he put the issue of human rights, and particularly the case of Ida Nudel, on the agenda in his forthcoming talks with Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev on the topic of the nuclear arms reduction.

We in Congress, concerned not only with Ida Nudel but with all the other dissidents and all those whose religious rights are discriminated against and denied, must lift our voices today to join in this international chorus directed at the Soviet Union. The Chorus says, "Stop harassing Ida

Nudel! Allow her to join her sister in Israel!"

We live in freedom because we constantly fight to see freedom achieved, and we must fight to see freedom extended to others.

Today, somewhere in the Soviet Union, Ida Nudel is by herself; she is alone; she is searching for a place where the authorities will let her live, and she is searching for the opportunity to renew her attempts to go to Israel, where her only close relative, her sister, resides.

I call upon the Soviet authorities to end their psychic barbarism of this woman. She has suffered enough. She has been a Prisoner of Conscience, vainly attempting for 11 years to emigrate to Israel. During all this time Ida has been arrested countless times, imprisoned, harassed by authorities, beaten, starved, and kept in isolation. Last March, she was permitted to return after 4 years sentence in Siberian labor camp for what the Soviets called "malicious hooliganism."

Ida Nudel today is still the victim of psychic barbarism, and we in Congress who support her cause plead that the Soviet authorities will take cognizance of the world outcry against their barbarism and grant Ida Nudel her freedom.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HECKLER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman for her long enduring, courageous struggle on behalf of Ida Nudel, and on behalf of other Soviet citizens who have long sought release; and commend the gentlewoman for arranging this special order so that, along with her, many of our colleagues can express themselves with regard to this very important cause.

Mr. Speaker, it was only recently that I called to the attention of my colleagues the continuing plight of Ida Nudel, whose 11-year struggle to emigrate to Israel from the Soviet Union has resulted in a long and difficult struggle. Today I am pleased to join my colleagues in dedicating this day as the day of international solidarity with Ida Nudel.

When I last addressed the cause of Ida Nudel, it was to once again urge that Ida be released from the Soviet Union, and allowed to emigrate to Israel, where her family has long awaited her. After 4 years of exile in Siberia, Ida Nudel's imprisonment ended in April of this year. Upon her return to Moscow she was met with further harassment and was informed by the Soviet authorities that she would have to report periodically to local police. Ida has now been denied a permit to live in Moscow. Not only is Ida forbidden to emigrate to Israel, to

join her sister Elena and to live among loved ones, she is also forbidden to live in her former neighborhood, the place where her remaining ties are, and with which she is most comfortable and familiar.

After Ida was denied a permit to live in Moscow, she temporarily assumed residence in Riga, the capital of the Latvian S.S.R. Again, she was refused residency, and reports indicate that she continues to move from place to place, attempting to secure a resident's permit and being forced to sleep on benches in train stations. What next, we ask. Will the Soviets next arrest Ida and sentence the 51-year-old woman into exile for sleeping on a park bench as a result of their refusal to grant her a residency permit?

We join in Ida's suffering on this day of international solidarity. But the suffering is far greater because Ida is far from alone in her struggle. Our most recent information indicates that only 182 Soviet Jews arrived in Vienna, with Israeli visas, from the Soviet Union during the month of June. This is a decrease of 96 percent from the 4,500 Jews who received exit visas in June of 1979. This represents the sharpest decline in emigration since it effectively began in 1971. During the first half of this year, about 1,500 Jews arrived in Vienna from the Soviet Union. During the first half of 1979, 25,000 Jews received exit visas. Last year, only 9,447 Jews were permitted to emigrate, as compared to the 51,320 who were granted visas in 1979.

Today is a day of solidarity, not just for Ida Nudel, but also for Anatoly Shcharansky, for Mark Nashpitz, and, in fact, for the 500,000 Soviet Jews who, like Ida Nudel, have continually applied for, and have been denied, exit visas, and who have been harassed, imprisoned, persecuted and exiled solely because they do not choose to remain residents of the Soviet Union.

I recently spoke in behalf of Ida Nudel, and today I am speaking again. I will continue to work for Ida's release, and will continue to oppose the distressing violation of human rights in the Soviet Union. We must demonstrate to the Soviet Union that we have not tired of this issue. We will not give up our fight for what we know to be a vital cause. I urge my colleagues to join in this day of solidarity for Ida Nudel, and for the 500,000 Soviet Jews who have applied for exit visas, and I ask that we all join together in an effort to assist the emigration of Soviet Jews and the release of all Prisoners of Conscience in the Soviet Union.

□ 1920

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. HECKLER. I wish to thank my colleague for his comments. I think he

has continued to make a very impressive contribution to the issue and concern not only of the freedom of Ida Nudel, but that of all Soviet dissidents who deserve and await the conscience of the world.

As my colleague spoke, I must respond that as we hear of the figures of the exit visas and the limitation upon the right of exit, one wonders how a great United States of America could be achieved if indeed exit visas had been required from every country. How would the Irish and the Poles and the Italians and Portuguese have had the opportunity to come to this country to form the melting pot that is America, and today the right of exit, the right to choose one's country is denied simply because of one's religious faith in the Soviet Union, and that particularly which pertains to Ida Nudel as well as others of other religious faiths.

Today's special order is designated to focus upon the psychic barbarism that the Soviet Union has inflicted upon Ida Nudel and that hallmark of their treatment of all others under their jurisdiction all over the world.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HECKLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. First and foremost I want to commend the gentlewoman from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts for her untiring efforts to speak out for those who are seemingly so forgotten behind all of the various curtains of oppression around the world.

Today is a very fitting day for people throughout the free world to speak out for a real 20th century hero like Ida Nudel because this is a day that went down in the history books of mankind for a stunning scientific achievement, that one step of a man that became a giant step for mankind when an American astronaut really, for all human beings on the planet Earth, walked on our nearest celestial body, the Moon, and showed just how far this tiny little mortal existence on this planet can go in reaching out for the stars.

But it seems like the world always seems to go in two directions at the same time. As we move forward with great scientific and medical achievements, as some people reach out with tentative little moves toward democracy, and other continents that have known nothing but oppression for all of recorded history, we see other areas of the world slipping backward into a dark age again where one lonely voice of someone who simply wants to join a relative somewhere in the world or speak out for a little bit of freedom, we see that person crushed.

I was in Moscow shortly after Ida Nudel made her courageous statement for justice, hanging a sheet out over

her apartment balcony on that great boulevard called Gorki Prospect in Moscow. Shortly thereafter the door was kicked down by big, strong policemen from the KGB and other authorities there.

It did not dampen her spirit at all. I received, as did some of the Members participating in this special order, a letter from Elena Fridman, her sister, thanking me. For what? It seems like in 6 years here whatever we do is such a small effort, and that is why it is so great of the gentlewoman to keep pushing and pushing.

I remember in traveling to Moscow for one of my five trips there with my good friend and colleague from New York, the Honorable BENJAMIN GILMAN, that we were with a group of 10 Congressmen and we met in the Kremlin itself at a long paneled desk in a beautiful room in what they called the Congress, with representatives from all levels of government.

I happened to be sitting directly across from the chief justice of their supreme court, a very grandfatherly looking man with white hair and noble features that would have indicated that he was a justice from any country on the face of the Earth.

When we brought up the human rights stand, all 10 of the Congressmen had on bracelets remembering Anatoly Shcharansky, who a few months before had been sent off to a long, lone sentence in Siberia. His last words were "Next year in Jerusalem." His spirit has not been broken.

We had met with his brother, Leonold, his mother. We all showed that we wore a bracelet for one simple human being whose human rights were being violated, the chief justice of the Soviet Supreme Court said that human rights was only a tool of propaganda of the West.

How wrong this grandfatherly looking man is. Human rights does not originate in the West. It originates in those far-off camps of concentrated human beings, political prisoners everywhere and in every dark corner of this planet, and the spirit or love for freedom that burns so vividly in the hearts of courageous women like Ida Nudel, her sister in Israel who will not let her be forgotten, with people all over the world who simply want to be able to move with freedom or speak out with simple freedom about what they think is the fairest concept of political justice.

That flame is never going to be extinguished as long as there is one man or woman standing erect on two legs anywhere here on this planet.

I think if we keep our pressure up, the gentlewoman keeps her work up with her colleagues from the great State of Massachusetts, and the two New Yorkers that I see here on the

floor with us, every now and then something magnificent happens.

A nun who has known persecution for most of her adult life, from her early twenties to her late forties, has just been released.

I remember walking through the night in Riga, Latvia, where Ida Nudel has tried to set up her new residence.

In seeking out some of the dissidents, I found out their mailboxes had been pried off, smashed in and broken, and the door to the mailbox was all that remained of one prominent member of the Helsinki team living in Riga.

There is not a corner of what is the Soviet Empire that does not have its pentacostals, its refuseniks, its dissidents of some type speaking out for the right to teach Hebrew as a native language, the right to study scripture, the right to speak out about politics. It just simply is not going to go away, no matter how it is characterized by the chief justice of their supreme court.

I think that if Ida Nudel keeps her fighting heart, and there is no indication that she will not, that sooner or later she will be with her sister in Israel and that she will be visiting with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts in one of the anterooms or dining rooms here, and she will be telling us about some other courageous woman or senior citizen or young man or young girl who is now in need of our assistance.

I think one of the noblest things we can do here in the Senate of the United States and in the great House of Representatives is to constantly make contact with those people whose names come to the fore, to pick days of solidarity like this, and to pick days that already have historical significance like this great day of July 20 when American astronauts first walked on the Moon.

□ 1930

Walking on the Moon is important, but getting freedom for any one single heroic person anywhere in the world who reaches for their rights and for the rights of their fellow citizens, that is far more important, even if it is not recorded in the history books, than any scientific or medical achievement. The spirit of freedom in the world is still the greatest thing that has ever been wrought by man, religious freedom, freedom of speech, freedom to assemble. The Soviets can spend all of the energy they want trying to suppress this, but it is like a mercury thermometer breaking open and you try to press your thumb down on that chemical substance, the more you push on it, the more little parts it breaks into, the more directions it flies off into. The greatest thing about the indomitable spirit of human beings is that they will always reach out for freedom and speak out, even if it

means that they will be crushed as individuals.

Ida Nudel, God bless you, God bless your sister Elena, and God bless everyone in the world who speaks out for human rights. The seemingly forgotten heroes, they are not forgotten.

Mrs. HECKLER. My colleague has spoken eloquently on an issue that I think touches all of our lives and our consciences. I think with his sharing of his international experience in Moscow, we understand the dimensions of the Ida Nudel odyssey, because we come here to stand behind Ida Nudel, but also behind all that she symbolizes, the fight for freedom of religion and freedom of exit, freedom to choose where one will live and what one will eat, and the freedom to live a life of one's own choice. Ida Nudel, Shcharansky, and so many others come to mind. But in fighting for the quest of freedom, we also fight for the survival of humankind.

I think my colleague from California has made a very unique contribution, in that he has offered the inspiration that the freedom for Ida Nudel will indeed be a great leap forward for humankind. I think that it is sad for those of us in the House who have served with our colleague from California to know that his eloquent voice will not always be available. We do expect it to return in this body or another, we do feel for those eloquent words that he has submitted on so many different issues, and we know that his contribution will be memorable in whatever role he may fulfill.

I take this time to urge Soviet authorities—both those in the Soviet Union and their representatives in the United States—to listen to the protests of the world. Ida Nudel has suffered enough. Let her go to Israel.

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in focusing attention on the plight of a very courageous woman, Ida Nudel, who has steadfastly clung to the dream she has worked toward for so many years—to emigrate to the State of Israel.

Ida's struggle with Soviet authorities exemplifies the indefatigable spirit carried by many prisoners of conscience who have had to endure Soviet oppression and harassment. Her case is one more glaring example of the Soviet Union's refusal to honor its commitments under the Helsinki accords. In serving her sentence of internal exile to Siberia from 1978 to March of this year, Ida clung to the hope that she would one day be able to live a life of dignity and happiness in Israel, bolstered by the thousands of letters of support she received from friends around the world.

Elena Friedman, Ida's sister in Israel, expressed the thoughts we all had in a letter she wrote me last month:

Ida's release from Siberian exile and her return to her Moscow apartment sparked hope and anticipation in my heart. I thought it might be the first step toward our long-awaited reunion in Israel. Instead it turned out to be the beginning of a new round of the Soviet authorities' campaign to further embitter her life.

Ida's indomitable spirit continues to prevail. She has stood firm against Soviet officialdom's attempts to erode her will by subjecting her to the machinations of impenetrable bureaucracy which Elena writes "seems to provide no way out and is obviously designed to strangle her hope and spirit." Obviously, the Soviets do not know our Ida. She will continue to fight until she is freed from the bonds of Soviet oppression and intimidation.

This is a part of the Soviet policy to deny Jews the right to emigrate to their homeland. There has been an incredible disparity in the emigration figures of 1982 and 1979—96 percent! According to the figures of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, only 182 Jews were permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union this past June, compared to 4,500 in June of 1979; only 1,500 in the first 6 months of this year compared with 25,000 for the same period in 1979. These are people we are talking about—not just statistics.

Ida is a particularly affecting victim of this policy. How ironic that a woman whose only crime has been to assert her entitlement to a basic human right should be in the forefront of those denied their exit visas. We cannot abandon our efforts on behalf of this brave woman, and all the other refuseniks. We must continue to be active in support of Ida's efforts to seek redress from the Soviet Union, continue to make ourselves heard so that the Soviet Union will know that Ida is renowned throughout the world as a fighter, a leader, and that she and others like her will not be forgotten; that the United States and all freedom-loving people everywhere will raise their voices in protest of the unjust, illegal, and inhumane treatment of Ida Nudel and all other refuseniks.●

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was only 5 days ago that I received a letter from Elena Fridman on behalf of her sister Ida Nudel, a Soviet Jewish refusenik. Elena expressed her fear that Soviet authorities were going to force Ida from her apartment in an effort to discourage Ida from her struggle to obtain an exit visa.

And today, Mr. Speaker, Elena's fearful speculation has become reality. I have been informed by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry that Ida Nudel was evicted from her home, and with no place to go, was living in a train station in Riga.

Ida Nudel had first applied for an exit visa with her family in May 1971. While her family was granted permission to leave the Soviet Union, Ida's request to emigrate was refused, as Soviet officials claimed that Ida had knowledge of unspecified secrets. Her requests to emigrate were continually denied and after many refusals Ida realized that she was being singled out.

And so began Ida Nudel's struggle for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, her struggle for freedom became a struggle on behalf of all refuseniks and Ida became known as the Guardian Angel of Soviet Jews. Through public demonstrations, Ida gathered strength within the Soviet Jewish community and encouraged refuseniks to act collectively in countering Soviet persecution. Under the constant threat of harassment and abuse by Soviet officials, Ida refused to remain silent. In a final, desperate attempt to obtain an exit visa, Ida had hung a banner from her balcony which read "KGB give me my visa." Three weeks after this public display, on June 21, 1978, Ida Nudel was convicted of "malicious hooliganism." She was sentenced to 4 years of exile in Siberia for expressing her wish to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, even while serving her sentence in the oppressive surroundings of Siberia, Ida would not remain silent. I would like to quote from a letter that Ida wrote to her sister Elena in Israel:

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

In May 1982 Ida was released from Siberian exile only to face new barriers constructed by the Soviet authorities. Soviet officials refused to reinstate Ida's permanent resident status, thus denying her the right to obtain an apartment in Moscow. Ida moved to Riga where she once again received a denial to establish residency.

Mr. Speaker, as of Friday, July 16, the whereabouts of Ida Nudel are unknown.

I think it is time for Soviet harassment to come to a complete halt. Ida Nudel has done everything that the Soviet Government has forced her to do except to cease her campaign for an exit visa. The Soviet Union should live up to the Helsinki accords and allow Ida Nudel to join her family in Israel. It is time for the Soviet Union to release Ida Nudel and to grant her the basic human right to be free.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a copy of Elena Fridman's letter on behalf of her sister Ida Nudel for the RECORD:

HOLON, ISRAEL,
June 27, 1982.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am deeply moved and encouraged by your concern and activity on behalf of my sister, Ida Nudel, as expressed in your letter to Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin dated February 26 co-signed by you and 73 of your colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I enclose a volume, "Our Ida Nudel", which you may find interesting and helpful in learning more about her person and struggle. If you receive any response from Ambassador Dobrynin you can well appreciate how anxious I will be to have you share it with me.

Ida's release from Siberian exile and her return to her Moscow apartment on March 26 sparked hope and anticipation in my heart. I thought it might be the first step toward our long-awaited reunion in Israel. Instead, it turned out to be the beginning of a new round of the Soviet authorities' campaign to further embitter her life.

This time they have evidently decided to throw her into a bureaucratic maze which seems to provide no way out and is obviously designed to strangle her hope and spirit.

Immediately after having received her I.D. card from the police in Moscow, Ida went to the Ovir office to again apply for an exit visa to Israel. There she was told that such application could only be received from persons who are resident in the district. Since no address was written into her new I.D. card, she would have to apply for a residence permit. Ida's subsequent application for the reinstatement of her permanent residence status in Moscow has now been turned down. She does not know where she will live if she is indeed forced out of her apartment in Moscow.

Of equal concern is the fact that Ida has expressed her need to enter a hospital for long overdue treatment of her heart condition. This is also impossible because hospital facilities in Moscow are unavailable to non-residents. During conversations in Moscow, Ida has indicated that what kept her going during her difficult exile were the thousands of letters she received from well-wishers around the world. I believe that continuing the flow of letters now is the most important thing we can do. The only address I can give you is that of her Moscow apartment. I do not know whether letters will actually reach her there, but I believe we must try for as long as this is her only address: U.S.S.R., Moscow Yunikh Lenintzev St. No. 79, CPRP. 6, Apt. 28 NUDEL Ida (Personal Delivery—Acknowledgment of Receipt Requested).

Obviously, I would also be very grateful if you would continue to place pressure on the Soviet authorities so that they might finally relent in this senseless campaign and allow Ida to go.

Sincerely yours,

Elena Fridman.●

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, again we take time to express support and admiration for the struggle carried on by Ida Nudel against the arbitrary and inhuman policies of the Soviet Government. Once more, we are reminded of the brutality of the Soviet regime against its own people. For more than

a decade Ida Nudel has stood fast in her beliefs and refused to be dominated by the police state that seeks to crush religious freedom and personal dignity. What threat does Ida Nudel pose to the massive military machine and bureaucracy of the Soviet Union? Why do they refuse to allow her to join her sister and friends in Israel? There are no reasonable answers to those questions. However, I submit that the major reasons for Soviet intransigence lie in the fact that Ida's release would signify a victory of the human spirit and the quest for freedom over the forces which try in vain to crush both. It is often upsetting to learn of the widespread misunderstanding of what true Soviet policies are. The lifestyle Ida Nudel has been subjected to by her own government is beyond comprehension for many Americans. Internal exile and continuous harassment by Soviet officials have not broken the will of this courageous woman to continue her effort for freedom.

I hope that every Member of the House will join us today in supporting every possible attempt to secure permission for Ida Nudel to leave the U.S.S.R. and emigrate to Israel. Our thoughts, prayers, and work are her best chance for release.●

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, Ida Nudel, the refusenik and Jewish Prisoner of Conscience, has survived Siberian exile to return to more savage repression. It is up to us who are free to speak out to let the Soviet Union know that we are watching their conduct and we will not cease from speaking out until Ida Nudel enjoys the freedom for which she has suffered so long.

When Ida Nudel was released from Siberia, she was denied permission to return to her home in Moscow. She was, instead, given permission to live in Riga. But this too was revoked. The Soviet regime seemed determined to force Ida Nudel into a new exile, to keep her in a place where she would be isolated from the Jewish community and from any foreign visitors. Forced again from her home, Ida Nudel has now reportedly been forced to live as a nomad, moving from place to place, without a home, and unemployable as a refusenik. Frequently, in the Soviet scheme of things, such people are then arrested for parasitism. We must make sure that this does not happen to Ida Nudel, which is why we must not relax our vigilance.

This brave woman still has not achieved her dream of rejoining her family in Israel. She, like most of the Soviet Jewish population, still suffers under the most severe repression since the death of Stalin, repression that has stemmed the flow of emigrants to a pitiful trickle. Until they, like Ida

Nudel, are free, we must not let our voices be silent.●

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today that I participate in this special order for Ida Nudel. For 11 years this brave woman has had only one simple goal, and that is to leave the Soviet Union and rejoin her sister who is living in Israel. For this crime she has been imprisoned, unceasingly harassed by the Soviet authorities, and denied any of the most basic human rights.

She has recently completed a 4-year sentence of internal exile in Siberia on the charge of malicious hooliganism after hanging out a banner which read, "KGB, Give Me a Visa to Israel." Upon her return to Moscow in March of this year she declared that it was still her intention to leave Russia and live in Israel. For this she was banished from Moscow.

There are many, many more examples of the heartless and brutal treatment afforded Ida Nudel by the Soviets, and they are well documented. For this reason the Congress and the American people must not be silent regarding her suffering.

We must speak loudly enough for the Soviet leaders in the Kremlin to hear, and call on them to cease their mistreatment of this woman who is now in poor health from spending four winters in a hut in Siberia. We must also make it clear that we believe Ida Nudel should be allowed to leave the Soviet Union and spend the remaining years of her life with her sister in a land that will make her welcome.

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in this blessed country have great difficulty imagining why the leaders of the Soviet Union insist on running their country as a prison.

The case of Ida Nudel is an example. This woman wants to leave the Soviet Union to live with her sister in Israel. She has been trying to leave for 11 years, but her applications for emigration have been rejected.

She was recently released from exile in Siberia, where she was sent for protesting the injustices committed against her and others like her. She has been denied a permit to live in Moscow, so she went to Riga, Latvia. She has been denied permission to live there, and Soviet authorities still refuse to let her leave the country.

What we see in this case and others like it is nothing less than calculated cruelty by a government committed to ruthless exercise of power instead of serving and representing its people.

This is a government that punishes even modest dissent with imprisonment of Siberian exile, and when members of its captive population apply to emigrate, it treats them as criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in this appeal for the freedom of Ida Nudel and to remind the

House of what her case demonstrates about the character of the Soviet leadership.●

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the serious plight and mistreatment accorded Ida Nudel in the Soviet Union.

Ida's situation and subsequent problems with Soviet authorities began over 10 years ago. In 1971, Ida applied for an exit visa to Israel. She was refused by the Soviet Government on the grounds that she knew too much as an economist to leave. This is when Ida began her crimes against the state. Because of sheer compassion, Ida began caring for other individuals imprisoned for similar crimes of conscience. For 7 years, Ida acted as an "angel of prisoners." During this time she was continually harassed by the KGB secret police. This soon led to threats of violence by her Muscovite neighbors. Finally in 1978, Ida Nudel committed the crime that would eventually send her into isolation in Siberia. Out of desperation, she hung a banner on her Moscow balcony stating: "KGB—Give Me My Visa." Ida was convicted of "malicious hooliganism" and sent away for 4 years.

Mrs. Nudel is one of many such persons persecuted by the Soviet Government for demanding their deserved human rights. However, Ida is unique in the fact that she is one of the three oldest such prisoners and the only woman among them. I have received correspondence from her sister Elena Fridman who Ida desires to join in Israel. As Mrs. Fridman explains, "Ida has proven to be a strong woman, but I hesitate to imagine how much more of this she can take." Between her threadbare clothing and meager heating, it is a miracle that Ida has survived these long harsh winters in Siberia.

Under the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the right to emigrate is guaranteed. Furthermore, under the Helsinki Act of 1975 signed by the Soviet Union, the rights of all persons to secure and exercise their fundamental human rights are fully protected. All Ida Nudel is asking for is the right to leave a country where she is being persecuted for her religious affiliation and humanitarian practices. If this is too much to request, then the Soviet Union should not have deceitfully misled the rest of the world by signing the Helsinki Act. I have sent several letters to the Kremlin alerting them to my concern, but have yet to receive a reply.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again I have stood before this Chamber to register my utter distaste for the manner in which the Soviet Government has treated Ida Nudel. Mrs. Nudel was released from Siberian exile recently, however the Soviet authorities have compounded her problems, not alleviated them. They refuse to

issue her a residency permit for her old Moscow apartment nor allow her to stay with friends in another town. Thus, the Soviet authorities have effectively made it impossible for Ida Nudel to live comfortably in the Soviet Union. I feel strongly that this is the time to help obtain an exit visa for Mrs. Nudel, now, before it is too late.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we focus our attention and that of the people of the world on the plight of a courageous individual who is seeking her freedom and basic human rights. Ida Nudel has come to personify the suffering of all who are trying to emigrate from the Soviet Union to join family abroad.

For 11 years Ida Nudel has sought to emigrate to Israel. After her application was refused, she worked untiringly to assist other refuseniks with food, medicines, and encouragement. For her efforts over a 7-year period, she became known as the "Guardian Angel of the Prisoners of Conscience." She was also harassed by the Soviet authorities and finally arrested in 1978 and sentenced to 4 years internal exile in remote Siberia for "malicious hooliganism."

Ida Nudel survived her 4 arduous years in exile and this past March returned to Moscow. But evidently Soviet authorities feel she has not suffered enough. She has been denied residency permission in Moscow as well as in Riga and has been forced to sleep on a bench in a train station. How cynical and heartless the Soviet system can be. I am sure any city in the United States or Israel would be more than willing to grant Ida Nudel a residency permit.

Today we call on all freedom-loving people to protest this shameful treatment to the Soviet authorities. The treatment of Ida Nudel is a clear violation of the Helsinki accords and a reminder of the tragic lack of basic human rights in the Soviet Union. I join my colleagues in appealing to the Soviet Government to "Let Ida Nudel Go!"●

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in an international day of solidarity with Ida Nudel. This remarkable woman, an inspiration to all of us, has been persecuted for over a decade because of her unflinching loyalty to her religion and conscience.

Since 1978 she has survived the exile of four Siberian winters, withstanding both physical and mental strain. I was quite relieved to learn of her release this past spring—but the struggle for her freedom continues. Ida Nudel is now fighting the atrocious Soviet emigration system, as well as unending hardships. She has applied for an emigration visa, but in the meantime she is spending her nights on a bench in a train station, because several Russian

cities have refused her application for a propiska, or residency permit.

Ida Nudel is now 52 years old. She has fought all her life for the basic rights we enjoy as Americans and that others in the free world take for granted. Her simple wish is to join her sister in Israel, yet the Soviet Union effectively holds her prisoner in an endless maze of paperwork. I have repeatedly written to Soviet officials requesting her overdue permission to emigrate—all to no avail. But we must continue to press for her right to live in the country of her choice, not only for Ida's sake, but also as a symbol of our serious intentions regarding international human rights.

The Soviet Union must comprehend that the free nations of the world will not permit flagrant violations of the Helsinki accords to go unnoticed or unchecked. I believe it is our duty as citizens of a nation dedicated to freedom that we all struggle with Ida for her release.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of international solidarity with Ida Nudel, who is known as the Guardian Angel of Soviet Jewish activists, and is one of my "adopted" Soviet Prisoners of Conscience. Last March, 74 of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the Soviet Ambassador expressing our hope that, once released from Siberia, where she was exiled on the charge of "malicious hooliganism," Ms. Nudel would be allowed to emigrate to Israel. Ida Nudel was released in late March, but, almost 5 months later, her hope of going to Israel remains unfulfilled.

I just received a letter from Elena Fridman, Ms. Nudel's sister in Israel, who writes:

Ida's release from Siberian exile and her return to her Moscow apartment on March 26 sparked hope and anticipation in my heart. I thought it might be the first step toward our long-awaited reunion in Israel. Instead, it turned out to be the beginning of a new round of the Soviet authorities' campaign to further embitter her life.

The newest form of harassment has been the denial of a "propiska," or residency permit. Ms. Nudel applied for a reinstatement of her permanent resident status in Moscow, but was turned down. She then applied for such status in Riga, but was again rejected. Without such a residency permit, Ms. Nudel can neither set up a permanent residence, nor can she apply for an exit visa.

At this time, we know nothing of Ms. Nudel's whereabouts. No doubt she struggles daily with the possibility of arrest on yet another trumped up charge. She is forced to flee from unjust bureaucratic forces which, though they prevent her from establishing a home, refuse her simple request to leave.

Ms. Nudel's courage throughout her ordeal has been inspiring, yet her plight remains unresolved. Most

shocking is the realization that Ida Nudel is only one of many political and religious activists suffering routine harassment in the Soviet Union. We in Congress must continue to pressure Soviet authorities to end this senseless persecution.●

● Mr. JAMES K. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, for a decade Ida Nudel's resilience and conviction as a human rights activist in the Soviet Union has been an inspiration. In her efforts to emigrate to Israel and to guarantee Jewish rights in the Soviet Union, she has demonstrated the force of her indomitable spirit.

The Soviet Government is clearly resolved to test that spirit without mercy. Since Ida applied for a visa to emigrate to Israel with her sister in 1971, she has been harassed, interrogated, tortured and imprisoned by Soviet officials. Finally, in 1978, in a desperate effort to publicize her plight, Ida placed a banner outside her apartment window which stated, "KGB, Give Me A Visa To Israel." This display led to her conviction on charges of "malicious hooliganism", for which she served 4 years in internal exile.

Her term of 4 years ended last month, but the intense pressure placed on her by the Government did not. She was again denied permission to join her sister in Israel and was refused a permit to live in Moscow. In desperation, Ida ventured to the Latvian capital of Riga, where she assumed temporary residence. Just this week, however, she was also denied a permit to live in Riga.

Ida Nudel must now continue her struggle to emigrate even while she wanders in search of shelter. We call on the Soviet Government to release her to be reunited with her sister in Israel now.

The indomitable spirit of Ida Nudel will not be crushed—nor will our opposition to her appalling treatment.

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join in this special order on behalf of Ida Nudel. I congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut for making possible this united congressional effort to end the harsh persecution Ida Nudel has been enduring.

Mr. Speaker, Ida Nudel is truly a remarkable, heroic, and courageous woman. Since adopting her as my Fourth Congressional District's Prisoner of Conscience more than 3 years ago, I have been tremendously impressed by her unbreakable spirit, her indomitable determination and her compassion for others. In her more than 10-year struggle with the cruel and heartless Soviet authorities, she has never faltered in her unceasing efforts to win her heart's desire—permission to leave the Soviet Union and join her family in Israel.

Four years ago her struggle for freedom so angered the Soviet officialdom

that Ida Nudel was sentenced to 4 years in exile in the bleak wastelands of Siberia. The Soviets charged her with "hooliganism." Her "crime" actually was to display a banner reading "KGB Give Me My Visa" from the balcony of her apartment in Moscow. Released from exile last March, Ida Nudel returned to Moscow still fighting to win her freedom. Her first act was to go to the Soviet officials to ask for her visa to Israel.

This brought sharp retaliation from the Soviet authorities. They refused her permission to return to her Moscow apartment, and denied her permission to reside anywhere in Moscow. Just this past week, I was informed by Lynn Singer, president of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews that Ida Nudel has gone to Riga to live, but again was denied a residence permit.

Mr. Speaker, this cruel persecution and harassment of an innocent woman cannot be permitted to continue. We must unite in pressuring the Soviet authorities to give Ida Nudel her visa to emigrate to Israel. In pursuit of that goal, I have already written to Soviet President Brezhnev and Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin demanding that they end this gross inhumanity toward an innocent woman who seeks only to join her family in Israel. The Soviet leaders know well their actions are in direct violation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki accords, to which President Brezhnev himself agreed with so much ceremony in 1975. What a mockery the Soviets make of their treaty obligations in their treatment of Ida Nudel.

I have also written to our new Secretary of State, the Honorable George P. Shultz, asking him to give his personal attention to special efforts on behalf of Ida Nudel. I can think of no worthier cause, nor one more deserving of the personal involvement of the highest American officials. Certainly, if we cannot trust the Soviet leaders to respect the Helsinki accords, how can we expect them to respect any international obligation to which they might agree?

Even further, Mr. Speaker, I urge every one of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to become involved in Ida Nudel's case. Add your letters of protest to mine. Write to President Brezhnev and Ambassador Dobrynin demanding that Ida Nudel be given the right she has under the Helsinki accords to immigrate to Israel to join her family. The more Members of Congress who join us in fighting for her freedom, the more likely the Soviet Union will grant Ida Nudel the freedom she has sought for so long.

The time to act is now.●

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

IDA NUDEL—PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subjects of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order to demonstrate the strong support of Ida Nudel that continues to exist in this body. Her story is one of great personal courage and heroism, and this special order is part of the international day of activity on behalf of Ida Nudel and her 11-year struggle to immigrate to Israel.

I first became familiar with Ida Nudel when I was secretary of state of Connecticut. I was working in my office one afternoon when I was invited to a meeting of Soviet Jewry in the State capitol. I went upstairs that day and saw a movie that had recently been smuggled out of Russia. This movie told the story of a woman who, for many years, from 1971 to 1978, had asked the Russian Government to let her go to Israel. She could not get permission, she could not get an exit visa. But she continued to help those, even if it was not the same goal that she had, to go to Israel, to help those who wanted to emigrate out of Russia. Even those who were in prison, she took food to them, she helped them, and she became known as the guardian angel of refuseniks in Russia.

Then the story got much more serious on June 21, 1978. It was an International Day of Children, and those activists of Jewish faith decided that they would demonstrate a little more fully. They were going to be so brave as to put banners out their window. And Ida put a banner out her window, just saying a few things that were hardly controversial. There were people who pulled the banner down. And then Ida decided that she had a

50-50 chance and that she could say what she wanted to say, and that was "KGB, give me my visa." She put that on her banner, and she lost. Ida was in jail for 120 days before they even brought her to trial. After her trial she was sent to Siberia. She was made to live with 60 convicts, 60 men. She slept with an ax under her mattress. Eventually she got a small hut to live in. There was no light, there was no water. The only thing that kept her sanity was her dog named Pizer, which she has, hopefully, as far as we know, to this day.

Four years took a long time to pass, but she remained strong. Ida is a woman who is an economist. She is known in Russia as an intelligentsia. But she worked as a cleaning woman in Siberia. She had very few friends, but she did not lose her faith.

Then last March we heard that Ida Nudel had been released, that she was allowed to leave Siberia, and she hoped that she could go home. Some of her friends had kept her apartment in Russia. She returned there, but she found out that she could not get a residence and that she was not allowed to live in Moscow, and the apartment was gone. She moved on, and during this time she talked to her sister, Elena Fridman, who was in Israel, and she said, "Don't be too optimistic, I don't think it looks too good."

She went to Riga, and she could not get a residency there either. As has been said on this floor tonight, she came to the point where she was sleeping in the railroad station. I say to you as a woman who has also worn an Ida Nudel bracelet for the last 2 years, and I say to you as someone, when I heard she was let go from Siberia and I was thinking of taking the bracelet off, I thought, "No, this isn't going to be so easy, Ida is not going to be allowed to go to Israel without working harder," and I kept the bracelet on but, hopefully, thought that it would only be for a couple of more months. And yet we see this poor woman, still refused an exit visa so she can go to Israel.

I say to the Russian officials: What can this woman do to you now? She is 51 years old. She has got kidney trouble, she has got heart trouble, she cannot harm you.

So today I join with my colleagues on this floor and I say in honor and respect for Ida Nudel, "You have been strong." But how much longer can we expect her to remain that strong? So I urge anyone who can help to listen, to continue the letters, the telegrams, especially the prayers. But I say if anyone is listening who has any clout in Russia: Let this woman go to Israel.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in this special order

to express our support and solidarity with Ida Nudel, and I congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut for first initiating a special order on her behalf. Ida Nudel is a brave woman who has endured the unrelenting harassment of the Soviet Government. Ida Nudel is a woman who instills a deep sense of commitment to those involved in the Soviet Jewry movement. As one individual, with no immediate family in the Soviet Union, Ida Nudel has persisted in her efforts to stand up to Soviet authorities in pursuit of one noble goal; the right to emigrate and to be reunited with her sister in Israel.

Ida Nudel has encountered the most harsh brutalities which the Soviets inflict on those individuals who express a desire to pursue their intellectual, religious, and cultural interests. Ida Nudel has endured slanderous articles in the Soviet press, internal exile, and imprisonment with common criminals. Yet Ida Nudel will not yield to the threats and acts of intimidation of the Soviet authorities who steadfastly refuse her application to leave the Soviet Union.

Not only does Ida Nudel's persistence provide us with inspiration—the kind of inspiration which has brought all of us here today united in our determination to free her—but Ida Nudel's compassion and dedication to her fellow refuseniks has been a great source of strength to the other refuseniks in the Soviet Union as well. A woman of Ida Nudel's stature, a woman who has expended so much of her own physical and emotional energy in the pursuit of freedom, will not be forgotten.

After 4 years of internal exile resulting from a trumped up charge of "malicious hooliganism," the Soviet authorities have yet again expressed their determination to hold Ida Nudel as a hostage, a symbol of their inability to respect internationally recognized human rights standards as embodied in the Helsinki Accords. Ida Nudel has now been denied permission to return to her home in Moscow or to take up residence in the city of Riga. The Soviet campaign to break the will of Ida Nudel continues.

Mr. Speaker, today I call on the Soviet authorities to heed public opinion in this country which demands the release of Ida Nudel. Her release will send a signal to the people of the United States that the Soviet Union is truly interested in seeking an improvement in relations between our nations. Further, the time has come for President Reagan to reaffirm the American commitment to securing the right to emigrate for Ida Nudel and the thousands of other Jewish refuseniks who have been refused exit visas by the Soviet Government. Those of us in the Congress who are committed to Soviet Jewry mark this as an important day,

because our commitment to this woman and to Soviet Jewry is unyielding. We will continue to fight for Ida Nudel's right to emigrate so she can live her life in freedom in Israel.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to congratulate our colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, for her initiative in taking this special order. I must say that I was very taken by her very eloquent review of the facts concerning Ida Nudel's imprisonment. I had not heard them all, and I thought I had heard just about everything with reference to this poor woman's life. I guess the two of us have a great deal of empathy with Ida Nudel, a woman who is at the point of life where her freedom is taken away, and here we are, standing on the floor of the House of Representatives, with our own freedom and the ability to speak up.

Mr. Speaker, we rejoiced last April when we heard the news that Ida Nudel was free after 4 years of exile and hard labor in Siberia.

That freedom we hailed then has proved to be short lived. Ida Nudel, an economist whose only crime has been her desire to join her sister in Israel, is being forced to wander like a hobo as Soviet city after city has closed its doors to her.

Caught in the clutches of a malicious bureaucracy, whose only aim seems to be to harass her, Ida Nudel has already been refused permission to live in Moscow, her home, in Riga and in several smaller towns near the Latvian capital.

Ida Nudel is a woman without a country in her native land. At the same time, Soviet authorities refuse to grant her permission to emigrate to Israel despite her 11-year quest.

We speak here today in hopes that our voices and our outrage, mingled with that of other Americans of good will, can persuade the Soviets to desist from their senseless policies of harassment and bureaucratic persecution of their own citizens.

The story of Ida Nudel is the story of government gone out of control. It is today, at a commemoration such as this, that we point to the problem and as the Soviet Union: Please take a close look at the plight of this woman and release her.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend our colleague from Connecticut for her outstanding work in this particular matter.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

It is time obviously from the remarks, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard on this floor that there is a con-

sensus that Ida Nudel should be allowed to join with her sister in Israel. While this day will pass, this day of saying that we must release and help Ida Nudel to go to Israel, I just want to assure Soviet officials that our commitment in securing Ida's release from the Soviet Union will not diminish. We are going to continue to speak out on the right to be heard until Ida gets to Israel.

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today, a feeble, middle-aged woman is wandering homeless in the Soviet Union for the "crime" of requesting her right to emigrate to Israel, as guaranteed under the Helsinki accords. Since her release from Siberian exile in the spring, Ida Nudel has been denied the official permit needed to live in her hometown, Moscow, and in the city of Riga. Under Soviet law, a person cannot stay in a city for more than 48 hours without a residency permit. Thus, the Soviet authorities have placed Ida Nudel in a "bureaucratic maze" designed, in the words of her sister, "to strangle her hope and spirit."

The Soviet authorities have made Ida Nudel a refugee, fleeing the absurd regulations of a totalitarian legal system. Whatever the twisted motives of the officials who have initiated this latest round of the battle to crush Ida Nudel, they have insured the continuation of international protest against Soviet violations of basic human rights. The treatment of Ida Nudel reveals the entire range of Soviet tactics employed against Jews who assert their religious and cultural identity. But the mistreatment of Ida Nudel also reveals the undefeatable spirit of Soviet Jewry, which will continue to struggle for the rights outlined in the Helsinki accords no matter what cruel methods are employed against them.

Somewhere within the Soviet bureaucracy, an individual issued the orders which have made Ida Nudel a refugee. Further along the chain of command, many have knowingly lied about this episode. But we do not know the individuals involved in this specific incident, so we are forced to place the blame on the entire Soviet regime, and our relations with the Soviet Union must be conducted with their guilt in mind. If the Soviets truly desire better relations with the United States and other countries around the world, they must cease the persecution of Ida Nudel.●

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the name of Ida Nudel is a watchword for courage, fortitude, and faith. Known as the Guardian Angel of the Prisoners of Conscience, Ida Nudel has risked her own life to help others refused the freedom which is now eluding her to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel.

Her selfless devotion to the task of providing hope and comfort to fellow refuseniks was repaid by the Soviet authorities in the form of 4 long years of suffering in Siberian exile.

Now that her years in internal exile have ended, she is now denied a permit to return to her home in Moscow, and has even been forced to sleep in a train station. Not even exile is enough punishment to satisfy her Soviet tormentors. While she suffers this ordeal, we must attempt to live up to the standards she has demonstrated, and do what we can for Ida Nudel.

For 11 years, Ida Nudel has wanted to join her family in Israel. Surely, now is the time to finally grant her that liberty and allow her to be reunited with her husband and sister in Israel. I ask you to join me in calling upon the Soviets to give her that long-awaited visa to freedom.●

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, this past January I visited the Soviet Union. I met with many refuseniks and was appalled by the constant fears with which they live: Relentless harassment, the ever-present threat of arrest, and the continuing attempts to deny their human dignity. They suffer immense hardships and perpetual repression, their crime being their quest for religious freedom and the right to emigrate.

The Soviet Union has guaranteed these and other fundamental rights by signing both the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki accords. Yet, the Soviet Union has clearly failed to abide by their oath to uphold these principles.

In particular I would like to call attention to the plight of a remarkable woman, Ida Nudel. This brave woman has been referred to as a "superhuman angel" by former fellow prisoners of the Siberian exile camps. She has tirelessly striven to help others around her, whether it be by obtaining and providing blankets and medicine to the needy, or by buoying the hopes of the spiritually exhausted.

Ever since she first applied for emigration in 1971, she has been arrested and rearrested. She has been starved, beaten and treated for alcoholism when she suffered from a heart condition. After spending 4 years in internal exile in Siberia she was released in March and is once again trying to obtain an emigration visa to join her only close relative, a sister who lives in Israel.

We must support the cause of Ida Nudel and the thousands and thousands like her who seek only to lead lives of simple dignity. We must urge the Soviet Union to reevaluate its policies and allow Ida Nudel the freedom of living without harassment or abuse.●

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this International Day of Solidarity in sup-

port of Soviet "Prisoner of Conscience" Ida Nudel, I would like to lend my voice to those of my colleagues participating in this special order on her behalf.

The plight of Ida Nudel is, no doubt, familiar to my colleagues. Through the efforts of concerned individuals and groups, Ida Nudel's struggle has become familiar to many. Letters have been sent to Soviet officials, speeches delivered, and resolutions passed on behalf of Ida Nudel and many other Soviet "Prisoners of Conscience" seeking the right to emigrate to Israel. This great effort, then was certainly to be congratulated when the news reached us in March of Ida Nudel's release from Siberian exile and her return to Moscow.

The joy, however, was shortlived. Despite application to the Moscow City Council to renew her residency permit, Ida Nudel's application was denied. Her next attempt to overcome this bureaucratic harassment was application for residency in the Riga area, where Ms. Nudel has friends. This also was denied. What for many Soviets is a simple procedure has become for Ida Nudel a continuation of her sentence by Soviet authorities. Arrest is likely if she remains in Riga. Ida Nudel's flight appears to have no end.

Our efforts have accomplished a great deal, as Ida Nudel's release points out. But we must not stop short of our goal of freedom for this brave woman. Soviet officials must know that we are aware of the difference between appeasement and justice. Ida Nudel's struggle continues as long as she is denied the right to emigrate to Israel and is at the mercy of Soviet officials. We must send the Soviets the message that we remain vigilant in our concern for Ida Nudel. I ask my colleagues to join me in reaffirming our commitment to total freedom for Ida Nudel; a freedom defined as nothing short of her right to emigrate to Israel.●

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, for over 11 years Ida Nudel has been one of the leaders in the Soviet Jewry movement in the Soviet Union. Ida, affectionately known as the "Guardian Angel" for her activities on behalf of Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, was charged and convicted in June 1978 of "malicious hooliganism" and sentenced to 4 years of internal exile.

Experiencing antisemitism in her job as an economist and in her life, Ms. Nudel applied to Soviet officials for permission to emigrate to Israel. Since 1971 her repeated requests for this visa have been denied. Disturbed by her persistent efforts to obtain this visa and to keep up to the morale of those forced in labor camps, the KGB constantly subjected Ida Nudel to harassment and intimidation. Gradually, this persecution took its toll and on

June 1, 1978, she found that she was under house arrest. In protest, Ida hung a banner outside her Moscow flat that read, "KGB, give me my visa." The next day she was charged with "malicious hooliganism" and within 3 weeks she was convicted.

By banishing Ida Nudel to the dreadful quarters she occupied in Siberia, Soviet authorities assumed they were silencing this voice of justice. They were mistaken. From her forsaken village of exile, Ida wrote:

I am fortunate that I myself add not only one page to the history of Jewish resistance in Russia. I am fortunate that my efforts permitted thousands of Jews to leave this barbarous country. I am fortunate that during all these years I was helping prisoners of Zion, those who were chosen to cut the way to Israel by the price of their own freedom. But if our suffering will not force every one of you to rush to help us, then it is in vain.

Today, Ida Nudel needs our help. Even though she has been released from internal exile in March, she is still trying to emigrate to Israel to live with her sister, Elena Fridman, her only close relative. I recently received a letter from Elena in which she stated that:

Ida's release from Siberian exile and her return to her Moscow apartment sparked hope and anticipation in my heart * * * instead, it turned out to be the beginning of a new round of the Soviet authorities' campaign to further embitter her life.

Ida Nudel has been denied residency permits to live in Moscow and Riga and is now without a home.

We, as Members of Congress, must continue to actively fight for her freedom to emigrate and to practice her religion. The Soviet Union's oppressive tactics should never be tolerated by free-thinking people around the world. I therefore commend my colleagues for joining together in this special order.●

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to honor individuals who have made outstanding contributions to their specific fields. Today it is my great pleasure to honor a man who has accomplished a great deal in many fields. Dean S. Leshner is a man of energy, expertise, and life-long commitment. I rise before you today to honor Mr. Leshner for his contributions to the fields of education, law, business, health care, and communication, but especially for his outstanding service to the community of Merced, Calif.

Dean Leshner received a J.D. from Harvard Law School in 1926 and went to Kansas City, Mo., where he practiced 14 years as a trial, insurance, and corporate lawyer. While representing various newspaper interests, Mr. Leshner became interested in the industry and was lured into purchasing a daily newspaper in Nebraska. The field of communication apparently agreed with Mr. Leshner, for he went on to purchase a daily paper in Cali-

fornia and eventually acquired five more daily newspapers, one multi-weekly, 11 weeklies, and also AM and FM radio stations in Idaho. Today I rise in commendation of Dean Leshner, in anticipation of a July 30 honorary dinner in Merced where Mr. Leshner will be recognized for 42 years of continuous publication of the daily Merced Sun-Star, and for the contributions his newspaper and his community involvement have made to Merced.

Besides keeping the people of Merced informed, Mr. Leshner's contributions have come in the form of unequivocal public service. He serves on the board of directors of Suburban Newspapers of America, the Concord Century Club, the Better Business Bureau, and other worthwhile groups. Among the many honors and awards which Mr. Leshner has received are 1979 Business Person of the Year, California Press Association Publisher of the Year in 1977, and Mountain Diablo Boy Scout Council 1981 Distinguished Citizen of the Year.

In addition to his ongoing dedication to publishing quality newspapers, as is evidenced by his numerous awards including one for the Best Daily Newspaper in California in 1980, Mr. Leshner has shown a life-long commitment to education. He has served an 8-year term as trustee of the California State University and Colleges System, and on the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges. Mr. Leshner has also used his talents and resources in service to the health care field, as he has been a steady annual contributor to area hospitals and is currently serving on the John Muir Hospital Foundation Board of Directors.

Dean S. Leshner personifies competence, selflessness, and dedication. He is a symbol of the commitment of those people all across our Nation who give of themselves and continue to give, in generous devotion to the spirit of public service. I commend Dean for his contributions and accomplishments, and wish him well as he embarks on another year of service to the community of Merced and the people of our country.●

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues to demonstrate my support for Ida Nudel's struggle to leave the Soviet Union and emigrate to Israel.

Ida Nudel is an extraordinary person. Sentenced to 4 years of internal exile because of a banner she hung from her apartment window which read, "KGB, Give Me a Visa to Israel," Ida Nudel was placed in a prison punishment cell where the Soviets attempted to strip her of her dignity. Remarkably, she has risen above this inhumanity to shine as a brilliant ray of hope, stirring the emotions in all of us who cherish liberty and freedom.

Ida Nudel remains a proud human being and a proud Jew. She must be allowed to emigrate and live with her family in Israel.

I urge the Soviet Union to grant this true champion of liberty an exit visa. She has completed a 4-year exile term in a Siberian wasteland for "malicious hooliganism." Ida Nudel has suffered enough. Our support for her must remain as unwavering as her quest for freedom. I want an exit visa for Ida Nudel now.●

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in the House and concerned citizens around the world to urge Soviet authorities to free Ida Nudel, a woman of great courage and principle, from her 11-year struggle to realize her dream of emigrating to Israel.

Although Ida Nudel has returned from her 4-year exile in Siberia, the Soviet Union continues to harass and intimidate her in hopes that she will surrender her tireless campaign for the rights of Soviet Jews. They have denied her legal residence in Moscow and Riga, and she remains homeless, but still committed to securing a visa to join her family in Israel.

For 11 years, Ida Nudel has not only spoken out for her own rights and freedoms, but has fought on behalf of others who share her plight. Through her caring and compassion for her fellow Prisoners of Conscience, she has gained the honorable title of "Guardian Angel," and serves as an inspiration to others who fight for the freedom to practice their religion without persecution.

On this day, we must not only commemorate Ida Nudel's selfless battle on behalf of the Prisoners of Conscience, but continue to call attention to her ordeal and demand that she be freed and allowed to join her sister in Israel. Ida Nudel has become a symbol for us—a symbol of the human rights that we cherish and uphold and that the Soviet Union has so brutally violated.●

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues, Representatives FRANK, KENNELLY, COYNE, FERRARO, HECKLER, and GREEN as we participate in this day of international solidarity with Ida Nudel.

This is not the first time we are speaking for Ida Nudel. When she was sent to internal exile in Siberia many of our distinguished colleagues sent letters of protest on her behalf. When she was released from Siberia, again letters were sent to the Soviet authorities asking that she be allowed to immigrate to Israel. Her continuous brave struggle to exercise her basic right to emigrate is an inspiration to the thousands of Soviet refuseniks who have been consistently thwarted in their efforts to join family and friends outside the Soviet Union. Be-

cause of her activities on behalf of the exiled and imprisoned within the U.S.S.R. Ida Nudel is a symbol of hope for those who are silenced and those who are persecuted.

I would once again urge the Soviet authorities to honor their international treaty obligations—specifically the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act—and allow Ida Nudel to immigrate to Israel to join her family.●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this special order is necessary today. However, I am honored to join my other colleagues on this day of international solidarity dedicated to Ida Nudel.

As many of us are already aware, Ida Nudel is a Soviet citizen who has been waging an 11-year struggle to emigrate to Israel. She has already survived the harshness of internal exile in Siberia and she was released from that exile last March. With that ordeal over, the world thought that perhaps now she might be able to move to her beloved Israel. Unfortunately, Ida Nudel's dream to live a peaceful life has not been fulfilled and she is now experiencing new problems.

Ms. Nudel was recently denied her "propiska," a residency permit to live in Moscow and has since also been refused residency in Riga. Based upon the most recent information I have received, Ida Nudel's future residency is indeed unclear.

It is my fervent belief that the unjust treatment of Ida Nudel should cease and she should be allowed to emigrate to Israel. Her emigration to Israel seems particularly appropriate if cities in the Soviet Union are denying her a resident visa.

Mr. Speaker, Ida Nudel's story is one of courage and conviction and I hope that the world continues to keep her story alive until her dream to emigrate to Israel is realized.●

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, known as the "Angel of Mercy" for her ministrations to Soviet Jewish political prisoners, Ida Nudel has been trying to emigrate to Israel since May 1971. Ida's employment as an accountant in the Moscow Institute of Hydrology—she was dismissed in January 1972—gave her no cause to think she would be refused emigration permission. Shortly after losing her job, however, Ida was informed by the Soviets that her exit visa was denied because of access to "secrets"—still a favorite Soviet pretext for emigration refusals, as seen on July 9, 1982, in the cases of hunger strikers, Yuri Balovlenkov and Sergei Petrov.

Faced with obstinate and arbitrary refusals by the Soviets of her emigration applications, Ida became involved in charity work which earned her the title, "Angel of Mercy." Defeating the cruel and arbitrary world of Soviet labor camps, Ida Nudel visited and

wrote letters to Jewish Prisoners of Conscience; she sent them parcels of food, medicine, and books; and she acted as their advocate with camp and Moscow officials. Ida also informed the West about Soviet prison camp abuses and the plight of various political prisoners. Recent Soviet efforts to isolate—even from relatives—particularly active Prisoners of Conscience, such as Anatoly Marchenko or Mykola Matusevich, reveal how the Soviet system is stung by Western awareness of Soviet prison camp brutalities.

After 7 years of waiting for an exit visa, in June 1978, Ida Nudel decided to publicly protest her arbitrary treatment: She hung a sign from her balcony calling on the Soviet authorities to let her go to her family in Israel. In reprisal, on June 21, 1978, a Soviet court sentenced Ida Nudel to 4 years of Siberian exile for "malicious hooliganism." But even that 4-year term of isolation, hardship, and illness imposed by the Soviet regime was not enough reprisal against Ida for her persistent defense of her own rights and those of others: recently, Ida Nudel was told she has 48 hours to leave Moscow where she is denied official permission to live. Nevertheless, Ida Nudel persists in trying to emigrate and to help others.

In closing my tribute to this brave and kind woman, I would like to quote from one of Ida Nudel's letters from exile. Typically, she focuses not on her own plight, but examines the hope represented for all Soviet citizens by the emergence and continuation of the Jewish emigration movement:

Through our suffering we have been able to push the gates of the U.S.S.R. just slightly ajar. Through the tiny opening we have made in the Iron Curtain, Jews manage to get out of the U.S.S.R. This in fact is our one solace through our ordeal. But the opening is small and vulnerable, and we implore all of you in the free world to keep a close watch on the opening and not to allow the gates to be slammed shut again.●

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I take part in this dialog today with feelings of mixed emotion. In March of this year, this body had a World Protest Day on behalf of Ida Nudel, which I was pleased to join. At that time Ms. Nudel was very close to completing a 4-year sentence of internal exile in Siberia. It was the hope of many of us that once this ordeal was over for her, the Soviet authorities would finally grant her a visa to emigrate to Israel to join her husband and sister. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

There is a great sense of frustration and anger over what is now happening to Ida Nudel. True, she has ended her internal exile—at least her official internal exile. She is now being tested with an even more difficult cross. She is unable to obtain a residency permit since her release from Siberia. She had returned to Moscow and sought residency but it was denied. She next

traveled to Riga and applied there. This, too, has been denied her.

If the Soviet Union seeks to break her spirit by this latest form of harassment, I am sure they will fail. However, we must continue to call attention to her plight and use every available means to persuade the Soviet Union to cease its persecution against this woman. We must meet her resolve. We can do no less.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, 4 months ago, we heard that the famed Soviet refusenik, Ida Nudel, had been released from imprisonment in Siberia and flown to Moscow. At the time, some of us hoped that, at long last, the Soviet Government would allow her to leave the U.S.S.R. We hoped that her freedom was imminent. We expected, at the very least, that she would be permitted to live in her own home in Moscow.

But the Soviet Government has not even allowed her that much—it continues and intensifies its deliberate pattern of arbitrary harassment. When she was refused permission to live in Moscow, Ida went to Riga, but was refused a residency permit there also; although she owns her own home in Moscow, Ida was forced to sleep on a train station bench.

With no place to go, Ida now exists, in her own homeland, a person without a country. For over a decade she has asked simply to be able to join her sister in Israel. By repeatedly denying her legitimate request, the Soviet Government has outraged the free world. After all these years, after serving her Siberian prison term, after being harassed and ostracized, Ida still endures and will not give up the fight. And, in fact, the Soviet Government has succeeded, not in breaking her down, but in making her the courageous "Guardian Angel" she is. We feel for her and the many, many refuseniks we do not know. And we are here again to say that this situation is intolerable.

Ida Nudel has paid her dues, and much, much more. The Soviet authorities, for all their empty justifications, cannot hide behind anything—what they are doing to Ida Nudel is wrong. We have said so before and will say so again and again and again. No matter how powerful the U.S.S.R. would hope to become, it will always be weak for the quiet dissension of its people. It will always be covering up the cries of those who long for freedom, and wrongfully punishing those who will not be silent. And these refuseniks, who have long endured the shameful treatment of their Government, will ultimately be vindicated.

Ida, we are with you all the way. You have continued the fight. We will too.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in requesting that the Soviet authorities allow Ida Nudel to obtain an exit visa

so she may leave the Soviet Union and be reunited with her only living relative, her sister Elena, who lives in Holon, Israel. Ida Nudel, our Guardian Angel, has been in the minds and prayers of so many of us during her past 4 years of unjust exile in Siberia.

Ida is a strong-willed woman of great devotion, courage, and conscience. In 1970, she applied for an exit visa to Israel. The Soviets refused to permit her emigration, even though she fulfilled all the requirements for an exit visa. They absurdly claimed she could not leave the country because she knew "government secrets." Ida had to wait 7 years before she could reapply. In 1977, she reapplied. The Soviets, again, refused her an exit visa, neglecting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at Helsinki, and the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. At this point, Ida Nudel was sentenced to 4 years of exile in Siberia, without even being allowed representation or witnesses at her trial. Furthermore, her crime was hanging out her window a simple banner which read, "KGB, give me my visa to Israel."

Mr. Speaker, Ida Nudel's basic human rights need to be respected. Although Ida Nudel has finally been released from exile, we must continue our efforts to assist her and her sister in their struggle to be reunited. I appeal to the conscience and humanity of Soviet Premier Brezhnev, to allow Ida Nudel to emigrate to Israel as quickly as arrangements can be completed.●

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on this day of international solidarity with Ida Nudel to express my outrage over the Soviet Union's continual harassment visited upon her and all other Prisoners of Conscience in the U.S.S.R.

This courageous woman has struggled for over 11 years to gain the freedom to emigrate to Israel. Four of those years were spent in forced internal exile under the harshest of conditions. When she was finally released in March of this year, Ida Nudel had hoped to return to her native Moscow. Her residence permit request was denied. Instead she moved on to Riga and once again went through the process of requesting residency status. She has now been told by the Riga authorities that she cannot settle there either. In fact, her applications to several smaller towns in the Riga area were all refused.

Ida Nudel has been forced to flee from Moscow. Now she must also flee Riga or be subject to arrest. How many more places will she travel to, only to be turned away again and again? If the Soviet authorities will not permit her to settle anywhere

within the Soviet Union, and they refuse to allow her to leave, what alternatives are left for this woman? She has been harassed, abused, slandered, sexually assaulted, broken spiritually, mentally, and physically. How much more must she be forced to accept for the simple desire to join her family in Israel?

What is usually a routine request for residency in other cases has turned into a Kafkaesque nightmare for Ida Nudel. If it is the intention of the Soviet Government to wear down those of us who have supported Ida Nudel's hopes, it cannot work, for we will not lose hope, we will not forget her struggle, and we will continue to fight for her rights until they are granted.●

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry has coordinated today as being the international day of activity for Ida Nudel. I find that today is an important day to demonstrate our Nation's concern for an individual who has shown unyielding strength through unnecessary harassments, imprisonment and punishment by the Soviet Government.

It is particularly distressing to hear that even after her completion of her 4-year term in a Siberian wasteland, she continues to be harassed. In addition to this mistreatment, she has been refused permission to reside with her friends in Moscow, Riga, and in surrounding cities. She has been frequently forced to remain homeless, and in times, she has had to spend nights in train stations and in deserted areas.

To further worsen the situation, Ida Nudel is presently suffering from ulcers, kidney, and heart trouble, and has been denied access to the Tomsk University Hospital for extensive diagnosis and treatment.

Perhaps the most disgraceful part of the Soviet's treatment of Ida Nudel is that they do not seem to care or even slightly comply to the hundreds of letters from people and governments around the world. I find it distressing and sickening that the Soviet Government continues to punish a woman whose one goal is to reach her sister in Israel.

Although Ida Nudel's strength seems immeasurable, her strength can not last forever. The Soviet Government's attitude must change or else this disgrace will only lead to a worsening of Soviet's relations with other country's around the world.

Ida Nudel we will never forget you.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in once again calling on the Soviet Union to allow former Soviet Jewish Prisoner of Conscience Ida Nudel to emigrate to Israel. In addition, I wish to strongly protest the way Ida Nudel has been relentlessly harassed by Soviet authori-

ties since her release from 4 years of internal exile in March 1982.

Over 10 years ago Ida Nudel applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel with her sister, whose exit visa was approved. Ida was not so fortunate; her request was denied on the grounds that since she was an economist, she knew too many "state secrets."

A woman of very strong convictions, Ida Nudel would not allow her spirit to be dulled by Soviet injustice. After being denied her exit visa, Ida Nudel began the series of "crimes" that led to her Siberian exile. She began caring for those other terribly unfortunate Soviet Jews who had requested to emigrate only to be denied and later imprisoned for simply being true to their Jewish faith.

For 7 years Ida Nudel cared for her fellow Soviet Jews, and she became known as the Angel of the Prisoners of Conscience. Finally, after being constantly harassed for her work and her deep commitment to the right to basic human rights, she hung a banner outside her apartment window that read "KGB give me my visa."

She was arrested and after a token trial, she was sentenced to 4 years in internal exile for "malicious hooliganism." She was released in March of this year, but Soviet justice has not fully been served.

Instead, the Soviet Government has refused granting her to permit that is required for any Soviet citizen to establish a residence. As a result, Ida Nudel has been forced to wander from one Soviet town to the next, only to be denied a residency permit wherever she goes.

Although not surprising, the Soviet treatment of Ida Nudel is intolerable.

Earlier this year, I joined a number of my colleagues in cosponsoring a resolution that calls on the Soviet Union to approve Ida Nudel's emigration visa and allow her to go to Israel, where her sister and only close relative resides. In addition, this resolution (H. Con. Res. 330) informs the Soviet Government that their relations with the United States will depend in part on their human rights record.

Finally, it must be emphasized that Ida Nudel's experience is becoming far too commonplace in the Soviet Union. I am deeply saddened to report that the latest figures released by the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry show that only 182 Soviet Jews were granted exit visas during the month of June, compared to the nearly 500,000 Jews who have applied for emigration.

To show what a dramatic decline in Soviet Jewish emigration these numbers represent, we must only compare 1982 figures with 1979. For the first 6 months of 1979, 24,794 exit visas were approved; for the first 6 months of

1982, only 1,537 exit visas were approved.

To make matters worse, this decline in emigration has also been coupled with a tremendous increase in Soviet anti-Semitism, directed especially at Soviet Jewish activists.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of Ida Nudel has been a tragic one. Yet she is not defeated. She continues to remain strong in spirit, and her life continues to inspire other Soviet Jews who are facing similar harsh treatment. Her life should also inspire us to do everything at our disposal to insure basic freedoms for Soviet Jews and oppressed people everywhere.●

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concern for a remarkable woman and dear personal friend, Ida Nudel. While it has been over 11 years since Ida Nudel made her first request for an exit visa to leave the Soviet Union, now is a particularly important time for all freedom loving people to express their solidarity with her brave and courageous efforts to advance the cause of human liberty. Following her release from a 4-year harsh and bitter exile in a remote area of Siberia, Nudel sought, in March, to return to her native Moscow. In June, she was denied this permission and was forced to leave. Settling in Riga, she once again sought a permit for permanent residence. Recently, though, this request was also turned down. The 52-year-old activist, homeless and harassed, must know that the international community will not tolerate this terrible violation of her human rights.

Ida Nudel was refused permission to leave for Israel on the grounds that she possessed "state secrets." As happens with exit visa applicants, Ida Nudel lost her job as an economist almost immediately. She was then labeled as "an enemy of the Soviet State," a malicious hooligan and a common criminal—all for merely expressing her desire to leave for Israel. Constant harassment, KGB interrogations and harsh attacks in the newspapers did not discourage Ida Nudel in her efforts to help her fellow Jews obtain emigration rights. Providing material and constant support for those seeking to emigrate, Nudel became known as the "Guardian Angel" of the movement. She lent support to Jews in labor camps by sending them reading material, pictures, food, and clothing—for 7 years she pleaded with the Soviet Union to allow her and others to leave.

Ida Nudel married in January 1975. In April of that year, her husband and sister received permission to leave for Israel; Ida Nudel did not. Despite continued harassment and interrogation by Soviet officials, Nudel continued her emotional pleas to the authorities. She never allowed concern about her

own plight to inhibit her dangerous activities on behalf of other refusniks.

Finally, on June 1, 1978, in utter desperation, she placed a banner outside her apartment window stating: "KGB, Give Me a Visa to Israel." For the Soviet authorities, this small act of defiance was too much. She was arrested that same day and charged with "malicious hooliganism." What is seen in America as an everyday example of free speech, is considered a state crime in the Soviet Union. After a trial in which she was allowed no representation, nor any witnesses to testify on her behalf, she began her sentence of 4 years of internal exile.

Ida Nudel's stay in prison was one filled with constant terror and hardship—traumas that have adversely affected her health, but not her spirit. Living in the most primitive barracks, in fear of the male prisoners at night and isolated from people in the nearby village during the day, Nudel somehow remained optimistic that one day she would be allowed to leave. Her problems, however, did not end when she was released from the camp. Soviet authorities have continued testing her resolve by denying her the right to live in the two cities which she has requested, Moscow and Riga.

Those who tortured and continue to harass Ida Nudel and other refusniks are the same people who signed the Helsinki accords on August 1, 1975. In signing this document, the Soviet Union, pledged to abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Nonetheless, the case of Ida Nudel and countless others demonstrate the glaring Soviet disregard for the basic principles of human decency to which they agreed in Helsinki.

The world must not forget Ida Nudel and the movement to which she has dedicated her life. Recent developments in the Soviet Union have confirmed our worst fears—in June 1982, only 182 Jews were allowed to leave. This is the lowest monthly figure since the movement began in the late 1960's and represents a 96-percent drop from the June 1979 numbers.

I know I speak for most Americans when I urge the Soviet Union to allow Ida Nudel to emigrate to Israel, to give her back her basic human rights. She is a dynamic, caring woman—our "Guardian Angel"—a spirit whose dedication to justice should serve as a reminder to all of the freedom that many are still denied.

I am very pleased to join my colleagues today in an effort to demonstrate our solidarity with those in the Soviet Union who yearn for even a sliver of the human liberties that we in the United States already enjoy.●

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, Ida Nudel, the Guardian Angel of the re-

fuseniks in the Soviet Union, is continuing her 11-year struggle to leave the Soviet Union and emigrate to Israel.

On this special day of "International Solidarity with Ida Nudel," I join with my colleagues in bringing this tragic situation of the Soviet Union's continuing harassment of Ida Nudel and other religious activists to the attention of all people.

Once again, it is evident that Ida Nudel's tireless struggle to emigrate is being hindered and that the Soviet Government is trying to strangle her hope and spirit by placing yet another obstacle in her way. Now that she has returned to Moscow from Siberian exile, Ida Nudel finds that she is forced into the bureaucratic maze of the Soviet Union—they have denied her residency permit in Moscow and the neighboring town of Riga. She literally has no place to live in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is clearly disavowing its signing of the Helsinki Final Act, in which it agreed to uphold certain fundamental human rights, among them, the rights to join family members living abroad and to emigrate to a historic homeland. Ida Nudel seeks to join her sister, her only close relative, in Israel.

We need not ask how the Soviet leaders can sign a solemn agreement and not live up to it. We have an obligation to expose their cynical actions to the judgment of world opinion.

Why is the Soviet Government so afraid that it cannot permit this brave woman to leave and join her family and, instead, they continue to hold her hostage in the Soviet Union.

Ida Nudel thinks of the suffering of her fellow prisoners and does whatever she can to help them, no matter what her own problems are with the authorities. She is an outgoing and courageous woman who, despite a heart condition, never ceases in her battle with authorities to emigrate to Israel. Ida Nudel is a woman worthy of our assistance and admiration.

Along with my colleagues, I call upon the Soviet authorities to let Ida Nudel leave the Soviet Union.●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, Ida Nudel has served as a symbol of the plight of Soviet Jews who would free themselves from the tyranny of the Soviet State. This brave woman has worked vigorously for her own liberty and selflessly to support others who yearn to escape the miserable plight of Soviet Jews. For the past 11 years, Ida Nudel has been deprived of the right to emigrate and, since 1978, has experienced the treatment which the Soviet Government reserves for those who express an independent will. That year, she dared to hang a banner demanding a visa to Israel. For this courageous act, she was sentenced to 4 years of internal exile, a life of isola-

tion and brutality difficult for citizens of the free world to fully comprehend.

Ida Nudel has served her sentence, but she is by no means free. Instead, she has been denied a permanent home, denied a visa, and suffers from continued harassment. Those of us who have followed her case and called for her freedom in the past must now redouble our efforts to gain the freedom of this noble woman.

Unfortunately, Ida Nudel is but one of many thousands of Soviet Jews who have been denied the right to emigrate. In blatant violation of the 1975 Helsinki accords, the Soviet Government prohibits its citizens from expressing their cultural and religious beliefs and refuses them the right to emigrate. In June, a mere 182 Jews were allowed to emigrate to Israel. The rest remained trapped in a barren prison of atheistic Soviet society.

Thus, we, as the leaders of a free nation dedicated to international human rights, must speak out—loudly, clearly, and continually—until the Ida Nudels are given their freedom and Soviet Jews are treated with the dignity which is their God-given right.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, this day of international solidarity with Ida Nudel marks Mrs. Nudel's 11-year struggle to leave the Soviet Union and emigrate to Israel. Sadly, that struggle is far from over.

Mrs. Nudel is only one of thousands of brave political and religious activists who suffer in the Soviet Union because of their strong wills and own personal beliefs. As Mrs. Nudel is in the process of applying for yet another emigration visa to join her sister in Israel, it is imperative that we in the Congress let the Soviet Government know that the denial of such visas and the unjust treatment of these Soviet citizens is unacceptable to the people of the United States.

Unless conditions improve for these Soviet dissidents the further unjust actions of the Soviet Union will have a severe impact on future relations between our two nations.

Decency mandates that Soviet Jews be given the chance to leave Russia and its religious deprivations for the freedom of Israel. We in this country must never relax our demands that the doors be opened for all who seek to immigrate to Israel.●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the struggle of Ida Nudel to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Ida Nudel's case is a prime example of Soviet religious persecution. There is no justifiable reason why the Soviet Union should not grant Ida Nudel permission to emigrate to Israel to be with her sister, who is her only living relative.

The Soviets have made life miserable for Ms. Nudel by denying her a residency permit for the cities of Moscow and Riga. As Soviet citizens

are not permitted to remain in major cities for more than 48 hours unless they obtain permission, the Government's refusal to grant such pleas, essentially relegates Ms. Nudel to internal exile. Normally people who wish to stay for longer periods simply register with the authorities. If a citizen wants to live permanently in a city, he or she then applies for a residency permit. But for Ida Nudel, this routine procedure has become a nightmare.

I fully support this brave woman's effort to emigrate in order to be free and follow her religious beliefs.

I urge the Soviet authorities to demonstrate compassion and a willingness to comply with the Helsinki accords which they are signatories to and free Ida Nudel immediately.●

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in today's special order for Ida Nudel. It is important that we remind the Soviet authorities, again and again, that the U.S. Congress will not forget this great woman and that we will not relax our efforts until she is free to leave for Israel.

I find it difficult to understand why the Soviet Union continues in its determination to deny Ida Nudel her right to live in Israel. Is she so important? Is the presence of Ida Nudel in the Soviet Union worth jeopardizing relations between our two countries? Why does the Soviet Government continue its persecution of this woman?

I do not know the answer to these questions. For some reason the Soviet Government has decided to make an example of Ida Nudel. Her continuing persecution must be designed to intimidate the Soviet Jewish emigration movement. Of course, the persecution of Ida Nudel is not having that effect. Ida Nudel continues to be an inspiration for all those people who are struggling for their right to live in Israel. Today, as she is denied residency permits in one city after another, as she grows weaker and more frail, Ida Nudel remains what she always was: the guardian angel of the refusenik movement.

Tragically, Ida's torture seems unending. The latest news from the Soviet Union is that Ida has been denied a residency permit for Riga. This follows denial of a permit for Moscow.

This illegal harassment of Ida Nudel is, of course, designed to break her spirit, if not her body. But Ida is not broken. She is determined to continue her struggle until she wins her right to join her sister in Israel. As Members of the U.S. Congress we join this heroic woman in her struggle. Ida Nudel must be permitted to leave the Soviet Union. Until she is in Tel Aviv we must continue to raise our cries of protest. This illegal persecution must end.

I enclose a short article by Elena Fridman, Ida's sister, which describes this woman of valor, Ida Nudel.

ELENA FRIDMAN: IDA'S SISTER

Ida and I were born in Crimea, Russia. We were the only children in our family and we were two years apart in age. Our home was not religious, but generally Jewish. Only grandfather was orthodox. Since we lived together with him, and were especially attached to him, we were very influenced by his way of life and it was from him that we absorbed our first Jewish feelings.

When the war against the Germans burst upon us, father was drafted into the army. He was sent to the front, never to return. His death was a terrible blow to us, unbearable to endure. After some time, we took leave of our beloved grandpa and moved to Moscow.

We attended a non-Jewish school in Moscow but suffered no discrimination. After completing high school, we entered the university, Ida in 1949, myself in 1951. Shortly after I started attending the university, mother became very ill and it was clear that one of us had to stay with her. We decided that I should tend mother and that Ida should continue her studies. This was during the period of the anti-Semitic Doctors' Plot accusations, and for the first time in her life Ida was conscious of hostility against her by her fellow students because she was Jewish.

When she completed her studies, she specifically asked to do her three-year compulsory service (required of everyone who attains higher education) in a remote area. She felt that she wanted to contribute as much as possible to the state. This was typical of her character. She was sent to a desolate village in the Ural Mountains near Siberia where she worked under difficult conditions as an economist.

When she returned to Moscow in 1957, she found work in her field, while continuing to study economics and construction engineering in the evenings. Her life was filled with music, theater, poetry, sports and hiking. I always remember Ida with a knapsack on her back.

News of the Six Day War in 1967 had an enormous effect on all of us. It stirred Jewish national feelings in the entire Jewish community. Ida began looking for reading material on Jewish history and on Israel, though this was difficult to find.

In 1970 we heard about the attempted hijack of the plane in Leningrad. We had no information save what we heard and saw on Soviet radio and television, as we still had no connections with any emigration activists. We began seeking other sources of information and suddenly we learned that some people had received permission to leave the Soviet Union. This represented a revolution for us as we were not emotionally prepared for this. Ida was the first member of the family to start discussing this development, insisting that we must all leave for Israel. She soon made contact with emigration activists and intensified her search for material about Israel, reading everything available. She sensed that she had discovered something that all of us had been lacking—Jewish content in our lives. She contacted a group whose members were studying Hebrew underground, and soon joined them in study. In our apartment, on every wall, on the doors, in the kitchen, she pasted stickers with Hebrew words inscribed on them and whenever she passed them, she studied them. She also urged us to start learning Hebrew at once.

Ida lived close to us, an once when she was with us, our son Ya'akov came in from the street with swollen eyes, blurring out, "I don't want to be a Jew."

"Who told you that you were Jewish?"
"The children in the street told me. I asked them, 'How do you know that I'm Jewish.' They said, 'By your eyes.'"

Then Ida said, "That's the end. We have nothing to wait for."

We started looking for ways to leave. My husband Aryeh had a large family in Israel and they sent us the required invitation to come. Ida and I never thought of being separated. In all our applications we wrote that we were together. Actually, we were concerned about Aryeh's right to leave, but we had no worry about Ida since she had been working at production planning and was not involved in secret work.

We submitted applications at the beginning of 1971. Following this, Ida was informed that she would have to appear before a special meeting at her place of work. At the factory where she worked, a large sign was posted indicating that a general meeting was being held "concerning Ida Nudel's application to leave for Israel." It was like a lynching. A large group of people attended, including members of the administrative staff. All sat tensely and quietly, allowing Ida to speak first. She spoke pleasantly, with much emotion and power of persuasion. She pointed out, among other things, that every Jew, no matter what language he speaks, always looks to the East. She added, "I have no complaint against Russia nor the authorities. I was born and educated here. Nevertheless, there is one place where I must be: the State of Israel, the homeland for Jews throughout the world. I am drawn there as by a magnet. I feel that I belong to that piece of land in the East, to the people living there. I don't know what contribution I can still make there, but my place is undoubtedly there."

The reactions to Ida's speech were favorable and most of the listeners were sympathetic. They tried to dissuade her. "Why wreck your life? You have a good position here, a place to live as we all have." But she was not deterred. "I need something entirely different. My place is there together with my Jewish brothers." After the meeting Ida returned home proud of what she had done. She told us, "In the silence prevailing following my talk, I heard someone whisper, 'Excellent, how she spoke!' That gave me courage to stand."

The next day at work, people passed by her and clasped her hand, not only Jews but gentiles as well. That gave her the feeling that she was right, adding strength to her stance. Following the meeting, she was, of course, discharged from her post, the fate suffered by all Jews requesting exit permits. She was unemployed for an entire year. Her application for an exit permit was rejected one month after we had received our permits. Why was she refused? Someone had arbitrarily decided against her and that was it. That occurred in April 1972. We were at a loss. How should we react? I couldn't reconcile myself to leaving without her. How could I leave without Ida? We were always together. We held a family conference and she said to us, "You have to leave. You, Elena, have to think of your child, your husband, and yourself. You will all leave together and meanwhile I shall remain here. There must have been some error in my case. Who needs me here?" On Ida's insistence, we made preparations to leave for Israel.

I wept terribly at the airport. I was already bereft of feeling, I could only cry. Ida said, "Why are you weeping? It is I who should be crying." She tried to console me.

Ida remained behind and quite naturally attempted to seek out people in her position. She attended many courses and meetings where she and friends read numerous letters arriving from Israel. In that manner she became acquainted with many families of prisoners of conscience and their problems. She suddenly realized that there were people whose situations were worse than her own. Many were in prison only because of what they did for the Jewish people and they had no one to help them other than their families. When their families left for Israel, they remained alone. From early childhood Ida was accustomed to helping people in trouble and now she saw an opportunity to assist fellow Jews who had helped others and were suffering for it. Ida was among the first, if not the very first, to establish a movement for freeing the prisoners, and to rouse Jews to fight for this cause.

She began to write and encourage. Her first task was to determine the locations of the prisoners and inmates in mental institutions. She contacted prisoners and their families. She had a special gift for gathering information on matters in which she was interested. She received much encouragement from the families. They came to visit her and consult with her, and because she always thought of and helped others, never asking anything for herself, she was highly regarded by all. She wrote thousands of letters of encouragement, never complaining about her own difficulties nor asking for thanks. Ida understood the nature of the people she was writing to, sensed their moods and their personal interests, and found ways of getting information about their physical condition.

It was not only the prisoners whom she helped. She assisted every Jew who expressed his desire to leave for Israel, never judging whether he was a good person or not. She also undertook to explain to people who were reluctant to leave why it was incumbent upon them to emigrate to Israel. People came to seek her advice on how to stand up at meetings and face the government and people. They requested her to visit their families and talk to them about why they ought to leave. She always obliged willingly.

She always said to the men: You must be proud in making your decision to leave. When you see a K.G.B. agent, walk straight, don't cross the street to avoid him. When you go to apply for a visa, look them straight in the eye, don't lower your head, for you have done nothing wrong. You have decided Israel is the place for you. Be proud of this. She was no longer concerned with developments in Russia. Spiritually and emotionally she already felt herself in Israel.

In 1973, during the course of a six-hour interrogation session by the K.G.B., her interrogator said to her, "You may be Esther to the Jews, but that won't help you get out." That was just the beginning.●

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again to join my colleagues in expressing concern over the welfare and liberty of Ida Nudel, a courageous political and religious activist suffering in the Soviet Union.

It has been my privilege to be involved during the last 4 years in Ms. Nudel's 11-year freedom struggle. Most recently, I received a letter from Ms. Nudel's sister, Ms. Elena Fridman, which details the continued oppression of Ms. Nudel in the Soviet Union.

At this point, I would like to submit for the RECORD this letter from Ms. Elena Fridman.

I congratulate my colleagues for the continued vigilance which we have shown with respect to Ms. Nudel's struggle for human rights. We must continue to demonstrate our concern to Soviet authorities on this matter, and I plan to do so.

HOLON, ISRAEL, June 27, 1982.

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FAUNTROY: I am deeply moved and encouraged by your continuing concern and activity on behalf of my sister, Ida Nudel, as most recently expressed in your letter to Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin dated February 26 co-signed by you and 73 of your colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I also appreciate your comments regarding Ida, as recorded in the Congressional Record of March 2, 1982. If you receive any response from Ambassador Dobrynin you can well appreciate how anxious I will be to have you share it with me.

Ida's release from Siberian exile and her return to her Moscow apartment on March 26 sparked hope and anticipation in my heart. I thought it might be the first step toward our long-awaited reunion in Israel. Instead, it turned out to be the beginning of a new round of the Soviet authorities' campaign to further embitter her life.

This time they have evidently decided to throw her into a bureaucratic maze which seems to provide no way out and is obviously designed to strangle her hope and spirit.

Immediately after having received her I.D. card from the police in Moscow, Ida went to the Ovir office to again apply for an exit visa to Israel. There she was told that such application could only be received from persons who are resident in the district. Since no address was written into her new I.D. card, she would have to apply for a residence permit. Ida's subsequent application for the reinstatement of her permanent residence status in Moscow has now been turned down. She does not know where she will live if she is indeed forced out of her apartment in Moscow.

Of equal concern is the fact that Ida has expressed her need to enter a hospital for long overdue treatment of her heart condition. This is also impossible because hospital facilities in Moscow are unavailable to non-residents. During conversations in Moscow, Ida has indicated that what kept her going during her difficult exile were the thousands of letters she received from well-wishers around the world. I believe that continuing the flow of letters now is the most important thing we can do. The only address I can give you is that of her Moscow apartment. I do not know whether letters will actually reach her there, but I believe we must try for as long as this is her only address:

U.S.S.R., Moscow, Yunikh Lenintzev St. No. 79, CPRP. 6, Apt. 28, Nudel Ida.

(Personal Delivery-Acknowledgment of Receipt Requested)

Obviously, I would also be very grateful if you would continue to place pressure on the Soviet authorities so that they might finally relent in this senseless campaign and allow Ida to go.

Sincerely yours,

ELENA FRIDMAN.●

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my continued concern and support for Ida Nudel who is trying to obtain a visa to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel.

Ida Nudel's case has attained symbolic significance—symbolic of all persons in the Soviet Union who are attempting to exercise their right to emigrate.

For 11 years, Ida Nudel has been struggling to leave the Soviet Union. She wishes only to go to Israel to join her sister, her only close relative. She applied for a visa in 1971 and was denied permission. She has been repeatedly harassed and placed under surveillance by the Soviet authorities. Her only "crime" was that she worked until 1978 aiding Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience by providing them with messages, parcels, and a feeling that someone cared.

In 1978, Ida Nudel was arrested and sentenced to internal exile in Siberia for hanging a sign from her balcony which said, "KGB, give me my visa." She was released from exile in March of this year, and is currently in the process of applying for an emigration visa once again. She has even been denied the right to live in the apartment she formerly occupied in Moscow, and as a result, spends many nights wandering the streets with no place to go.

I would like to urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this brave woman's efforts. The Soviet Union has ratified the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which commits nations to respect individual rights and freedom, and specifically, the right to emigrate to the country of one's choice to rejoin relatives. In spite of this commitment, though, Ida Nudel is still involved in a heated struggle, the outcome of which is suspensefully uncertain.

Let us join together on this day, International Day of Activity for Ida Nudel, to remind Soviet authorities, and Ida Nudel herself, that the world has not forgotten Ida Nudel and her battle for freedom.●

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in support of Ida Nudel, who for 11 years has sought to emigrate from the Soviet Union and live in Israel.

She has suffered greatly for her desire to live in freedom, in the country of her choice.

Ida Nudel is one of dozens of Soviet Jews who have faced harassment, prosecution and harsh prison sentences because of her unfaltering desire to emigrate from the Soviet

Union. She first applied for exit permission in May 1971 and was repeatedly refused. At that time, she began her efforts to care for and support Jewish prisoners who had been jailed for their beliefs. Her kindness and tireless work earned her the title of "Guardian Angel" of the Prisoners of Conscience. It also brought her to the attention of the Soviet secret police, the KGB.

After 7 fruitless years of hard work and continued harassment, she finally hung a banner from her apartment balcony that read: "KGB, Give Me My Visa"—a desperate attempt to bring public attention to her plight. Shortly thereafter, she was arrested on charges of malicious hooliganism, tried and sentenced to 4 years of internal exile in Siberia. She spent those years confined to a small village, forced to live under conditions of extreme loneliness and hardship.

Her exile ended on March 25 of this year. Since that time, the harassment has continued. She was recently denied a permit to live in Moscow, and she is now reportedly homeless. She continues to seek exit permission to live in Israel.

Ida Nudel has paid dearly for her desire to live a life of freedom and dignity in Israel. I strongly and earnestly urge the leaders of the Soviet Union to permit this remarkable woman to emigrate at the soonest possible date.●

● Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a problem that has gradually worsened in recent months. The problem of Soviet emigration and, particularly, the problem of Ida Nudel, a Soviet Jew living in limbo while she is refused an exit visa.

According to the Council for Soviet Jews, Mr. Speaker, only 182 Jews were permitted to leave the U.S.S.R. in June. This is the lowest monthly figure since the early 1970's; a 96-percent drop from June 1979 figures.

So it seems particularly appropriate that this month we should recognize this International Solidarity Day with Ida Nudel, a brave woman who has been trying to leave the Soviet Union for the last 11 years.

As soon as Ida Nudel applied for her first exit visa, she lost her job. She has been subjected to Government harassment, social ostracism, KGB arrest, and finally, imprisonment in Siberia under the harshest conditions.

In spite of the threats to her mental and physical well-being, Ida Nudel continues her quest. A quest that the Soviet Union should not be reluctant to fulfill since they, too, are signatories of the Helsinki accords of 1975.

Ida Nudel's plight today is not a happy one. Her sister and husband were allowed to emigrate to Israel in 1975. She has been denied work and a place to live. She is 52 years old, home-

less, and under constant surveillance by the Soviet Government.

Let us, then, observe this International Solidarity Day with this brave woman. She is more than just one person. She represents thousands like her who ask nothing more than to join their families in other countries. They do not seek to cause trouble for Soviet authorities, they do not seek to change the Soviet way of life. They ask simply to leave.

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in once again speaking on behalf of Ida Nudel.

It has now been 11 years since Ida Nudel began her ordeal to gain an emigration visa to join her sister in Israel. In that time she has been subjected to various forms of harassment and persecution in order to fulfill her desire to return to her "homeland." Although her only crime has been this longing, Ida has been forced to spend the last 4 years of her life in exile in a remote and isolated village in Siberia.

In March of this year Ida completed her 4-year exile term, yet she is still being held a prisoner by the Soviet Government. Upon her release, she returned to her home in Moscow, but was denied residency status there. Ida has attempted to gain residency in other surrounding cities, but with no avail. This heroic woman has been reduced, at times, to spend nights in train stations and in deserted areas, while she continues her struggle to obtain a visa to Israel.

It is disgraceful to see such a respected and loved woman harassed in her struggle to obtain the most basic of human rights—the right to religious freedom and the right to emigrate to Israel. Ida has become the Guardian Angel of the Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, taking on the plight of other Soviet Jews regardless of the danger to herself. She stands as a symbol to all those who have been persecuted and harassed in their attempts to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

I urge my colleagues to join with me on this International Day of Activity for Ida Nudel, to demand that the Soviets stop harassing Ida Nudel and allow her to join her sister in Israel. It is inhumane to deny any person the basic rights that Ida is trying to obtain. We all must continue to fight with this heroic woman, so that one day her dream can be achieved.●

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY) and the National Conference on Soviet Jewry for arranging this special Day of International Solidarity. The commitment of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry to aiding Soviet Jews is highly regarded in Congress and across the Nation.

More than 2.5 million Jews remain in the Soviet Union, where often their

rights are withheld, their jobs are taken away, and the freedom to study the Hebrew language and practice their religion is officially denied them.

The plight of Ida Nudel, Guardian Angel of the Soviet Prisoners of Conscience, concerns all Americans and everyone around the globe who cares about human rights. The harsh treatment that she has endured reminds all of us that the Soviet Union continues to deny basic rights to Soviet Jews. So long as these and other injustices exist, it is difficult for the world to believe that any real human rights exist in the Soviet Union.

Ida Nudel, the only Jewish woman being held prisoner of conscience in the Soviet Union, first attempted to emigrate in 1971. After her request was denied she began her heroic efforts to support Soviet Jews who had been jailed for their beliefs. For the next 7 years, she was harassed, interrogated, and falsely branded a criminal by Soviet officials. Finally, she was arrested for "malicious hooliganism" for hanging a banner outside her Moscow home that read "KGB Give Me My Visa." She was sentenced to 4 years of internal exile in Siberia in 1978. The only female among 60 criminals, Ida slept with an ax under her bed to protect herself. One year later, as a result of numerous appeals on her behalf, she was moved to a one-room hut.

This year Ida Nudel completed her sentence, never having committed any real crime, and still she continues to be punished. She has been denied a "propiska," or residency permit, in Riga where her close friends live, as well as in many small surrounding towns. Since Soviet citizens are not allowed to remain in most major cities for more than 48 hours without permission from the proper authorities, and in each place she has traveled to she has been denied residency, Ida has been forced to sleep on a bench in a train station at least once before continuing her journey. It seems this courageous woman, who has spent most of her life helping and defending the rights of others, has been placed in an almost perpetual exile.

On this International Day of Activity for Ida Nudel, we must let our voices be heard in strong support of human rights everywhere, and specifically for Jews in the Soviet Union. The courage and spirit of Ida Nudel are an inspiration to all, reminding us that we must not rest in our protests. We must show the Soviet Union that we will continue to speak out as long as Ida Nudel and others like her are being denied their basic human rights.●

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to add my voice today to those who have indicated their concern for a remarkable woman, Ida Nudel. Quite frankly, the actions of

the Soviet Government amount to no less than persecution. She was sentenced to 4 years of internal exile in Siberia for the crime of "malicious hooliganism." For those in our country who may not know what such a crime is or how important our freedom of speech is in our own country, her crime was to display a banner outside her window expressing exasperation over the fact that she had not been permitted to emigrate to Israel. Having served 4 harrowing years in Siberia, Ida Nudel sought permission to reside in her native Moscow after being released. She was denied a residence permit. She then sought to establish residence in Riga. Again, she was denied a residence permit. The harassment of Ida Nudel continues unabated.

Ida Nudel has been a woman of conscience and compassion. Many of those who finally received permission to emigrate told of her valiant efforts to support them through their tribulations. Despite the danger of official retaliation, she provided food, clothing, and reading material for Jews who had been sent to labor camps. Now that Ida needs help, we have an obligation to appeal to the conscience of our own Nation and to try to move the conscience of the Soviet authorities.

Ida Nudel has been denied basic human rights. She was first denied the right of emigration. Soviet authorities have violated the Helsinki agreements providing for the reunification of families. She was also denied the freedom of speech and unjustly sentenced after being denied the right to a fair trial. Finally, she is presently being denied the freedom of residing where she chooses. I ask the Soviet authorities why this vicious harassment of a single woman is necessary and request them to permit her to emigrate to Israel.●

REGULATORY REFORM

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this special order at this time to begin a discussion of the subject of regulatory reform and the entire issue of what has happened to the initiative in this House that was so boldly undertaken many months, indeed years ago, to get the bureaucracy of the Federal

Government under control and to make it more responsible to the desires and wishes of the American people.

The reason I take this special order and begin this discussion is that, for reasons which are unexplained to me, and I think unexplainable, the initiatives that have been launched in this direction have ground to a silent and mysterious halt someplace in the Halls of this House.

What is regulatory reform all about, Mr. Speaker?

It is a method, a means, by which the American people seek to regain control over their own Government.

The fact of the matter is that more decisions are made, more rules and regulations are issued, by unelected officials affecting the lives and the livelihood of all Americans than there are as a result of laws passed by the Congress of the United States.

During the average session of a Congress, somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 laws are passed. During that same period of time, almost 20,000 rules and regulations can be passed.

The ratio of those rules and regulations having the force and effect of law on nonelected officials as compared to those made by those elected by the people of the United States is something to contemplate.

Much of the cynicism that the American people feel about their Government is a result of the unaccountability of a bureaucracy that is remote, insensitive, arbitrary, and sometimes, yes, Mr. Speaker, oppressive.

It was out of this concern that Members of Congress, both in the House and the other body, rose up and said that we are going to change this.

In a bipartisan way, members of my party, Democrats, took the initiative in this effort originally to bring the bureaucracy under control through a streamlining and accountability, even through the use of the legislative veto, which lets Members of the Congress elected by, accountable to the people, have the final say so by reviewing and where necessary rejecting and vetoing regulations issued by unelected bureaucrats.

In 1975, Mr. Speaker, when that issue of legislative veto first came to the floor of this House for a vote, up or down on all agencies that should be covered by it, 265 Members of this House voted in favor of it.

Since that time, for reasons again unexplained and unexplainable, there has never been an effort made to get that legislation back to this floor for action even though over a majority of the Members of this House of both parties have cosponsored legislation to that effect.

We have amended pieces of legislation on an item-by-item basis to place this mechanism in effect to get control over these unaccountable bureaucrats,

and it has had an improving impact on our Government.

Recently we added this type of control over the Federal Trade Commission, different programs in the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Agriculture, but the need to make the entire bureaucracy accountable to the American people still remains.

In years gone past, while the House of Representatives has moved forward, the other body has been reluctant. The other body has been the one that has failed to pass this legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, this year, this year, the other body by a unanimous vote adopted legislation providing for regulatory reform, including a legislative veto.

What has happened in this House, Mr. Speaker?

What has happened I think is a shame because it reflects upon the Members and the leadership of this House.

What has happened is that, although regulatory reform legislation was reported out of the Judiciary Committee on February 25 of this year, that legislation—a major bipartisan effort to return control of the bureaucracy to the American people—has not yet been able to be voted on by the Members of this House.

The legislative veto legislation, H.R. 1776, which has over 250 cosponsors, well over a majority of the Members of this House, of both parties, has yet to be considered in committee or brought to the floor of this House.

I think it is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that for reasons that cannot be explained, there are those in power in this House who have been unwilling to let the voice of the American people be heard, who have been unwilling and refuse to understand the force behind more than a majority of the Members of this House, seeking to have this opportunity to make the bureaucracy accountable, and the cynicism of the American people persists about who runs their Government—is it the elected officials or the unelected bureaucrats? Then that cynicism is understandable and will grow until the Members of this House are given the opportunity to do their will and to express the desires of the American people.

□ 1950

I think you are going to see more and more. Mr. Speaker, fingers pointed at the leadership of this House asking the question: Why is it that legislation which would require accountability on the part of unelected bureaucrats is being locked in a closet, pigeonholed, and not even given the opportunity for consideration?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are Members of this House who in November when the people get an oppor-

tunity to go to the polls and express their concerns about the future of this Nation are going to hold the leadership of this House and Members of this body accountable for once again frustrating the opportunity and the will and the desire of the American people to be heard on this matter.

What can be so wrong with a piece of legislation that passed the other body by a unanimous vote, by people of both conservative and liberal persuasion, by the most conservative Senators and by the most liberal Senators?

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Senators from your own State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, supported this legislation as it came through the other body.

What can be wrong with legislation like that, that it is not even possible to let the Members of this body, speaking on behalf of the American people, have that chance to bring accountability?

I do not know what you hear, Mr. Speaker, when you go to your district, but one of the things that I hear is that the American people are fed up with a bureaucracy that will not listen, with people who control their lives and livelihood, whose names they do not know and if they did, could not hold them accountable. That is not a phenomenon of this administration, or the last administration or the administration before that. That is a fact of life about the Government we have.

The American people under our system of government are entitled to look to their elected officials and not be put upon solely by the unelected officials.

Yes, there are many, indeed most, of the people in the civil service of this country are dedicated and reasonable and committed individuals, many of whom serve at a sacrifice for the American people and consider themselves public servants; but there are others, Mr. Speaker, who because of this unaccountability have delegated to themselves decisionmaking powers, an imposition on the American people that is unwarranted.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this is not a liberal or a conservative issue. Some people have suggested that it is an approach that would favor business as opposed to consumers or environmental groups or public interest groups. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is a two-edged sword. The voice of the people can be heard through their elected officials when they cannot even get in the front door of many agencies of Government.

There are many regulations which have been issued by this administration undoing the gains and accomplishments in the field of consumer protection or environmental protection, but environmentalists and con-

sumer advocates would have had the opportunity to deal with through regulatory reform and legislative veto, just as in other instances the excesses of zealots who have gone too far could have been curbed and restrained and made accountable to the American people where those who did not suffer the inconvenience of running for public office have taken it to themselves to pass rules and regulations affecting every aspect of the life of the American public.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you, I urge you, bring this legislation to the floor of this House. It would take no more than a word from you for this legislation to come forth and let the Members of this House work their will upon it on behalf of the American people.

Failing to do that, Mr. Speaker, I fear that many Members of this House in the elections that are coming up later this year are going to have to answer to the fact why it was that that which was wanted and desired by the American people, control over their own Government, accountability of the Federal bureaucracy, was not even given the fair opportunity to be voted on, even through a majority of the Members of this House have sponsored legislation to do that. That is no way to run a democratic institution, and if people have to pay a price for that failure of democracy, then it is an appropriate price to be paid.

The American people want their Government to be accountable to them. It is, indeed, a government of the people and by the people and in that way it can be a government for the people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge you, do that which the Members of your House, the Members who elected you Speaker of their House, have asked for. Let the regulatory reform legislation and the legislative veto have the opportunity to come to the floor of this House so that the Members can join with their counterparts in the other body, pass this legislation and help restore true democratic principles to our Government.

ASSURING DIVERSITY OF INFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the "information age." New technologies are greatly facilitating the sharing of information that can be used in a variety of ways. Developments in this area are and will be of great benefit to our citizens.

As Congress has considered telecommunications legislation over recent years, a consensus view has been that we must insure that information will

be transmitted over regulated facilities without discrimination among the providers of the information. I have supported the inclusion of protections in this regard; in 1980, I supported an amendment in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to strengthen prohibitions on the offering of information over regulated facilities by the owner of those facilities, and I support the "Diversity of Information" section of H.R. 5158 that is being considered by the Energy and Commerce Committee.

For electronic publishers, the telephone network is the only system generally available to provide information services. As the chairman of the Telecommunications Committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association testified in March, "in the absence of appropriate legislation, the telephone network would remain a classic 'bottleneck facility'" because of the high degree to which competition is absent. Where there are no electronic alternatives to information publishers, as is the case almost entirely in local telephone service and is largely the situation today in long-distance service, there is a great and dangerous potential that telephone companies will discriminate in making transmission facilities and services available if those companies are permitted to offer information products and services. Until there are effective competing conduits available to electronic publishers, telephone companies should not control the content of information transmitted over their own lines.

Legislation I am introducing today responds to this legitimate concern. While it comprises language developed by the House Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance as contained in section 263 of H.R. 5158, with the exception of the requirement that facilities be made available "element by element," my bill expands the protections to include all exchange and interexchange common carrier services and facilities. As is the case with the offering of "enhanced services" over regulated facilities, it is nearly impossible to guard against anticompetitive activities when a telephone company offers information services over facilities it owns and which are not subject to competition. Thus, the bill requires that no costs of providing information publishing services, except traditional directory information, may be recovered through charges for regulated service, that regulated facilities must be provided without discrimination, that regulated services and facilities of all exchange and interexchange carriers must be made available to any person upon reasonable request and that "no interexchange common carrier nor exchange common carrier may provide any information publishing service through any transmission facility

which such carrier uses to provide common carrier service." Its short title is the "Assurance of Diversity of Electronic Information Sources Act."

Having believed that these protections are essential, it is important that they be promptly approved, especially in light of the proposed modified consent decree involving A.T. & T. My legislation provides a means of doing so. Though I am a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I do not serve on the Telecommunications Subcommittee, and the subcommittee's review of this measure may improve upon it; for example, its protections may be too strong. Yet, more comprehensive safeguards than those in H.R. 5158 are needed, and I hope that legislation assuring diversity of electronic information sources is enacted this year. ●

ALARM RISES OVER DECAY IN U.S. PUBLIC WORKS

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

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Sunday last, July 18, 1982, has a fascinating first-page article headed "Alarm Rises Over Decay in U.S. Public Works."

This article is just one in a series of long overdue comments by responsible journalists, commentators, economic planners, engineers, Federal, State, and local officials—literally a parade from all sections of the country and from all walks of our national life who are deeply concerned with the future of that structure which is the backbone of our Nation's operation—our infrastructure. Our need to revitalize and rebuild our major public facilities from water systems through and including highways, bridges, and rails has never been more apparent than it is today.

The Committee on Public Works and Transportation has for a number of years pointed this out and has led the way by authorizing legislation to take care of our obsolete and decaying bridges, crumbling highways, leaking water and sewer systems among other public facilities.

The Economic Development Administration, a creation of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and this Congress, pointed out the shortage of capacity of many facilities throughout the country back some 4 years ago in 1978. The record is clear. The need to proceed is apparent. This article in the New York Times and others, which I am sure will follow, highlight the problem very succinctly. I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1982]
ALARM RISES OVER DECAY IN U.S. PUBLIC
WORKS

(By John Herbers)

In Pittsburgh, the United States Steel Corporation contends that it is paying at least \$1 million a year to detour its trucks 26 miles around a major bridge that the state closed two years ago for lack of repair.

In Albuquerque, motorists are up in arms because sewer lines are crumbling under the streets, many of which have become impassable as the city struggles to make piece-by-piece replacements.

In Houston, the magazine *Texas Monthly* asserted that it had counted 1.5 million potholes in a city that is a center of great wealth.

In New York, broken water mains, subway failures and the deterioration of other facilities above ground and below have become so common that the seemingly mundane subject of "the infrastructure" has become a prominent issue for both the city and state governments.

News of a neglected and decaying infrastructure—public facilities such as water systems, sewers, streets, highways, bridges and rails, which undergird life and commerce in every community—has taken on a new prominence on the national scene at a time when the country is suffering from a recession, high unemployment, decline of much of its basic industry and the reduction of public services by governments at all levels.

The situation is similar to that of a family whose income has been cut, that is behind on the mortgage payments and unable to buy shoes for the children, and then learns that tree roots have plugged the drainage pipes, the furnace must be replaced and termites have weakened the foundation of the house.

In the urban policy report the Administration made public last week, President Reagan said he wanted to do something about the infrastructure problem but had not decided what.

Meanwhile, a bipartisan coalition is growing in Congress to force action by the national Government, partly on the ground that Mr. Reagan's goal of revitalizing American industry cannot be reached until something is done about inadequate public facilities. Many Democrats say that repairing public works would provide jobs for many of the unemployed.

One difficulty is that public works projects have been so fragmented between the various levels of governments that no one knows the extent of the decay, or how much money would be needed for repairs and new construction necessary to support the economy and quality of life at reasonable levels.

Only in the past year or so has the concern of policy makers about the neglect of basic public works grown urgent. Studies by George E. Peterson of the Urban Institute and by Pat Choate and Susan Walter of the Council of State Planning Agencies documented the inadequacy of public facilities, not only in older, fiscally troubled cities such as New York and Boston but in suburban and rural communities in every region of the nation.

Their findings have been confirmed and expanded by a number of Government agencies and by Congressional investigations. These are some of the more serious deficiencies cited:

Obsolete and decaying bridges. The Transportation Department recently classified 45

percent of the nation's 557,516 highway bridges as "deficient or obsolete." Replacement or repair could cost \$47.6 billion, the department said.

Crumbling highways. The 42,000-mile interstate system, begun in the 1950's and not yet completed, is deteriorating at a rate that would require reconstruction of 2,000 miles a year, in addition to a backlog of 8,000 miles in need of rebuilding that accumulated because of cuts in financing in recent years. The condition has contributed to costly traffic jams on the expressways of most major urban areas.

Deteriorated rail facilities. The condition of roadbeds and rolling stock of Conrail and other rail systems is so poor that some officials say there are no reliable estimates available on the cost of replacement and repair. But frequent derailments and delays in shipments attest to the need, according to a range of officials.

Leaking water and sewer mains. The Urban Institute, in a survey of 28 cities, found that 10 of them, Cleveland, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Tulsa, Philadelphia, Hartford, Kansas City, Mo., Cincinnati, Buffalo and Baltimore, were losing 10 percent or more of their treated water because of deteriorated pipes. And the survey did not include New York and Boston, with two of the leading all-time water-leaking systems. Probably a larger problem, from the standpoint of waste, is leaky sewers, in which ground water flows into the pipes, adds to the volume of sewage and greatly increases the cost of treatment.

Shortage of capacity of many facilities. A survey conducted by the Economic Development Administration in 1978 showed that half of the nation's communities had wastewater treatment systems operating at full capacity, meaning they could not support new economic or population growth without costly new construction.

The estimates of need tend to become astronomical. Nationally the figures run into the trillions. Last fall, the New York State Legislature estimated that \$8 billion to \$10 billion a year would be needed in New York State for repairs, replacement and construction of the infrastructure, which would double current expenditures.

A more precise expression of need was published by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, which said that New York City alone over the next few years would have to service, repair or replace 1,000 bridges, two aqueducts, one large water tunnel, several reservoirs, 6,200 miles of streets, 6,000 miles of sewers, 6,000 miles of water lines, 6,700 subway cars, 4,500 buses, 25,000 acres of parks, 17 hospitals, 19 city university campuses, 950 schools, 200 libraries and several hundred fire houses and police stations.

The causes of neglect and decay are more easily documented than the extent of need. Mr. Choate, an economist and a former Federal official who is now the senior analyst for a giant corporation, said in a paper prepared for the House Wednesday Group, made up of moderate Republican representatives, that investments in capital projects had declined sharply.

"The nation's public capital investments fell from \$33.7 billion in 1965 to less than \$24 billion in 1980, a 30 percent decline," he wrote. "Public works investments dropped from \$174 per person in 1965 to less than \$110 per person in 1980, a 36 percent decline, and shrank from 3.6 percent of the gross national product in 1965 to less than 1.7 per cent in 1980, a 54 percent decline."

In the 1960's and 70's, public works projects frequently were delayed so that the

Government could finance such endeavors as the Vietnam War, social programs, education and space exploration. Nevertheless, the Federal Government assumed a much larger share of public works costs, which previously had been borne by state and local governments. In 1957, the Federal Government paid 10 percent of the costs. By 1980 its share had risen to 40 percent.

RESPONSIBILITY FRAGMENTED

The responsibility for maintaining public facilities, Mr. Choate pointed out, was fragmented between 100 Federal agencies, 50 state governments, 3,042 counties, 35,000 general-purpose governments, 15,000 school districts, 26,000 special districts, 2,000 area-wide units of government, 200 interstate compacts and nine multistate regional development organizations.

But the Federal Government, the dominant player, never achieved any rational method for allocating the funds. Mr. Choate said Federal laws favored new construction over repairing of existing facilities.

Public works money, which often has been handed out for purposes of politics rather than need, became increasingly subject to waste and fraud, according to Mr. Choate and others. In 1980 alone, 219 state and local public officials were convicted of criminal abuse of public funds, a figure three times greater than the 1970 level.

At the same time environmental requirements enacted in the 1970's increased the need for higher expenditures for public works.

Many authorities say they believe, however, that the greatest cause for inadequacy of public facilities lies in the spread of the population and industry out of the central city to suburbs and remote communities around the nation.

Retired people moved in large groups into new communities, many in rural recreational areas; factories settled along the freeways and new urban development sprang up near them; state governments spread their colleges over once remote areas; people migrated from the old industrial cities to the South and West, where urban and rural sprawl was greatest; after the 1980 census the Federal Government designated 36 former small towns as metropolitan areas. All this new development required enormous amounts of capital investment for streets, curbs, water and sewer facilities, airports and other facilities.

DEMAND IN CITIES REMAINED

But the growth did not lessen the demand in the thinned-out central cities. The infrastructures in old cities, which suffered heavy population losses, serve many vacant lots, half-empty buildings and closed factories and warehouses. But the facilities must usually be maintained as though they were being used at capacity.

At a recent conference on land use sponsored by the Engineering Foundation in Rindge, N.H., Philip Finkelstein of the Center for Local Tax Research in New York pointed out that when the city government suggested that it could no longer afford to maintain basic facilities in the South Bronx, where many buildings had been abandoned, there was a storm of protest and the suggestion was dropped.

"I don't think there is any way to do that with any degree of acceptability," he said, in reference to a suggestion that there be a contraction of public facilities in the cities.

Americans in 1982 are separated as never before by great stretches of pavement, communication and electric lines and water and

sewer pipes. Many authorities are questioning whether the nation can any longer afford to maintain what it already has built and continue to provide for new communities.

LAND USE AT THE HEART

Harry E. Pollard, president of the Henry George School of Social Science of Los Angeles, said the way it is now, "A bus driver in order to collect one acre of people has to drive five acres to find them. And he has to drive past five miles of sewer pipe instead of one. It is a land-use problem. If you have to finance five miles for every one you will forever be in financial trouble."

According to a number of authorities, no national administration has succeeded in bringing order to the chaos of public works spending. The Carter Administration, they said, was beginning to coordinate Federal spending so that priorities could be established.

The Reagan Administration, according to those officials, abandoned the coordination but to some extent has stopped the use of Federal funds for capital projects in new areas. For example, it refused to finance water treatment plants in new communities around Orlando, Fla. The rationale was that if people there wanted new communities they could finance them themselves.

FUTURE OF FEDERAL ROLE

Yet even high White House officials acknowledged that the Reagan Administration had no comprehensive policy on public works, except that it intends to drastically reduce the Federal role. Richard S. Williamson, assistant to the President for intergovernmental relations, said Mr. Reagan wanted to help the cities with their infrastructure problems, and he ordered that this concern be put in the Administration's urban policy report that went to Congress.

The report, however, sought to show that the picture was not so bleak as had been depicted. It pointed out that demand had lessened for schools and new highways and said many cities were moving on their own to step up capital projects. And it pointed to local innovations. New York, for example, had switched emphasis from new buildings to repairing streets, bridges, mass transit, water and sewage systems. Other cities, such as Boston, were putting the authority for public works in the hands of independent commissions for greater efficiency, while others, such as Cleveland, were enlisting private interests for help.

The Federal Government's role, the report said, was to gather information about more cost-effective methods of financing public works while "other aspects of Federal aid remain to be determined."

Meanwhile, members of Congress have stepped into the void. Some have been spurred by such reports as bridges being closed for long periods in Kansas City, Mo., while motorists drive blocks out of their way and school children in Altoona, Pa., having to leave their bus, walk across a bridge and wait for the empty bus to follow because the bridge can no longer support the weight of both children and bus.

PROPOSAL BY HOUSE MEMBERS

Two Pennsylvania Representatives, William F. Clinger Jr., a Republican, and Robert W. Edgar, a Democrat, have been pushing legislation for a capital budget that would require the Administration to take an inventory of capital needs and assign priorities for spending on public works, as a first step toward long-term recovery.

They were joined in their effort by such diverse leaders as Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. and Representative Jack Kemp, the conservative Republican from Buffalo, who were among a number of Congressmen signing a letter to Mr. Reagan asking him to consider the idea. A similar bill has been introduced in the Senate by Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut.

Meanwhile, a number of Democrats around the country have taken up the issue on ground that rebuilding the nation's capital plant would fight unemployment.

In New York, Assembly Speaker Stanley Fink has made repairing of the infrastructure one of his major concerns and Governor Carey, in the recent legislative session, proposed increases in taxes and fees to help pay the costs. The tax legislation, however, was defeated, in part because it was an election year. Officials on the national and state levels predict the issue will become more heated in the years ahead.

In response to questions about how the nation could let basic facilities decay to the extent that many authorities say they have, Maury Seldin, president of the Homer Hoyt Institute, a nonprofit foundation in land economics, and a professor at American University, said, "We as a nation are accustomed to living on uppers and downers."

He said that in recent years the nation had become accustomed to "taking a fix" for whatever bothers it without much thought to the long-range consequences, especially in response to various special interests that can command support for narrow goals, and policy is fragmented.

He called for a maturing of the political processes so that various interests could reach compromises for the overall good and "be willing to settle for a fair shake." ●

VOTE FOR LOWER INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island, (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recongized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today, the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee reported out H.R. 6124—the Credit Control Act—on a 6 to 3 vote.

The vote is a reaffirmation of the deep concern over high interest rates and the misdirection of so much of the Nation's available credit.

This legislation, which I introduced on April 20, 1982, will give the President standby authority to control credit and interest rates in any or all areas of the economy. It gives him standby power to take steps to stop credit from flowing into nonproductive areas such as the fueling of unnecessary and unwanted corporate mergers and acquisitions. This would be standby power triggered by the President and administered by the Federal Reserve.

At a time when thousands of small businessmen are going bankrupt and more than 10 million Americans are standing in unemployment lines, it is important that Congress take the steps necessary to assure that the President has all the tools available to

control and moderate the catastrophic effects of high interest rates.

As the New York Times editorialized Saturday, it would be "foolhardy to deny the Government standby powers for emergencies. . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we can move the legislation through the full committee in the near future. It is an opportunity to record this Congress' demand for lower interest rates and a more rational use of credit during a period of economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of Consumer Affairs Subcommittee, FRANK ANNUNZIO, and the members of the subcommittee who have moved swiftly and decisively on an economic issue that is of paramount importance to every worker, businessman, farmer, and consumer across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the July 17 edition of the New York Times urging support for the Credit Control Act.

KEEP CREDIT CONTROLS ON THE SHELF

The President's standby power to ration credit has expired without fanfare—and few regrets on his team of free-marketeers. They believe that steady monetary growth will assure that competitive interest rates decide who most needs a loan. Yet there is some reason to keep the President's power alive.

When the Credit Control Act of 1969 was invoked in March 1980, inflation had vaulted to an 18 percent annual rate and no other remedy seemed at hand. In desperation, President Carter directed the Federal Reserve to limit credit-card extensions and other unsecured consumer loans.

The controls had a powerful psychological effect. They restrained borrowing, drove down interest rates and slowed down economic activity. Only afterwards did economic observers decide that the controls worked too well. The recession apparently had already begun and this new restraint merely made it worse. An angry Congress voted to take the credit power from the President and the Federal Reserve Board, effective this month.

But a weapon misused is not necessarily a bad weapon. Credit controls proved of some value during World War II and the Korean War by holding down the demand for loans in the nonessential sectors and also freeing resources for investment in defense.

A prudent set of standby control powers would permit some regulation of down payments and the terms of installment loans and curbs on lending for corporate acquisitions and financial speculation. They could be a useful supplement to monetary policy when the economy becomes overheated. The controls, which could not be safely requested in the middle of a crisis, would assure the flow of funds to productive sectors of the economy and thus help to restrain interest rates.

While this is now the view of a minority of economists, it deserves to be taken seriously. It seems foolhardy to deny the Government standby powers for emergencies on the ground that they once were wrongly applied. ●

ADMINISTRATION'S ACTIONS HARMFUL TO U.S. INTERESTS

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

● Mr. **BEDELL**. Mr. Speaker, the United States is making a grave mistake in setting itself apart from the international community. We have just seen the United States decide to stand alone among the 160 members of the United Nations by refusing to negotiate further on a Law of the Sea Treaty. That decision plays against our long-term economic interests and the benefits that could accrue in fisheries management, environmental protection and scientific research.

Our domestic seabed mining industry has the best technology and resources in the world and any sea law treaty has to take that into consideration. By going it alone, we will force other nations to develop their own technology and resources and we will risk losing our advantage to them.

The United States is presently turning its back on another opportunity to help a domestic industry move strongly into world markets. We are resisting a concerted United Nations' effort to promote the development of new and renewable sources of energy around the world. Why we are trying to do this, I do not know.

We are the world's leader in renewable technology, especially photovoltaics, an industry which has incredible potential in the next decade. Any effort to increase the sales of renewable energy technologies around the world has got to help our own industry.

The United Nations has held two conferences on new and renewable sources of energy. The objective was for the member nations to come up with a plan of action to link developing nations that want to buy renewable energy products with developed nations that want to sell them.

The problems are enormous. Developing countries have to learn about the different kinds of technologies, to decide what mix is best for them. They need financing assistance to undertake the huge up front costs associated with such an effort. The goal of the United Nations effort in this area is to facilitate this transition by helping purchasers and sellers get together.

This is necessary because much of our renewable energy industry is made up of smaller, mostly high technology companies. Our small companies need help in establishing a presence in developing countries, yet our Government is steadfastly refusing to supply it.

On the other hand, the Europeans and Japanese give their domestic industries almost unlimited support in marketing their products abroad. As a

result, we are in danger of losing our technological and marketing edge to others.

Instead of trying to work with other countries to strike deals in negotiations that will assist our domestic business in world trade, this administration insists on using international forums to preach the "free market" dogma. It has become commonplace that whenever the United Nations meets, a certain amount of unconstructive politics transpires, but I am personally embarrassed to inform my colleagues of the extremes of our U.S. conduct. Instead of working constructively in our Nation's best interests, our foreign policy decisions seem to be based on simplistic ideological fervor. Others view us as being plainly arrogant.

The upshot of this behavior is that the rest of the world acts in its own self interest while we seem to act against ours. We will lose some of the technological advantages that we cultivated so carefully in years past. Our Nation will lose new industry, jobs and tax revenue; our balance of trade will continue to suffer while the rest of the world benefits from our technological advances. All this is the guise of "free market politics."

I have seen U.S. foreign policy in action through my attendance at several Law of the Sea Treaty negotiations and the first United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy in Nairobi, Kenya. Last month, a follow-up to the Nairobi conference was held in Rome, Italy. Mark Levine, a member of the staff of the Small Business Subcommittee on Energy, which I chair, attended that conference as an observer.

Our colleague **RICHARD OTTINGER** and I attended the Nairobi conference as observers for the Congress in the U.S. delegation. Mr. **OTTINGER** will be placing the staff report on the Rome conference in the **RECORD**.●

● Mr. **OTTINGER**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with remarks made by my colleague **BERKLEY BEDELL**. He has made some very important points in his statement. At this point I would like to enter into the **RECORD** for the benefit of our colleagues the staff report that Mr. **BEDELL** and I received on the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, held in Rome last month.

The report follows:

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY, ENVIRONMENT,
AND SAFETY ISSUES AF-
FECTING SMALL BUSINESS,

Washington, D.C., July 12, 1982.

To Hon. Berkley Bedell, Chairman, Small Business Subcommittee on Energy; Hon.

Richard Ottinger, Chairman, Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy Conservation.

From Mark J. Levine.

Re: U.N. Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy.

BACKGROUND

In August 1981, the United Nations sponsored a conference on new and renewable sources of energy in Nairobi, Kenya. You attended that conference as observers for the Congress in the U.S. delegation. The delegates to the Nairobi Conference, representing a majority of the 154 member nations in the General Assembly of the United Nations, adopted a plan of action to expand worldwide programs to encourage the development of new and renewable sources of energy, especially in Third World countries.

Last month a follow-up to the Nairobi Conference was held in Rome, Italy. Delegates representing a majority of the member nations of the United Nations General Assembly met to work out methods for implementing the Nairobi Plan of Action within the United Nations' system as well as through other multilateral and bilateral channels. This conference, as was the one in Nairobi, was presided over by the United Nations' Secretariat.

The legislative schedule precluded Members of Congress from attending the conference in Rome in June. Consequently, I accompanied the U.S. delegation as an observer in your absence.

PARTICIPANTS AT THE CONFERENCE

Although the objective of the Rome Conference was to work out a way to implement the Nairobi Plan of Action, the key players used the conference as a forum for political posturing in anticipation of the upcoming global negotiations, scheduled to occur later this year.

The political nature of the conference was apparent in the makeup of the delegations from the key participating nations. For example, the United States' official delegation consisted of three State Department representatives, one representative from the Agency for International Development (AID) and one representative from the US mission at the United Nations. Although the representative from AID was familiar with AID's energy programs, his participation was of a political rather than technical nature. The Department of Energy and the Department of Commerce declined the opportunity to be represented in the US delegation.

The composition of the delegations from the other key nation-participants at the conference reflected a similar lack of emphasis on energy expertise. By contrast, several of the smaller, less influential nations included upper-level energy officials in their delegations. Unfortunately, it appeared that the concerns of these nations, which represented vast potential markets for new and renewable energy technologies, received only secondary consideration at the conference.

The key participants at the Rome Conference were essentially the same nations and blocs that were most active at the Nairobi Conference. They were the United States, the "EC-10" (members of the European Economic Community), the "G-77" (Group of 77, a collection of developing Third World nations), the Soviet Union (and the

allied Eastern European countries), China and Japan.

ISSUES AT THE CONFERENCE

The Nairobi Plan of Action recognized the important role new and renewable sources of energy will play in the world economy and called on all nations to work to develop new and renewable energy technologies through many levels of international cooperation. The potential nation-consumers of new and renewable sources of energy, represented by the G-77, wanted to implement the Nairobi Plan of Action through the active involvement of the United Nations' resources.

As their primary objective, the G-77 wanted the Rome Conference to affirm support for: 1) a separate, authoritative body within the UN Secretariat to coordinate multilateral and bilateral activities in new and renewable energy technologies; and 2) a UN role in providing pre-investment capital to finance new and renewable sources of energy investment in developing countries.

Developing nations also wanted the conference to reach agreement on the establishment of intermediate sources of financing for new and renewable sources of energy, most notably a World Bank energy affiliate, which was discussed in hearings you conducted last fall.

As their main objective, the United States and several other industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union and some members of the EC-10, sought to maintain the status quo and defuse the efforts of the G-77 to use the conference to obtain strong support for an expanded role for the United Nations in new and renewable sources of energy development. To this extent, the developed nations were successful.

The United States and the Soviet Union are adamantly opposed to any new United Nations committees, bodies or offices. Since these two countries provide the bulk of the UN's operating budget, they can effectively veto the creation of new UN functions. They feel that any new office for new and renewable energy resource development must be funded and staffed from within the UN's existing resources.

Japan and the United States feel very strongly that their bilateral energy activities are more significant than any multilateral energy program the United Nations can administer. They don't mind sharing information about their bilateral energy programs, especially as this already is public knowledge. But they do object to the UN having a voice over the scope or direction of that aid.

It seemed to me that the issue of financial aid for the development of new and renewable sources of energy was not adequately addressed at the conference. A joint presentation by the UN Development Program and the World Bank Energy Sector failed to convince most conference participants that a clear and directed financial program for energy development activities in developing countries would be forthcoming in the near future. Several conference participants questioned the World Bank's commitment to such an endeavor.

The United States, as well as being opposed to an expanded United Nations role in the development of new and renewable energy sources, was strongly opposed to the establishment of any private sector financial mechanisms to provide capital for this purpose. This position of the United States, along with our refusal to participate in such financing programs, made the question of the World Bank energy affiliate academic.

While harboring a general distrust of a United Nations role in the financing of new and renewable energy development, most conference participants strongly supported the creation of a World Bank energy affiliate. They felt that, with proper support from the international community, an energy window at the World Bank would greatly enhance the development of new, small scale energy projects in developing countries. As we did at the Nairobi Conference, the United States stood virtually alone in its opposition to the proposed World Bank energy affiliate.

As a result of the differences of opinion between many of the developed countries and the G-77, the conference arrived at a stalemate on many of the major points that were discussed. The delegates were finally able to reach agreement on a resolution reaffirming the Nairobi Plan of Action and suggesting that the U.N. General Assembly consider the various, albeit diluted, methods of implementing an international system for new and renewable energy resource development.

OBSERVATIONS OF OTHER DELEGATIONS ABOUT THE U.S. POSITION

Many of the participants at the Rome Conference had harsh judgments about the U.S. position on the issues discussed during the conference. These critics felt that the U.S. wrapped itself in the cloak of its free market philosophy without giving proper regard to the true forces that exist in today's markets for new and renewable energy technologies. Many participants claimed to be "free marketers" as well, but noted that they, along with the rest of the world, realized that the market for new and renewable sources of energy has been influenced by subsidies offered by other governments who support their domestic renewable industries.

Because of the vast technical expertise that the United States has in the renewable energy area, especially in solar photovoltaics, these participants feel that the lack of support the U.S. gives to its domestic renewable energy industry, particularly smaller companies, was a major reason these new energy technologies are not more widespread in developing countries. In other words, they want the U.S. government to stimulate exports and joint ventures in appropriate technologies.

It is the strong feeling of almost all of the conference participants that a substantial market for new and renewable sources of energy exists in developing countries. This was confirmed in several private conversations with energy officials from developing countries attending the conference who said their countries were actively seeking outside investment in renewable energy technologies. Many of the other developed countries openly state that they view the Third World markets as a route to help develop their domestic renewable industries gain valuable technical and commercial experience.

Many developing nations questioned the United States' dogmatic reliance on the private sector for the development of renewable energy technologies. They felt that the only private sector enterprises with the resources to market these technologies to the Third World were the major oil companies. Yet most of the developing country representatives that I talked to feel that the oil companies are not aggressive marketers of renewable energy technologies.

Many developing country representatives said that their national markets are too

small to interest the oil companies that do market renewable energy technologies. They also note that many developing countries have laws requiring majority control of local companies to reside with national interests. This discourages oil companies from setting up subsidiaries in such countries. The representatives from developing countries felt that smaller companies that are looking to make inroads with their technologies would not be constrained by these factors.

There was also criticism of some of the United States' bilateral energy programs in the renewables area. In general, many representatives of countries who have received US energy aid told me privately that they believe this aid is given out based on political considerations and not necessarily on need. These officials also complain privately that the US aid is too project-orientated, with insufficient emphasis placed on the transfer of technology for new and renewable sources of energy.

My observations of US actions at the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy in Rome support the contention of many that the United States is in danger of losing its world pre-eminence in renewable energy technologies. These views come chiefly from private industry, and various comments are recorded in congressional hearings and General Accounting Office reports (most notably report ID-81-63, "Industry Views on the Ability of the U.S. Photovoltaics Industry to Compete in Foreign Markets"). They feel that US budget cutbacks in renewable energy technology research and development, especially in photovoltaics, coupled with the reluctance of the US government to provide export and marketing assistance to companies involved in this field, will result in the loss of valuable world market share in renewable energy sales to developing countries. It is also likely to lead to an erosion of our technological lead, as other nations obtain greater production levels.

Attached is an excerpt from the General Accounting Office's report on the effects of the recent severe budget cutbacks in photovoltaic research and development activities supported by the US government. (Report #EMD-82-60)

EXCERPT FROM PROBABLE IMPACTS OF BUDGET REDUCTIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF PHOTOVOLTAIC ENERGY SYSTEMS (GAO REPORT EMD-82-60)

OTHER IMPACTS OF PHOTOVOLTAIC BUDGET REDUCTIONS

The budget reductions for the Federal photovoltaic energy program are expected to have adverse impacts on U.S. leadership in the development and use of photovoltaic energy systems and on small businesses' involvement in photovoltaics. As viewed by officials in the Federal photovoltaic energy program and representatives of the photovoltaic industry, the budget reductions threaten U.S. leadership in photovoltaic energy, and may force small businesses out of the industry.

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN PHOTOVOLTAICS MAY BE THREATENED

The United States has been the world leader in photovoltaics since the inception of this technology. The first practical photovoltaic cells were produced by the Bell Laboratories in the 1950s, and photovoltaic systems have been used extensively in the U.S. space program. Due in part to this early development and expertise in photo-

voltic systems, the United States has maintained a leadership position in the terrestrial use of photovoltaic systems. U.S. photovoltaic manufacturers controlled about 85 percent of the worldwide photovoltaic market in 1979 and 1980.

However, many Government and industry officials believe that this position is threatened by the reductions in the Federal program. Companies in France, Germany, and Japan currently produce photovoltaic energy systems, and these companies receive support from their respective governments. While, for the most part, the funding of photovoltaics by other countries is not as large as U.S. funding, their support for photovoltaics is increasing as U.S. support is being reduced. Industry representatives pointed in particular to the willingness of foreign governments to get involved in market development activities, particularly demonstration projects, which they feel greatly enhance the visibility and marketability of photovoltaic energy systems.

A particular concern to many industry representatives and Government officials is Japan's aggressive photovoltaic efforts. According to officials at JPL who have been monitoring Japan's efforts, Japanese funding for photovoltaics has now equaled or surpassed U.S. funding and the Japanese photovoltaic industry may soon pose a serious threat to U.S. leadership. JPL and SERI officials noted, for example, that Japan is concentrating heavily on amorphous silicon technology, and that Japanese funding for this technology has increased to \$5.7 million, while Federal funding is reduced to \$2.8 million. The SERI official in charge of the Federal amorphous silicon efforts stated that Japanese companies are developing substantial experience and knowledge on producing amorphous silicon solar cells by using this photovoltaic technology in consumer products. Consequently, because of their extensive R&D and the worldwide market channels which they have already established for electronic components, industry representatives and Government officials believe there is a greater likelihood that the Japanese may be first to develop photovoltaic energy systems with prices competitive with conventionally generated electricity, and be in a dominant position in regard to the worldwide photovoltaic energy market.

Industry representatives and Government officials are hopeful that the United States will maintain its leadership in photovoltaics, but they believe it will be increasingly difficult. As stated by one program official at JPL, the United States is playing by one set of rules, in which the Government does not interfere with the marketplace, while foreign countries have different rules, which allow their governments to aid the production and marketing of photovoltaic energy systems. He added that this places the U.S. photovoltaic industry at a disadvantage which may be difficult to overcome. ●

AARP SUPPORTS HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 278

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

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter I received today from the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). The AARP represents

millions of senior citizens nationwide and is a highly articulate spokesman for America's elderly community. This letter expresses strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 278, which expresses the sense of the House that the senior community service employment program, title V of the Older Americans Act should be kept at the same level of participants—or more in fiscal 1983 as in fiscal 1982.

I know that my colleagues, who voted overwhelmingly today to support this resolution, will be interested in this message from AARP:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF RETIRED PERSONS,
July 20, 1982.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,
House Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PANETTA: We strongly support the Panetta-Conte resolution to express Congressional support for maintaining the Title V Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) at 54,200 positions.

AARP considers the SCSEP to be the most effective employment program ever developed for older Americans.

Title V has been extraordinarily successful by any standard of measurement. Administrative costs have been kept at rock bottom levels. The program has operated free of fraud and abuse. It has delivered vitally needed services while providing an opportunity for low-income persons 55 or older to help themselves while helping others in their communities at the same time.

Title V has also provided a passport for disadvantaged older persons to locate employment in the private sector. The Association's SCSEP, I am pleased to say, has had the highest transition rate of any Title V project. Our projects in 33 states and Puerto Rico have typically placed anywhere from one-third to nearly one-half of all enrollees in unsubsidized jobs. This not only provides new opportunities for more older Americans to participate in the program but also can assist them in locating fulfilling and gainful employment in the private sector.

Title V is needed now more than ever because rapidly rising unemployment is pushing more older persons into poverty.

Unemployment for persons 55 or older reached an all time record high in June. Nearly 824,000 older persons were unemployed in June. The level of joblessness for older Americans has jumped by nearly 300,000 in less than a year, from 534,000 in July 1981 to 824,000 in June 1982. This represents a 54.3 percent increase in the unemployment level for persons 55 or older.

For these reasons, we reaffirm our support for H. Con. Res. 278.

Sincerely,

PETER W. HUGHES,
Legislative Counsel. ●

ISRAEL'S COMMITMENT TO A LASTING PEACE IN MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in these times of turmoil and bloodshed

in the Middle East, it is always helpful to read a clear and concise analysis of events and the history leading up to them. I would like to share with my colleagues such an article, written by Ivan Novick, the national president of the Zionist Organization of America. It is important in that it reaffirms Israel's historical importance and her commitment to a true and lasting peace in the Middle East. The article follows:

Israel's advance into Lebanon has struck a mighty blow against the international plague of terrorism that has held the west hostage for nearly two decades. For years western democracies have been coerced into silence, or appeasement, thereby permitting the PLO to continue demonstrating its contempt for human life by threats and by acts of international violence. The barbarous attempt to assassinate Shlomo Argov, Israel's Ambassador to Great Britain, and the inhumane shelling of Israel's northern population centers, were only the latest acts in a unending spiral of PLO instigated murder and violence aimed at destroying the Jewish state.

Thus we are gratified that President Reagan has called for the end of the "scourge of terrorism" plaguing the Middle East, thereby indicating his understanding of Israel's legitimate right to protect its populace and to live in tranquility. We further commend the United States government's veto of the Security Council's Resolution to condemn the action which was taken by Israel for the specific purpose of eliminating PLO terrorist bases so they would no longer threaten Israel's civilian population in the Galilee.

Spokesmen for the United States have correctly assessed Israel's grievances towards the PLO as legitimate. They have indicated that the Administration has an enlightened understanding of the reasons which prompted Israel to confront PLO aims and to take action in the face of the deteriorating situation in Lebanon which could no longer be ignored.

Events may have created a new set of facts on the ground, a new reality which could very well redirect the entire political direction of the Middle East, and hopefully, that of the United States. Unlike other Administrations which did not fully understand the fact that Israel must act in its own defense for the security of its land and people, this Administration has maintained, and trust will continue to maintain this correct and constructive position. Hopefully other western democracies will follow America's example.

In the face of recent developments in Lebanon and in view of the historical record, we urge our government to act on the knowledge that Israel's action against international terrorists is in the long range interest of the United States and the free world. It should, therefore, reject those who would undermine this new opportunity to achieve stability in the Middle East.

As you are aware, American policy in the Middle East correctly includes Israel as a very important friend and ally. At the same time, the Administration's attempts to befriend and create relationships with various Arab states. We understand the need for the United States to build foundations of friendship throughout the world. Any concerned American hopes that such a policy would prove to be successful. But policy

cannot be based on what has proven to be false optimism, especially when all efforts to accommodate the Arab states in the Middle East have been shown to be ineffective, and in fact, counterproductive to American interests. Even if such efforts must continue, they should not be made to the disadvantage of those nations which have already passed the test of friendship.

To weaken Israel, or to place her in danger, in the vain hope that new Arab alliances will prove more substantial, more dependable and more lasting, is a direction which I believe has placed the United States in a vulnerable position.

However, the United States now has an unexpected opportunity to re-establish sanity in the Middle East. Because Israel dared to act, and because it was prepared to sacrifice the lives of its beloved citizens, the Middle East stands on the brink of opportunity that is unprecedented. But without American decisiveness and stoutheartedness, this opportunity will fall through the cracks of good intentions, the path to further agony kept open and the chance to attain peaceful solutions thrust farther away.

Let the United States grasp the moment! Let us insist that the sovereignty of Lebanon as a free and democratic nation be re-established. This requires the necessary safeguards to prevent the reappearance of the PLO and to insure the withdrawal of the Soviet-dominated Syrian forces which bear the responsibility for destabilizing the area and so much bloodshed and strife. This forthright position by the United States will serve to once again make possible a free Lebanon, help protect the Jewish state from organized acts of terror, and thwart as well the influence of the Soviet Union at a time when the Kremlin is making dangerous inroads elsewhere in the world.

Several months ago, in a personal letter to President Reagan, I expressed my dismay at what appeared to be the world community's acceptance of the PLO as the only spokesman for the Palestinian Arab people. I urged the President to issue a call that would encourage moderate Palestinian Arabs to reject the leadership of the terrorist PLO. Today Israel's action against the PLO in Lebanon provides the opportunity for responsible world leaders, led by President Reagan, to voice a powerful plea to the Palestinian Arabs to act courageously in their own self-interest. No longer should the Palestinian Arab people feel intimidated by the terrorist PLO. With the encouragement and leadership of the United States, let moderate Arabs come forward to negotiate with Israel to secure a safe and creative future for all the peoples in the area.

The civilized world has witnessed how a responsible Jewish State, in spite of severe circumstances, risked the lives of its citizen-soldiers to take unprecedented steps to shelter and protect Arab Moslems and Christian civilian populations, notwithstanding the dangers that the soldiers themselves faced. Now is the time for the Christian world to understand the far-reaching significance of Israel's action, an understanding that should arouse an outpouring of public support for what the liberation of Lebanon can mean for the people of Lebanon.

We commend the brave acts of the Israel Defense Forces and the leaders of Israel. Their actions will be recorded in the annals of history as a noble defense of the rights of democratic nations to remain free and safe, a courageous act to reduce future threats of war and avoid further confrontations. How-

ever, there cannot be a cease-fire against the terrorism of the PLO.

Recent events make it clear that the arms race in the Middle East serves neither the cause of peace nor America's interests. The policy that calls for Israel to receive additional military consideration each time the Arabs obtain new weaponry, must be seen as short-sighted and ill-advised. The fact is that even if Israel continues to maintain a qualitative and quantitative military superiority over specific Arab nations, at a given point the Arabs will have enough armaments collectively to launch a devastating attack. While Israel may still be able to retaliate and inflict heavy losses on the Arabs, the Arabs will be able to employ newly obtained arsenals that can confront Israel with greater strength than ever before. These arms sales represent a clear and serious threat to Israel's security.

The overall policy of the United States should now be reappraised. After the last few days there should not be any question in the Pentagon about whether or not the United States needs the strength and skill of Israel's defense forces in the Middle East. There should not be any question in the State Department as to which nation in the Middle East is willing to act in defense of democracy's right to prevail.

I suggest that our policy makers return to the drawing board, remember the lessons of the past and redesign a Middle East policy that will safeguard our allies, and in so doing, protect America's own vital interests. I suggest that those who make this reappraisal consider the following:

1. The United States has insisted that the Saudis are moderate and sells them our sophisticated AWACS, disregarding the fact that Saudi Arabia finances the PLO and rejects the Camp David peace accords.

This AWACS sale must now be rejected.

2. The United States is prepared to sell Jordan Stinger Missiles and F5G planes that are a direct threat to Israel. This sale is being considered even though King Hussein warns the Palestinian Arabs that they will be tried for treason if they cooperate with Israel for peace.

This proposed sale must be defeated.

3. The United States believes the Iraq should receive American equipment which can be converted for military use against Israel. This is true in spite of Iraq's long history of international terrorism and its disdain for the United States.

This plan must not materialize.

4. Recent investigations have determined that hundreds of American corporate heads participated in one of the most successful manipulations of American policy by a foreign power. Close to three hundred billion dollars in surplus oil profits have been invested in the United States. Twenty-one of America's largest banks hold over nineteen billion dollars of OPEC money. The PLO has secretly invested one hundred million dollars in U.S. Corporations. The Saudis own over forty billion dollars in U.S. Treasury Notes, and have made substantial loans to such corporations as ITT, U.S. Steel and IBM. The time has come for Congress to take urgent steps to make certain that all government agencies directly involved closely review what is happening to America.

The battle to keep America free is as serious as the battle to keep Israel safe!

I believe it would serve us well if we listen to the warnings of America's Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick. She recently declared that it was time to take seriously the political process aimed at villify-

ing Israel because the great nation of the United States is itself undermined when its best and only reliable friend, Israel, is the object of an international campaign to harm it.

Perhaps there can be no better example of the process Mrs. Kirkpatrick refers to than the scandalous immorality of world leaders who sit side by side with representatives of the PLO, notwithstanding this terrorist organization's main purpose for existence: the destruction of a sovereign nation and its people. Over 100 nations recognize the PLO, including those so-called Arab states, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, upon whom some in the Administration believe rests the future of America's interests in the Middle East. I suggest that these American policy makers are not realistic if they believe the American people can be convinced that these authoritarian Arab states are more reliable than the democracy of Israel.

We continue to hear the voices of hate from that infamous glass house on the East River in New York, voices which continue to denigrate the Jewish State, besmirch the Jewish people and ridicule our own great nation. Speaker after speaker threaten the validity and legitimacy of the State of Israel. Zionism itself is the target and the Jewish people the intended victims.

It is not ironic that Zionism, the movement for peace is maligned. That Zionism, the movement that produced a tangible humanistic program in Israel, developed roads and settlements, made forests grow, reclaimed arid lands and provided the opportunity and hope for the Jewish people in the land of their forefathers, is the target of scorn and hatred. This is the reality of the tortured world in which we live.

It is this cynical world that we find "humanists" and "universalists" who set aside morality and urge Israel to deal with the international terrorist Arafat today, because tomorrow he may be replaced by others more hostile and violent.

There is no difference between "moderate" terrorists and "radical" killers. Indeed, what is this nonsense about so-called Arab moderation?

For the sake of peace, Israel has returned the Sinai to Egypt. What have "moderate" Arab states like Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Iraq sacrificed for the sake of peace?

Did any "moderate" Arab friend of the United States condemn the assassination attempt against the Israeli Ambassador in England?

Did any "moderate" Arab friend of the United States express disgust at the way the body of the Israeli airman was dragged by an automobile through the streets of Lebanon?

Did the "moderate" West Bank mayors recently welcomed by the Administration in Washington voice their renunciation of terrorism? Did they promise the Administration that they would work to convince the Palestinian Arabs to accept the State of Israel and join with the Jewish people in a quest for peace?

Was it an act of moderation when Saudi Arabia did everything possible to deny bases to the United States, refused joint control over the AWACS, and pressured Oman to withdraw its cooperation in recent U.S. exercises in the Persian Gulf?

Was it moderation when Saudi Arabia immediately broke diplomatic relations with Zaire because it decided to reestablish diplomatic relations with Israel—and with Costa Rica because it acknowledged the right of

all nations to choose their own capitals and specifically Israel's right to Jerusalem?

Is it moderation when Saudi Arabian leaders continually call for the inclusion of the Soviet Union in Middle East peace negotiations?

I cannot understand the criteria this Administration uses to determine the difference between moderates and radicals when the record is clear that Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iraq and others neither wish for peace in the Middle East, the acceptance of Israel or a friendship upon which the United States can rely.

If members of government, as well as the media, are unable to distinguish between moderation and terrorists, the PLO Covenant should be required reading for every foreign service officer, as well as every editor and columnist.

This PLO Covenant is not merely a scrap of paper!

This PLO Covenant is a blueprint for Israel's liquidation!

This PLO Covenant is the basis for every action taken against the Jewish State by the Arabs. It is the best evidence of what the PLO stands for. The document is easy to read; its provisions are not difficult to understand; its objectives are clearly defined. When it says—"the Zionist presence must be eliminated from the whole of Palestine," it means exactly what it says—it means that the Jewish State is not to exist in any part of our historic homeland, that a PLO state on the West Bank is only the first step toward the liquidation of the Jewish State.

The Zionist Organization of America feels an urgent responsibility to expose the PLO by putting its Covenant into the hands of all who are responsible for the formulation of Middle East policy and all those who would urge Israel to believe that Yassir Arafat is only one step away from becoming a card carrying Zionist.

There are those among us who envisioned a Jewish State as flawless, and in theory of course, this would be ideal. But the Middle East is not a very safe place and the world is not an assembly of purists and moralists. It is often cruel, a jungle, as we are reminded continuously by the worlds of hate directed at the Jewish State and the Jewish people from the podium of the United Nations. In view of this reality, should we expect a beleaguered State of Israel to unilaterally beat its swords into plowshares?

We stand witness to the concentration camps, and ultimately, to the extermination of six million of our numbers in them. We recall that Israel has been compelled to defend itself against numerous military efforts to destroy it during the past 34 years, and still faces attack by terrorists sworn to its destruction and by neighboring countries who insist upon maintaining a state of military, economic and political warfare.

I salute the leaders of Israel for their commitment to the peace process. I honor the people of Israel for their courage in placing at risk their lives and the lives of their children in the search for peace. I call on the government of the United States, as a full partner in the peace process, to make certain that Israel's sacrifices for peace will not be in vain, and strongly urge that they adopt a realistic Middle East policy that rewards those who are willing to live in peace in the Middle East.

Eighty-five years ago the ZOA was already at work to make Herzl's dream a reality. Today the ZOA in this community, as well as throughout the United States, fights vigorously against those who would destroy

this dream. As Americans, we will carry out our responsibilities to the United States, our nation which we love; as Jews, we will continue to hold high the banner of Zionism. We are determined to defend both Washington and Jerusalem, the capitals of freedom, from the onslaughts by the enemies of democracy. ●

H.R. 5158

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

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, although it was clear that H.R. 5158, the Telecommunications Act of 1982, had the necessary support to win approval from the full Energy and Commerce Committee, the delay tactics promoted by A.T. & T., it became apparent, would have prevented the passage of this important legislation in this session of the Congress. I therefore withdrew it from consideration by the committee today.

I wish to assure my colleagues however, that our subcommittee remains committed to fulfilling our important task of exercising oversight over telecommunications policy in the remaining time of this Congress. We will continue our efforts to make sure that ratepayers are protected from undue increases in local rates, and that negative effects on consumers of the A.T. & T.—Justice Department proposed settlement are ameliorated. I wish to thank my colleagues on the committee, and particularly those on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance, for their diligent and courageous work on this legislation, and urge the attention of my other colleagues to the crucial public policy issues embodied in this legislation.

Following is the statement I made today before the Energy and Commerce Committee:

STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

Mr. Chairman, since I first took my seat on this Committee in 1975, I have been involved in no less than four efforts by Congress to establish comprehensive telecommunications policy. From the beginning, I have felt strongly—as I do today—that it is the responsibility of Congress, not the FCC or the courts, to establish comprehensive telecommunications policy.

Before and after I introduced H.R. 5158 last December, our Subcommittee held dozens of hearings, and heard hundreds of witnesses, give thousands of pages of testimony. We have traveled across the country seeking advice and counsel from state officials involved in telecommunications policy, from experts who have studied our present policy exhaustively, from interested organizations companies involved in the telecommunications field, and most importantly from individual ratepayers on whose shoulders the results of our present telecommunications policy ultimately rests.

From these meetings, one message was consistent and clear: we need a new telecommunications policy—and we need it now. H.R. 5158, as unanimously reported from

the Telecommunications Subcommittee, answers that need.

The urgent need for our efforts increased in January, when the Justice Department and AT&T proposed a consent decree. Their consent decree, although a positive first step, is by itself woefully inadequate as the measure of telecommunications policy in this country. H.R. 5158 supplies the pieces missing from the decree. It gives each local company an independent voice in the breakup of AT&T, assures that local rates remain reasonable, and provides the ground rules for a fully competitive telecommunications environment—which is the best ratepayer protection of all.

From the day the settlement was announced, everyone knew it was a great deal for AT&T, and that it would increase local rates. In it, Bell abandoned its high-cost local operations for the glamour of silicon chips and mainframe computers. The divested local companies were left with about two-thirds of AT&T's assets, but only a little more than one-third of its revenues—and the ability to provide nothing more than a dial tone. AT&T even took the highly profitable Yellow Pages to New Jersey.

Until the settlement, AT&T was the leader in advocating that Congress—not the FCC, and not the courts—should set telecommunications policy. What has followed the settlement is an unprecedented attempt by AT&T to block Congress from setting that policy. After all, Bell got a very good deal from the Justice Department.

In my eight years in this body, I have seen nothing like the campaign of fear and distortion that AT&T has waged to fight this bill. Are workers fearful for their jobs in an uncertain economy? Then assert that the bill will cost them those jobs. Are shareholders fearful that divestiture will jeopardize their investment? Then assert that the bill will render their stock worthless.

Are scientists fearful that divestiture will endanger Bell Labs? Then assert that the bill destroys the sources of funding for this national treasure. Is Congress fearful that imports are hurting our basic domestic industries? Then assert that the bill invites a takeover of telecommunications by Japan, Inc. With these charges and others, Bell has used its awesome power and unlimited financial resources to wage an unprecedented campaign to defeat this bill.

It has become clear from the roll calls, however, that the pressure tactics have failed. Confronted by the world's largest company, this Committee has stood firm for ratepayers and for competition—a course of action that is in the best interest of the country. It is clear where the votes are.

Unable to win substantively, AT&T has mounted an effort to disrupt this markup. We have sat through a reading of the bill. Dilatory amendments have been offered again and again. At the rate we are going, this Committee will be marking up H.R. 5158 well into August, leaving no time for the careful consideration this measure deserves from the full House. In addition, AT&T has attempted to have this bill referred to House committees from Agriculture to Armed Services to Ways and Means. We can anticipate the same tactics on the floor and in conference.

Having failed to convince Members on the merits, AT&T is engaging in this strategy of delay. In the 97th Congress, we are left with only 27 legislative days to complete work on the most significant telecommunications bill since the 1930's. The only way to pass legis-

lation now would be to accept an agreement dictated by AT&T.

Mr. Chairman, nobody wants telecommunications legislation more than I do. I am not unmindful that any legislation is the result of compromises over policy, and in this spirit, we have been talking with Bell since early spring, when several of my colleagues and I met with AT&T's board of directors in New York. We have spent countless hours with their representatives in Washington. Right up until last night, we were meeting with AT&T to try to find a consensus.

But the only terms that AT&T will accept to resolve the impasse are completely inadequate, self-serving, and not in the best interests of the ratepayers of this country. Bell has made it very clear, for instance, that it will not tolerate an independent voice for its local companies during divestiture. It will not tolerate effective safeguards to protect ratepayers against its own monopoly. It insists upon taking ownership of installed telephones away from the local companies.

Mr. Chairman, I have been willing to compromise language; I have been willing to compromise substance. I cannot in good conscience, however, compromise fundamental principles. The issues are too clear, the need for a new policy too overwhelming, and the interests of the public too apparent.

Let nobody be misled. The kind of bill which AT&T would find acceptable is a bill which only serves their interests and no others. Even a so-called "short" bill would leave the ratepayers and the local companies that service them without real protection.

In the short run AT&T has won a tactical victory by stopping this bill this year. But AT&T's victory is a major setback for the American people and for a telecommunications industry that is one of the fastest growing and most productive segments of our economy. AT&T is preventing Congress from making the decisions that are ours to make.

Let me make it very clear that our commitment to these issues remains as strong as ever, and that we recognize our responsibility to make telecommunications policy. Should AT&T discover the public interest and support a compromise resolution of these issues, we stand ready to move legislation expeditiously. But absent this change in position Congress cannot pass legislation in what remains of this year, therefore; we will use our influence to ensure, to the best of our ability, that decisions in other forums are in the best interests of ratepayers and competition.

The effort to derail this bill will not stop the process from going forward. In the end, Congress must and will set telecommunications policy. The fact remains that no matter how strong AT&T is, no matter how many million they spend, the issues are clear and the needs are there.

I want to thank the Chairman of this Committee for his leadership. I also want to thank the many organizations and interested parties who have supported our efforts. You all should know the fight will go on.

Finally, and most important, I want to praise the thoughtfulness and courage of my colleagues on this Committee, and particularly those on the Subcommittee. We have raised the issues, we have identified the needs, and we have brought our case to the public.

Mr. Chairman, I now move that the Committee adjourn.

THE MX MISSILE

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

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as we begin consideration of the \$180 billion DOD authorization bill, I think it appropriate to focus on one of the most controversial and expensive weapons systems provided for in this bill, the MX missile. Before committing up to \$30 billion on this highly accurate counterforce weapon, it would be wise to question whether its production and deployment would be in the national interest. That the MX is a missile without any foreseeable mission or home is the theme of the following article by Barry Schneider, director of the Institute for International Security Studies. After a thorough examination of this complex issue, Dr. Schneider concludes that the development of the MX is not consistent with any realistic nuclear arms strategy, especially when its deployment could lead to the adoption of a "launch-on-warning" nuclear policy by the Soviet Union. He also draws attention to the fact that of the available permanent MX basing modes, none are without high risk, prohibitive cost or other major drawbacks. I commend Dr. Schneider's article to the attention of my colleagues.

MISSILE EXPERIMENTAL—MISSION UNCERTAIN
(By Barry R. Schneider)

The MX missile program currently proposed by the Reagan Administration will consist of at least 100 missiles, the first to be deployed by 1986, each with 10 independently targetable nuclear warheads. The new "Missile Experimental" will be a "hard target" killer, capable of destroying hardened Soviet missile silos with greater accuracy and destructive capacity than the present Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). The MX is being designed to hit within 300 feet of a target 6,000 miles away from the launchpoint. In contrast, the present Minuteman ICBMs carry three nuclear warheads and can hit within about two lengths of a football field, instead of one length. The estimated probability of kill (Pk) of the MX is close to 98 percent for a double shot against a Soviet missile silo. The double shot Pk for a Minuteman is around 90 percent. The total cost for the MX program could exceed \$30 billion.

Ballistic missiles represent the world's most advanced and lethal slingshots. The superpowers house them on launchers inside concrete vertical shelters buried in the ground. A visit to a Minuteman missile site is surprisingly unimpressive. It has the appearance of a gravel parking lot surrounded by a chain link fence. The only clues that this is no parking lot come from the several antennae poking through the gravel and the large concrete slab door in the middle of the lot. Only when the door slides aside do you see the missile deep in its silo, poised for an intercontinental ride across the North Pole. The missile is launched skyward to a high velocity and altitude by a rocket that burns just the first few minutes of the flight to target. Guidance of the weapon toward its destination

can only be accomplished during the powered portion of the flight. Once the booster rocket shuts off and separates, the warhead package continues on to its apogee above the earth's atmosphere before the gravitational pull of the earth draws it back into a free-fall path through the earth's atmosphere to the target below. Within 30 minutes, a 6,000 mile ballistic missile attack can be completed—delivering a nuclear punch ranging from 17 to 50,000 Hiroshima explosions in each of its warheads.

The MX, weighing 190,000 pounds, is about 2½ times the size and weight of our present Minuteman missiles. It is about equal in size to the Soviets' SS-19, and is about half the size of their SS-18. The MX's 10 nuclear warheads, all independently targetable, compare with three on the Minuteman, six on the SS-19, and 10 on the SS-18. MX warheads have an estimated 335 kiloton yield each, an explosive punch equivalent to 17 Hiroshimas. With its advanced inertial guidance system, the MX will be the most accurate ballistic missile in the world when deployed, as scheduled, in 1986.

At present, the MX is in the full-scale engineering phase of development. The missile booster, guidance and control systems, post-boost MIRV vehicle, and reentry systems are now being developed, tested, and integrated into a missile system. The first flight test is scheduled for January 1983. At least 100 MX ICBMs with 1,000 warheads have been planned for deployment.

The basic military justification for the MX is to eliminate a potential vulnerability in the 1980s—the vulnerability of U.S. land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles to a Soviet surprise attack. Improvements in the Soviets' nuclear warhead numbers and the accuracy of their missiles will make it theoretically possible for them to destroy an increasingly larger percentage of our Minuteman and Titan missiles in their silos.

U.S. proponents of the MX missile see it as a way of similarly threatening the Soviet fixed-silo ICBMs while removing much of the threat to our own ICBMs. Our military planners are reluctant to abandon land-based missiles because they provide a unique combination of accuracy, reliability, assured defense-penetrating capability, as well as secure, instantaneous, and survivable command and control links to national command authorities. Moreover, ICBMs maintain a high alert rate and excellent responsiveness to commands. Their potential destructive power is believed to be a major contribution to the war deterrent posture of the United States in the world.

While some experts believe that the United States need not maintain three different nuclear retaliatory forces—on land, in the sea, and in the air—this is not the view of the leaders of our armed services. They argue that the triad of ICBMs, submarine-based missiles, and strategic bombers complicates the job of any potential attacker and increases the probability of early warning to a significant portion of the U.S. retaliatory force should such an attack occur.

Some strategists are disturbed by the fact that the Soviets have an edge in countersilo destructive capability and want to erase it with deployment of our own silo-killer, the MX. Those in favor of strengthening the ICBM leg of the triad note that we can operate land-based missiles at a fraction of the cost of maintaining fleet ballistic missile submarines or strategic bombers, an important consideration if we are to compete suc-

cessfully with the Soviets over the long haul.

MX proponents argue that the vulnerability of land-based missiles must be eliminated while we are still protected by the retaliatory capability of our bomber and submarine forces. They believe that this repair job needs to take place before new threats to the bomber and submarine forces also emerge and in order to force the Soviets to concentrate on countering three rather than two U.S. strategic elements.

The argument is also made that in actual nuclear war, the MX would inflict greater damage on the Soviets, at each rung on the escalation ladder, than they could inflict on the U.S. Knowing this, it is argued, Moscow would be deterred from initiating a conflict or from escalating one, once the terrible struggle began. The MX would enhance "peace through strength." Deployment of the fearsome weapon would be a visible symbol to the rest of the world of a continued U.S. commitment to remain second to none.

Moreover, the argument runs that MX deployment is a vital element in the U.S. drive to reestablish military superiority over the Soviet Union; it also provides the Soviets with an added incentive to negotiate reductions in nuclear forces through arms control as they see the "correlation of forces" shift against themselves. At a minimum, MX could force the Soviets to spend more heavily on counters to the MX program. Such a diversion of funds could keep them from increasing pressures on us through the buildup of conventional land, sea, and air forces.

Yet despite all these arguments for the MX missile, and for keeping an ICBM element in U.S. strategic retaliatory forces, critics feel that the MX missile is a weapon in search of a legitimate strategy and that it has not yet found a basing mode that makes sense. Behind all this concern about the MX is the fundamental question: How much is enough? How much nuclear weaponry is necessary to carry out the legitimate roles and missions of U.S. forces? Many share the conviction that the United States already has enough overkill capacity and counterforce capacity in its present forces and that it cannot afford and does not need the MX missile system.

Clearly, the United States already has an awesome retaliatory nuclear capability, with over 9,000 strategic nuclear warheads poised to strike from its strategic submarines, land-based ICBM silos, and long-range bombers. Altogether, the United States has about 25,000 nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has something like 15,000 to 25,000. The combined US-USSR megatonnage exceeds the power of a million Hiroshima explosions. A full-scale nuclear exchange between the two would probably kill over 100 million people in the United States, 100 million in the USSR, and 100 million Europeans, most of this humanity in the first days of combat.

In 30 minutes to an hour, U.S. retaliatory forces could destroy nearly all large Soviet cities, industrial centers, military bases, ports, major rail junctions, and large power stations. Our missile and bomber forces could do this even if struck first in a massive Soviet nuclear attack fired without warning.

The United States has no plans for a nuclear blitzkrieg. Presumably the only time such a thing could even be contemplated would be during an acute crisis, in which U.S. decision-makers thought the Soviets were about to strike first. Some American President might, under stress, order our missiles to fly first in hopes of blunting the

Soviet attack. But one reason many people have trouble with the MX missile is that its primary utility is as a first-strike force. The MX would give the American military the countersilo capability it currently lacks that would make possible, in theory at least, a preemptive surprise attack that could destroy or disable all, or nearly all, the 1,400 silo-based missiles in the Soviet Union before they could be fired at us. In military jargon, the MX will give us a first-strike capability against time-urgent hard targets. At present, we have a limited but quite respectable counterforce capability. Our 550 Minuteman III missiles carry three very accurate nuclear warheads each and could probably destroy more than half the Soviet missiles today in the time it takes you to read this article.

But destroying just half would be wildly irrational. A single surviving Soviet SS-18 missile, with its 10 warheads, could destroy 10 major U.S. cities in a counterattack. Knowing this, no U.S. general or President in his right mind would order such a counterforce strike. However, if the 1,650 highly accurate Minuteman III warheads were added to 1,000 superaccurate MX warheads, the United States could, at least theoretically, carry out a 2-on-1 nuclear attack against nearly every Soviet missile silo with a high probability of success.

What the United States would gain by matching the Soviet first-strike capability against ICBMs, is unclear. Surely the Soviets would see the MX as a potential first-strike weapon. It would make no sense to deploy such a potent silo-killer unless there was a contingency one had in mind for its use. Of course, this analysis applies to the Soviet SS-18 and SS-19 missiles as well as the MX. But what is to be gained by the peacetime deployment of a super-counterforce weapon? It would make no sense to be used as a second strike weapon. The United States already has plenty of those in its present nuclear arsenal. And if the MX survived an attack what would it be aimed at? Empty Soviet ICBM silos? The Soviets would have used most of their ICBMs in the first strike. As Rear Admiral Eugene J. Carroll (USN-ret.) has noted, "does the ability to ride out several thousand nuclear explosions in the United States and then retaliate against empty Soviet silos add to national defense? Clearly, it does not."

If the MX is indeed a first-strike force do we need it or want it? To reemphasize, a surprise nuclear attack on the USSR would be as irrational as it would be immoral. No United States attack could disarm the Soviet Union completely. Indeed, several thousand nuclear warheads would survive for retaliation against the North American continent and against our European and Japanese allies. Several hundred million casualties could easily be the result. One has to question the logic of building a first-strike force when its only wartime use would be to commit national suicide.

Some argue that the MX should be deployed in order to give the United States commander the option to engage in relatively small escalatory steps in a real nuclear war. But the United States already has 1,650 highly accurate Minuteman III weapons for such "limited nuclear options." Indeed, it is probably a delusion to think that such limited attacks could be kept limited, that escalation could be contained once nuclear weapons have been introduced into the conflict. Limited nuclear attacks would appear massive to the wounded nation. They would trigger massive responses. One

nuclear weapon on New York City would kill more Americans than have died in warfare in the last 200 years. Just seven Minuteman III warheads contain the same explosive power as all the bombs dropped on Germany and Japan by all our allies in World War II.

Those advocating limited nuclear options make the case that the United States should not be put in the box of either having to push all the buttons or of surrendering if war began. But a look at the Soviets' military strategy as spelled out in their military writings, speeches, and what we glean from intelligence sources has not shown that they believe in limited nuclear war. They will hit with everything they possess—or so they repeatedly say. Thus, an MX force built to prosecute a limited nuclear war is simply a waste of resources.

Even if a limited countersilo capability were a good idea, the MX force might not be the best way to providing that kind of capability. First, a significant countersilo capability is present in our Minuteman missile force. Second, if we are worried about the Minuteman's survivability in the opening phases of a war, we could rely upon the Trident II (D-5) submarine-based missile, which will be deployed in 1989. The D-5 missile will have an accuracy as good or better than current ICBM accuracy and will be based at sea where it is difficult or impossible to locate by an enemy. Why should the United States build a very costly and possibly vulnerable MX missile force, when it will have a Trident II missile about as capable, and much more survivable?

The Soviet Union would have a number of choices in the face of a growing United States counterforce threat. The combined threat of Minuteman II, MX, and Trident II weapons could cause them to:

Adopt a launch-on-warning or launch-under-attack superalert status for their nuclear forces.

Build up their missile forces further and speed up their work on antisubmarine warfare in order to improve their capability of destroying the threatening U.S. forces.

Move their ICBMs from fixed silos to mobile launchers to make them less vulnerable.

Shift their resources from land-based ICBMs to more survivable submarine forces.

The launch-on-warning or launch-under-attack option would be the cheapest—but the riskiest—that the Soviets could make. Putting their forces on hair-trigger alerts and adopting a policy of firing them at the first signs of an attack invites an accidental nuclear holocaust. Mistaken intelligence could make the Soviets launch a preemptive nuclear attack during an acute crisis. It is instructive to note that there have been 147 false alerts recorded at North American Defense Headquarters in an 18-month period beginning in January 1979. Half a dozen were serious, and took a number of minutes to detect as false alarms. Had we adopted a launch-on-warning policy and had it been a crisis when such attacks were expected, one of those could have triggered World War III. No record exists for Soviet false alarms in the nuclear age, but any such false alarms, combined with a launch-on-warning strategy, would leave U.S. security hanging by a thin thread. (Remember that we have already had one "accidental" world war in this century. World War I was triggered by the assassination of Austria's Archduke Francis Ferdinand by a Serbian nationalist. That act unleashed a train of events that culminated in 40 million deaths even

though none of the great powers wanted, or planned, a war in 1914.)

The second likely response to an MX force might be for the Soviets to accelerate their buildup of atomic weapons. After all, is this not the main reason we are building the MX, to counter the Soviet SS-18 and SS-19? Why should they think any differently when all their ICBMs appear to be in peril? Thus the MX would likely increase the Soviets' inclination to preemptively attack us in a crisis and to match or exceed our nuclear buildup.

The third option—the movement of Soviet ICBMs from their present silos to some future ground mobile force—would have a mixed result for American security. First, it would make it more difficult for the U.S. missile force to target all the Soviet missiles. This might make the peace more stable since the Soviets would have less reason to be nervous and trigger-happy in a crisis. It would also probably mean some decrease in Soviet missile accuracy and firepower for a time, since mobiles are less accurate and transporter-erector-launchers could not easily accommodate missiles the size of the Soviet SS-18. All this is to the good—up to a point. But the problem with land-mobile ICBMs is that they are difficult to count by national technical means of verification (e.g., satellites). Deployment of mobile ICBMs could ring the death knell for strategic arms control.

As for the fourth choice, that would be the happiest (but least likely) solution for the Soviet Union and the United States as well—to put their increasingly vulnerable missile forces at sea aboard strategic submarines. This would start an enormous political fight in both countries if the Soviet Strategic Rocket Forces and the U.S. Air Force used all their considerable bureaucratic clout to preserve their roles, missions, budgets, and prerogatives. For that reason alone, that choice is unlikely to be made in either country. Nevertheless, if both sides began to phase out land-based missiles and transfer to submarines, both would have invulnerable second-strike forces, and neither would see the advantage in striking first. The move to greater reliance on fleet ballistic missile submarines would also better facilitate the verification of nuclear arms control agreements as compared to mobile ICBM's on land.

The MX debate in this country is really two discrete debates. The first, of course, is whether the United States needs such a missile, which can destroy hard targets and can be used in a first strike. The second debate is how to base our ICBMs so that they can substantially survive a first-strike attack and still retaliate with devastation.

In an astonishing turnabout last spring, the Senate Armed Services Committee voted unanimously to put the MX missile on the shelf until the Reagan Administration proposed a better way to base the missiles than their temporary expedient of shoving the MX into old, easily targeted Minuteman silos. The Senators voted to defer to 1984 from 1983 the purchase of the first MX missiles. They also called on the Pentagon to provide them with a permanent MX basing plan by December 1 of this year.

But is there any better MX basing method that solves the triple problems of MX force survivability, cost-effectiveness, and political acceptability? And is there any logical military strategy that a President could employ MX missiles without committing national suicide? The MX problem confounds strategists and politicians alike, and unless

acceptable answers are discovered soon, the MX missile program may be cancelled for good.

In other, more prosperous times, the Congress probably would fund the MX program regardless of its feasibility. But in a season when massive Federal deficits are accompanied by ruinous interest rates, high inflation, and record unemployment, even the Pentagon budget is beginning to come under close scrutiny—and the MX program is a highly visible target.

Sen. John Tower, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has endorsed a \$3 billion cut in Reagan's defense package. Former President Ford has increasingly urged sizable cuts in military spending to reduce the deficit. Speaking to a Florida audience in February, Ford said, "I'm a hawk. I'm proud of it, and I don't intend to change. But I think there can be responsible delays in purchases of some big-ticket items in the defense budget." These sentiments were echoed by John Connally, former Secretary of the Treasury and the Navy, who advocates a \$10 billion cut in defense spending to bring down inflation and the deficit. Just as surprising is the turnabout of long-term hawk and former leader of the GOP in the House of Representatives, Rep. John Rhodes. He recently called for a 70 percent reduction in MX missile funding and launched a full-scale assault on the military and economic premises of the Reagan defense program. Rhodes' new stance is indicative of the growing bipartisan sentiment in Congress to cut the defense budget and to take some symbolic action that would put Congress on record against the nuclear arms race.

President Reagan's own advisory panel on the MX, chaired by Charles Townes, a physicist at the University of California, concluded that "It finds no practical basing mode for missiles deployed on the land's surface, available at this time, that assures an adequate number of surviving ICBM warheads."

During the 1980 Presidential election campaign, Ronald Reagan ridiculed President Carter's plan to rotate 200 MX missiles among 4,600 reinforced concrete shelters in Nevada and Utah. On October 2, 1981, he killed Carter's "multiple protective shelter" scheme and announced that he planned to put the first MX missiles in Titan silos, to be additionally strengthened against blast effects. This idea has since been modified in favor of putting the first 40 or so MX missiles in Minuteman silos instead of Titan holes.

For the future, President Reagan promised to look at permanent basing possibilities. Alternatives recently under serious consideration include: (1) defending MX missiles in silos with antiballistic missiles (ABMs); (2) putting the MX abroad giant "Big Bird" aircraft on continuous airborne patrol; (3) deep underground basing of MX missiles; and (4) putting MX silos so close together ("Dense Pack") that the first Soviet nuclear explosion on one of them would have the effect of destroying or deflecting later Soviet warheads targeted on other adjacent silos.

Many MX-basing ideas have been studied and then rejected over the years, including basing MX on the seabed, on inland ships, on ocean-going ships, on small diesel-powered submarines, on amphibious seaplanes, on vertical takeoff aircraft, on dirigibles, on railroad cars, on large-road mobile vehicles, in covered trenches, in pools of water or in lakes—or shuttling the MXs between hard-

ened shelters in the valleys of Utah and Nevada. The search goes on with no good solution in sight. As the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment concluded last year: "We see that all available models of basing MX pose serious problems. None of them is without serious risks, high cost, or significant drawbacks."

The Reagan MX-basing alternatives appear to be no exception to this gloomy view. For example, antiballistic missile defenses of silo-based MXs might fail to work; and their deployment would trigger a costly, risky acceleration in the nuclear arms race. Scrapping the ABM Treaty, which comes up for review this fall, might lead to an early Soviet ABM advantage and undermine the effectiveness of our retaliatory forces and that of our allies. Airmobile MXs would be vulnerable to barrage attacks even when airborne, and would lose in accuracy what they gain in survivability over silo-based systems. President Reagan is reported to have definitely rejected this MX-basing option, favored by Secretary of Defense Weinberger. Deep underground MX basing would rely on considerable guesswork about the survivability of underground structures when hit by thermonuclear explosions. At present nobody knows whether the MXs would be forever entombed inside the hill, mesa, or mountain, or whether MX forces could dig their way to the surface for retaliation. "Dense Pack" MX basing, putting silos close together, might protect the remainder when the first silo is attacked, but the debris, heat, radioactivity, and hurricane-force winds created could as easily prevent a successful retaliatory MX launch while simultaneously blunting further Soviet missile attacks. MX missiles unable to respond might as well have been destroyed; the effect is the same. "Dense Pack" has the further disadvantage of being a clear and direct violation of the terms of the SALT II Treaty still being observed informally by both superpowers.

Indeed, it is possible that there are no good solutions to be found for basing MX. As Dr. Seymour Zeitberg, Deputy Under Secretary for Defense Research and Engineering observed last year, "This [MX basing decision] is a question of what is the least rotten apple in a barrel of rotten apples."

The Senate Armed Services Committee action could force the President to choose the permanent MX basing mode before they grant him next year's request of \$1.5 billion for MX missile development and \$715 million in research funds to restructure Minuteman silos. The Senators reasoned that it would make no sense to expose the new MX to the same risks facing the present Minuteman and Titan missiles, which are fixed targets increasingly easy for the Soviets to destroy with their very accurate SS-18 and SS-19 missile warheads. Instead, Sen. Tower's committee felt the better idea was to hold off producing the missile until Reagan could do what he criticized Jimmy Carter for not doing: come up with a safe, cost-effective, permanent home for the MX.

Perhaps the best solution to the problems the MX was originally designed to correct exists not so much in the realm of military planning as in diplomacy and arms control bargaining with the Soviet Union. President Reagan's new strategic arms reduction proposals would have both superpowers limit themselves to 850 intercontinental ballistic missiles and to 5,000 strategic nuclear warheads, only half of which could be carried

by land-based missiles. The cuts would take place in land-based missiles where the Soviets concentrate three quarters of their firepower as contrasted to 25 percent for the United States. Fleet ballistic missile submarines and bomber forces would not be reduced.

This proposal is clearly loaded in favor of the United States, for Moscow would have to give up about 250 more land-based missiles than the United States, and would have to scrap most of its new SS-18s and SS-19s as well as 3,000 nuclear warheads. The United States, by contrast, could still add another 350 ICBM warheads under President Reagan's plan, while trimming back elsewhere.

As generally expected, the Kremlin rejected this opening position of the United States but, it may be hoped, it will counter with a revised plan of its own. One element of an eventual bargain could be a reduction of Soviet countersilo weapons such as the SS-18 and SS-19 if the United States were to forego the MX missile deployment. Such a tradeoff would save the United States \$30 billion or more in MX spending over the next several years. It would reduce the Soviet missile threat to the United States. The Soviets, on the other hand, would be spared the first strike threat implied by the MX force and the enormous costs of moving to mobile ICBMs. Both sides could avoid the risks of either side adopting a launch-on-warning posture.

With its 10 superaccurate warheads, the MX could make the Soviet ICBMs in their silos just as vulnerable as their SS-18s and SS-19s make our present Minuteman forces. But simply copying what the Soviets have done makes no sense in this case. Matching first-strike capabilities will make both sides less secure in a crisis. The aim should be to eliminate such first-strike capabilities from both arsenals—through diplomacy, not military action—by negotiating arms reduction agreements that remove these daggers from the throats of each side and by choosing weapons that are neither vulnerable nor provocative. Better to trade the MX away than to deploy it in a vulnerable manner for a mission that could only lead to national suicide if ordered.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHAPPELL, for today, on account of pressing business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WIRTH, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CORCORAN, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOWARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COELHO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEDELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ADDABBO, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BINGHAM, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,309.

Mr. CLAUSEN, on House Concurrent Resolution 278.

Mrs. HECKLER, on House Concurrent Resolution 278, older Americans bill, today.

Mr. VENTO, in support of the Stratton amendment to H.R. 6030 in the Committee of the Whole today.

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

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. HOLLENBECK.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. RUDD in two instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.

Mr. ROTH in two instances.

Mr. CHENEY.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. HYDE in two instances.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. SHUMWAY in two instances.

Mr. MARLENEE.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. PARRIS.

Mr. DANNEMEYER.

Ms. FIEDLER.

Mr. SMITH of Alabama.

Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.

Mr. LOWERY of California.

Mr. GOODLING.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. KOGOVSEK.

Mr. BEDELL.

Mr. WYDEN in two instances.

Mr. FRANK in two instances.

Mr. SANTINI.

Mr. WIRTH.

Mr. McDONALD in five instances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. LEHMAN.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. GRAY.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. SCHUMER in two instances.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. HOYER in two instances.

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

Mr. ECKART.

Ms. FERRARO.

Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. SHANNON.

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. BIAGGI in three instances.

Mr. STUDDS in two instances.

Mr. LaFALCE in four instances.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAWKINS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 19, 1982, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4688. An act to amend the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 to increase from \$15,000 to \$25,000 the maximum amount the United States may pay in settlement of a claim under section 3 of that Act; and

H.R. 6590. An act to provide for the operation of the tobacco price support and production adjustment program in such a manner as to result in no net cost to taxpayers, to limit increases in the support price for tobacco, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 21, 1982, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4401. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notice of the Navy's intention to lease, under the authority of chapter 6 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, a naval vessel to Pakistan, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4402. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Shipbuilding and Logistics, transmitting notice of the proposed conversion to contractor performance of the custodial service function at the Naval Avionics Center, Indianapolis, Ind., pursuant to section 502(b) of Public Law 96-342; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4403. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report that a substantial violation of the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement of July 23, 1952, may have occurred during the series of military operations which began on June 6, 1982, when Israeli forces entered Lebanon, pursuant to section 3(c)(2) of the Arms Export

Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4404. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report accounting amounts obligated and expended in Nicaragua, pursuant to section 724(e) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4405. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, transmitting the Commission's annual report on the International Communication Agency, pursuant to section 8 of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4406. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the first semiannual report of the Inspector General covering the period from October 1, 1981, through March 31, 1982, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

4407. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, TVA Retirement System, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report for the plan year ending September 30, 1981 for the TVA Retirement System, pursuant to Public Law 95-595; to the Committee on Government Operations.

4408. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the final study and environmental assessment on the proposed Florida National Trail, recommending that the trail be designated as a National Scenic Trail, pursuant to section 5(c)(19) of Public Law 90-543, as amended (H. Doc. No. 97-213); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4409. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report covering the period September 1978 through January 1982 on the implementation and administration of title IV of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4410. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a comprehensive emergency management report, including the Agency's 1981 activities, pursuant to sundry provisions of Public Law; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works and Transportation, Science and Technology.

4411. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the board's midyear monetary policy report, pursuant to section 2A of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (92 Stat. 1897); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs and Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORHEAD: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5380. A bill to recognize the organization known as American Ex-Prisoners of War; with amendments (Rept. No. 97-643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SAM B. HALL JR.: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2317. A bill to recognize the or-

ganization known as the National Federation of Music Clubs; with amendments (Rept. No. 97-644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. Budget allocation report of the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act (Rept. No. 97-645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. CHISHOLM: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 527. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5320, a bill to establish a community public-private training and employment assistance system and to provide employment and training services, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 97-647). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 528. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5203, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (Rept. No. 97-648). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 529. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5427, a bill to authorize support to Radio Broadcasting to Cuba, Incorporated (Rept. No. 97-649). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONIOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 530. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2329, a bill conferring jurisdiction on certain courts of the United States to hear and render judgment in connection with certain claims of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 97-650). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6011. A bill to designate certain lands in the Bankhead National Forest, Ala., as a wilderness area and to incorporate such wilderness area into the Sipsy Wilderness; with amendments, referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than July 30, 1982, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendments as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X (Rept. No. 97-646, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. SABO, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARLENEE):

H.R. 6793. A bill to improve farm commodity prices for wheat and feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDGAR (for himself, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WYLYE, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. MOTTL,

Mr. MICA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. NELLIGAN, Mr. SILJANDER, and Mr. SMITH of Alabama):

H.R. 6794. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve job training and job placement programs and educational assistance programs for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania: H.R. 6795. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to the collection of administrative costs under the child support program for non-AFDC support enforcement, and to make technical amendments in provisions of law relating to that program and the social services and foster care programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENEY: H.R. 6796. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain modifications of the existing Buffalo Bill Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORCORAN: H.R. 6797. A bill to amend title II of the Communications Act of 1934 to assure diversity of sources of electronic information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. WALGREN):

H.R. 6798. A bill to authorize appropriations for atmospheric, climatic, and ocean pollution activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for the fiscal years 1983 and 1984, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science and Technology.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself and Mr. BLANCHARD):

H.R. 6799. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act Amendments of 1978 to improve the ability of the United States to help insure an open and fair international finance system for U.S. industries; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PARRIS: H.R. 6800. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow certain employees of the National Transportation Safety Board to receive civil service retirement credit for their service under the Federal railroad retirement program; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANGEL: H.R. 6801. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the targeted jobs credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING: H.R. 6802. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK: H.R. 6803. A bill to define the circumstances under which construction workers may deduct travel and transportation expenses in computing their taxable incomes for purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 6804. A bill to provide subsistence allowances for members of the Coast Guard officer candidate program, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 6805. A bill to amend the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act to require voter approval of the financing of Washington Nuclear Projects No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 6806. A bill to establish an appropriate school and dormitory for congressional pages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H.R. 6807. A bill to prohibit the use on Cyprus of military equipment provided to Turkey by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAFALIS:

H.R. 6808. A bill to designate the Federal Building in Fort Myers, Fla., as the "George W. Whitehurst Federal Court Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BEILEN-

SON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.J. Res. 541. Joint resolution concerning the successful completion of the test flight phase of the Space Shuttle program; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. BENEDICT:

H. Con. Res. 376. Concurrent resolution recognizing the outstanding service and patriotism exhibited by the volunteers of the American National Red Cross during times of war and expressing the gratitude of the Congress for the service of such volunteers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. STARK):

H. Con. Res. 377. Concurrent resolution condemning the persecution of the Baha'is by the Government of Iran and calling upon the President to take steps to bring an end to their persecution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 6809. A bill for the relief of O. Edmund Clubb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIP BURTON:

H.R. 6810. A bill for the relief of Emily Gayanes Gaufo, Joselyn G. Gaufo, and Favio G. Gaufo, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 6811. A bill for the relief of Alejo White and Sonia White; 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. 39: Mr. GILMAN.
 H.R. 200: Mr. GILMAN.
 H.R. 1353: Mr. WYDEN.
 H.R. 2007: Mr. FOLEY and Mrs. HECKLER.
 H.R. 2034: Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. ERTEL, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2204: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
 H.R. 2222: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FISH, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. FAZIO.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. PATTERSON.
 H.R. 3117: Mr. WORTLEY.
 H.R. 3252: Mr. LEHMAN.
 H.R. 4230: Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. MYERS.
 H.R. 4657: Mr. ADDABBO and Mr. ROSENTHAL.
 H.R. 5180: Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. KRAMER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. McCLODY, and Mr. RITTER.
 H.R. 5214: Mr. BOWEN and Mr. FRENZEL.
 H.R. 5234: Mr. BLANCHARD.
 H.R. 5448: Mr. EVANS of Georgia.
 H.R. 5471: Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.
 H.R. 5738: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SHAMANSKY, and Mr. BEDELL.
 H.R. 5833: Mr. CONTE.
 H.R. 5918: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LENT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. WON PAT.
 H.R. 5995: Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FISH, and Mr. WIRTH.
 H.R. 6003: Mr. ZABLOCKI.
 H.R. 6062: Mr. MARLENEE.
 H.R. 6070: Mrs. SCHROEDER.
 H.R. 6124: Mr. DICKS, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. DWYER.
 H.R. 6131: Mr. RATCHFORD.
 H.R. 6165: Mr. PEPPER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. RATCHFORD, and Mr. OTTINGER.
 H.R. 6188: Mr. CLAUSEN.
 H.R. 6190: Mr. STOKES, Mr. DeNARDIS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ECKART, Mr. VENTO, Mr. YATES, Mr. DWYER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. WEISS.
 H.R. 6283: Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 6315: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 6467: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. NAPIER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.
 H.R. 6492: Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. COATS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. JAMES K. COYNE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DeNARDIS, Mr. DWYER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. KEMP, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. TRIBLE.

H.R. 6526: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. McEWEN, and Mr. BINGHAM.

H.R. 6527: Mr. MINISH, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, and Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 6538: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.R. 6573: Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HILER, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 6591: Mr. ECKART, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 6613: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 6693: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DWYER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BONKER, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. FARY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. MOFFETT.

H.R. 6729: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DWYER, Mr. EMERY, Mr. FARY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 172: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SANTINI, and Mr. GRAMM.

H.J. Res. 323: Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. PICKLE.

H.J. Res. 332: Mr. DICKS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. McCLODY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EDGAR, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, and Mr. BETHUNE.

H.J. Res. 456: Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PRICE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. NOWAK.

H.J. Res. 489: Mr. LOWRY of Washington.
 H.J. Res. 493: Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SMITH of Alabama, Mr. NELLIGAN, and Mr. RUDD.

H.J. Res. 503: Mr. EDWARDS of California and Mr. SHELBY.

H.J. Res. 533: Mr. MITCHELL of New York and Mr. HOPKINS.

H. Con. Res. 324: Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BEARD, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. WEAVER.

H. Con. Res. 355: Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COURTER, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LUNDINE, and Mr. BINGHAM.

H. Con. Res. 364: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FARY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. MINISH, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. LeBOUTILLIER, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H. Res. 367: Mr. JENKINS.

H. Res. 486: Mr. DWYER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. BEDELL.

H. Res. 505: Mr. MINETA, Mr. FISH, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. COELHO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DWYER, and Ms. OAKAR.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

523. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Ambassador of the Turkish Republic, Washington, D.C., relative to international terrorism; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 5203

By Mr. LEVITAS:

—Page 63, strike out line 21 and all that follows through line 10 on page 69.

H.R. 6030

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

—At the end of the bill add the following new section:

LIMITATION OF PROCUREMENT OF RATIONS
PACKAGED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 902. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this Act may be used for the procurement of combat rations for the Armed Forces unless such rations were packaged inside the United States.

By Mr. HOLLENBECK:

—Page 26, after line 22, add the following new section:

TREATY ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Sec. 902. It is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) actively promote negotiations among the member nations of the ad hoc working

group on chemical weapons of the Committee on Disarmament established by the United Nations General Assembly and meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, for the purpose of the member nations agreeing to a treaty for the complete and verifiable prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for the destruction of all chemical weapons; and

(2) communicate to the Government of the Soviet Union the willingness of the Government of the United States to proceed as soon as possible to conclude a treaty for the complete and verifiable prohibition of the development, production, and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and for the destruction of all chemical weapons.

By Mrs. SCHNEIDER:
(Amendment offered by Mrs. SCHNEIDER to H.R. 6030.)

—Page 26, after line 22, insert:

RESTRICTION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL
VESSELS IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS

Sec. 902. (a) Chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“§ 7309. Restriction on construction of naval vessels in foreign shipyards

“(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), no naval vessel, and no major component of the hull or superstructure of a naval vessel, may be constructed in a foreign shipyard.

“(b) The President may authorize exceptions to the prohibition in subsection (a) when he determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so. The President shall transmit notice to Congress of any such determination, and no contract may be made pursuant to the ex-

ception authorized until the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the notice of such determination is received by Congress.”

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

“7309. Restriction on construction of naval vessels in foreign shipyards.”

By Mr. SIMON:

—At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

STUDY ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 902. (a)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility of requiring each cadet and midshipman at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy and each member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program to study at least one foreign language for not less than two years and to increase existing requirements for foreign language study at such academies and in such program.

(2) The Secretary shall include in such study consideration of the desirability and feasibility of paying a bonus to each member of the Armed Forces stationed in a foreign country who is proficient in the native language (other than English) of such country.

(b) A report on the study conducted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the Congress not later than the date occurring 12 months after the date of the enactment of this section.